



EVALUATION CRITERIA

GENERAL

The major evaluation factors for this solicitation include technical (which encompasses experience, technical approach, corporate and human resources, quality control and past performance factors) and cost/price factors. Although technical factors are of paramount consideration in the award of the contract, cost/price is also important to the overall contract award decision. All evaluation factors other than cost or price, when combined, are significantly more important than cost or price. In any case, the Secretariat reserves the right to make award(s) to that Bidder whose proposal provides the best overall value to the Secretariat.

Bidders are advised that award will be made to that Bidder whose proposal provides the combination of features that offers the best or greatest overall value to the Secretariat. The Secretariat is more concerned with obtaining performance capability superiority rather than lowest overall cost. **However**, the Secretariat will not make an award at a significantly higher overall cost to the Secretariat to achieve only slightly superior performance. Overall cost to the Secretariat may become the ultimate factor for award of a contract as proposals become more equal based on other factors.

The evaluation will be based on the demonstrated capabilities of the prospective Contractors in relation to the needs of the project as set forth in the RFP. The merits of each proposal will be evaluated carefully. Each proposal must document the feasibility of successful implementation of requirements of the RFP. Bidders must submit information sufficient to evaluate their proposals based on the detailed criteria below.

MANDATORY CRITERIA

The below are mandatory criteria and will have to be met prior to award of the contract:

Company must be local and based in Suva

Company must have a valid business license

Company must be registered under the Registrar of Companies Act

Company must have a valid Tax Identification Number



TECHNICAL EVALUATION CRITERIA

The criteria below are listed in the relative order of importance.

Relative Order of Importance	Factor
1	Factor 1: Cost Effectiveness
2	Factor 3: Corporate Experience and Capabilities
3	Factor 4: General Technical Approach
4	Factor 5: Quality Assurance

1. Cost Effectiveness

- *Attendance rate for service call out (for building services)*
- *Building Construction Rate (for building maintenance)*
- *Building Maintenance Rate (for building maintenance)*
- *Contract Service Cost (for building services)*

2. Corporate Experience and Capabilities

- *Details of major projects for past three years*
- *No of projects completed in the past 3 years*
- *No of current contracts in place*
- *Workforce details*
- *Business registration*
- *Business License*
- *Criminal history (bankruptcy, tax evasion, FNPF compliance, bribery, collusion, fraud etc)*
- *Director/s Details*

3. General Technical Approach

- *New projects-detail how you will tackle new building projects? (optional)*
- *Maintenance projects –how will building maintenance services be provided?(optional)*
- *Building Services – What approach are you going to apply in providing the respective service that you are bidding for?*



4. Quality Assurance

- *After Hours service*
- *Technical assistance*
- *Fleet details*
- *Insurance policies held*
- *Key personnel details that will be involved in the services that is offered with relevant backgrounds and qualifications.*
- *Detail of key contact person who will be the contact point between the Secretariat and the Supplier.*

ADJECTIVAL RATING

The Secretariat will evaluate the Technical Proposal using the following adjectival rating.

Rating	Adjectival	Description
Blue	Exceptional	Greatly exceeds all minimum requirements of the criteria; has a high probability of success; contains no weaknesses or deficiencies.
Green	Good	Exceeds all the minimum requirements of the criteria; has an above average probability of success; contains no significant weaknesses and only minor, correctable weaknesses exist.
Yellow	Acceptable	Meets all the minimum requirements of the criteria; has an average probability of success; no significant weaknesses and any deficiencies can be readily corrected.
Orange	Marginal	Fails to meet one or more of the minimum requirements of the criteria; low probability of success; major weaknesses and/or significant number of deficiencies exist.
Red	Unacceptable	Fails to meet any of the minimum requirements of the criteria; proposal needs major revisions; very low probability of success.



PAST PERFORMANCE

The Past Performance Factor evaluation will assess the relevance and breadth of the Bidder's experience and the quality of the Bidder's past performance. The Secretariat is seeking to determine whether the Bidder has experience that will enhance its technical capability to perform and whether the Bidder consistently delivers quality services in a timely and cost effective manner. In evaluating past performance, PIFS will only take into consideration the relevant experience and past performance assessments from the Bidder's customers. However, the PIFS reserves the right to use other relevant past performance information it obtains through other sources including other agency databases and information contained in trade literature.

Relevance of Experience: The Bidder's experience will be evaluated on the degree of relevance to the requirement on the basis of similarity in size, scope, complexity, technical difficulty, contract type, and period of performance. Only recent experience will be evaluated. Evaluations may include interviews with previous clients of the prime contractor and subcontractors and may include interviews with previous clients of proposed personnel. The Bidder's experience with and knowledge of issues and problems of large organizations will be evaluated.

Past Performance Assessments: The Bidder's past performance will be evaluated on the basis of information contained in the Bidder's proposal and the information that the Secretariat obtains through other means. The past performance evaluation will assess the Bidder's record of providing high quality services of a similar nature in a manner that ensures maximum accuracy, throughput, cost effectiveness and overall client satisfaction.

If some of the Bidder's experience is relevant and the rest is not, only the relevant experience will be evaluated for purposes of past performance. If no experience is relevant or the experience that is relevant cannot be evaluated due to a reference's failure to respond, a rating of neutral will be assigned for past performance as defined below.



Pacific Islands Forum Secretariat

Excelling Together for the People of the Pacific

The Secretariat will evaluate the Past Performance Factor using the following adjectival ratings.

<i>Rating</i>	<i>Symbol</i>	<i>Definition</i>
Neutral	N	No past performance available for evaluation. Bidder has asserted that it has no directly related or similar relevant past performance experience. Proposal receives no merit or demerit for this factor.
Outstanding	O	Based on the Bidder's record of past performance, no issues, concerns, or risks are associated with receiving timely services and contract performance. Past performance surveys and the Bidder's experiences indicate that the Bidder is capable of exceeding the requirements of the delivery order. The Contractor has demonstrated <u>significant experience with and knowledge of</u> the issues and problems of large organizations.
Good	G	The Bidder's record of past performance indicates there is very little risk associated with receiving quality products, timely services and full contract performance. Past performance surveys and the Bidder's experience indicate the Bidder will meet or exceed the requirements of the delivery order. The Contractor has demonstrated <u>experience with and knowledge of</u> the issues and problems of large organizations.
Acceptable	A	The Bidder's record of past performance indicates that there is some potential risk associated with receiving quality products, timely services, and contract performance. Past performance surveys and the Bidder's experience indicate the Bidder may have some problems during performance of the delivery order. The Contractor has demonstrated <u>limited experience with and knowledge of</u> the issues and problems of large organizations.
Unsatisfactory	U	The Bidder's record of past performance indicates it will be unable to perform successfully on the delivery order.



COST/PRICE FACTORS

Bidder(s) cost/price proposal will be evaluated for reasonableness. For a price to be reasonable, it must represent a price to the Secretariat that a prudent person would pay when consideration is given to prices in the market. Normally, price reasonableness is established through adequate price competition. For provision of building services, the Bidder shall submit firm fixed prices for all items (including options).

EVALUATION OF OPTIONS

It is anticipated that any contract awarded from this solicitation will contain option provision(s) and periods(s)

The Secretariat will evaluate offers for award purposes by addition the total price for all options to the total price of the basic requirement, except when it is determined not to be in the Secretariat's best interests. Evaluation of options will not obligate the Secretariat to exercise the option(s)

SELECTION FOR AWARD

Bidder should be aware that the Secretariat shall perform a "best value analysis" and the selection for award shall be made to the Bidder whose proposal is most advantageous to the Secretariat, taking into consideration the technical factors listed above and the total proposed price across all contract periods.