

Name: JAN VAN MONTFORT  
Function: PROJECT ADVISOR

Followed procedure for the bid evaluation:

- o All bids are guarded unopened in a safe until the respective opening ceremony
- o The technical bids are opened all at once in one opening ceremony, presided by the Georgian Amelioration Ltd's director. Minutes are made of the opening ceremony.
- o The financial bids are not opened during this ceremony and return unopened to the safe. The financial bid will not in any way interfere with the evaluation of the technical bids.
- o Technical bids that contain any information about the financial bid will be disqualified
- o The opened technical bids are first screened on their eligibility, by the technical officers who organise the bid evaluation and the project advisor. They disqualify whenever:
  - o They are incomplete
  - o They are not written in both the Georgian and the English language
  - o They do not contain a track record over the last 5 years [based on signed references] that adequately meets the minimal requirements in the ToR:
    - o *Proven experience in site investigation for the gravity-flow rehabilitation of irrigation schemes bigger than 5,000 hectares*
    - o *Proven experience in carrying out ESIA's and drafting ESMPs for irrigation schemes bigger than 5,000 hectares, according to the IFC performance standards*
    - o *Proven experience in undertaking full identification and socio-economic characterization for over more than 5,000 smallholder beneficiaries*
    - o *Proven experience in carrying out financial and economic analysis for agricultural sector and for irrigation systems*
    - o *Proven experiences in undertaking market and value chain assessments for cereals, vegetables and fruits in Georgia and/or the EU*
    - o *Proven experience in advising irrigation departments and/or utility companies to set up tariff policies, based on full cost recovery, including depreciation and overheads*
    - o *Proven experience in making detailed designs for the rehabilitation of gravity-flow irrigation schemes bigger than 10,000 hectares, including technical specifications and Bills of Quantities*
- o They do not contain the certificates, financial statements and declarations that are minimal requirements in the ToR:
  - o *An internationally recognized certificate of quality assurance of the bidder's operations that are relevant to the scope of work of this ToR*
  - o *An average annual turnover (over the last three years, as evidenced by audited financial annual accounts) of the bidder and its possible consortium partners of minimally 3 million Euros*
  - o *Proved solvency of the bidder and the consortium partners (over the last three years, as evidenced by audited financial annual accounts), of at least 20%; applying the definition of Solvency Ratio = (Annual Net Profit + Depreciation) / Liabilities*
  - o *The guarantee that, during the execution of the contract, the bidders as well as its personnel, agents, sub-consultants, sub-contractors, service providers, suppliers and/or their employees will observe the IFC Performance Standards 2012 and the conventions of the International Labour Organization.*
  - o *The guarantee that neither the bidder nor its sub-contractors, service providers and/or its suppliers use forced and/or child labour, as defined in the ILO Conventions 29, 105, 138 and 182.*
  - o *The guarantee that neither the bidders nor any of its personnel, agents, sub-consultants, sub-contractors, service providers and/or its suppliers have been engaged, directly or indirectly, in bribery or any other illegal, corrupt, fraudulent, collusive, coercive or obstructive practices in competing for the contract in question.*

- o The guarantee that, during the execution of the contract, the bidders as well as its personnel, agents, sub-consultants, sub-contractors, service providers, suppliers and/or their employees will observe the OECD Guidelines for Multinational Enterprises (2011 edition).
- o The bidder's signed declaration to be CSR compliant.
- o The disqualifying bids are returned to the submitting parties with the unopened financial bid and a letter stating that they did not meet the minimal requirements. They will not be evaluated by the committee
- o The qualifying bids will be evaluated on the selection criteria:
  - o A: The work plan and description of the approach and methodology for the scope of work, staff deployment table and description of the proposed team composition to adequately cover all deliverables.

*This will not exceed more than 5 pages A4 and counts for 30% of the technical proposal evaluation score. Any information beyond the maximum number of pages (in the Georgian text) will not be taken into consideration by the evaluation committee.*

*The committee will evaluate the work plan, approach and methodology on five criteria:*

A1. Understanding of Objectives:

- o Does the bid show sufficient understanding of the objectives of the assignment?
- o Does it show a good interpretation of what the deliverables are?
- o Does it show a good interpretation on how the different deliverables relate to each other?
- o Does it quantify the deliverables?
- o Does it qualify the deliverables in the spirit of the ToR?
- Does it include all important and strategic elements of the ToR?
- Does the bid go beyond just resuming what is already in the ToR?
- o Does the bidder assume responsibility for the deliverables?
- o Does the bidder propose measures to manage and be held accountable for the adequate delivery of the deliverables?
- Does the bidder make comments on the ToR that add value to the ToR?

SCORE: 70 / 100

A2. Quality of Methodology

- o Does the bid break down the assignment in different components?
- Does it present a clear methodology on how each component will be handled with?
- Do the bidders prove that they have used these methodologies before, with success, and can they elaborate the different step and the different results to be achieved?
- o Is there no intellectual property that restrains the free use of the methodology?
- Are the methodologies that are proposed sufficiently gender-sensitive and participatory?
- Do they take sufficient account of sustainability issues?
- Does the bidder adequately explain why he/she has chosen for this methodology and what the comparative advantages are over other methodologies that are available?
- Can the methodology be expected to adequately produce all the required outputs in the ToR?
- o Do the proposed staff have sufficient competence in the proposed methodologies?

SCORE: 62.5 / 100

A3. Work Plan

- Is the work plan complete? Is there nothing missing?
- Is it realistic in its timing of the activities?
- Does it follow the critical path? (Meaning that each activity is only starting once the critical outputs that are required for its implementation are in place)
- Does it not contain redundant activities or activities that fall outside the ToR?
- Are the activities structured according to the stipulated deliverables and outputs of the ToR?
- Is the work plan sufficiently detailed?
- Does the work stick to the time frame for each deliverable?
- Does the work plan show sufficient flexibility to deal with unforeseen circumstances and constraints?
- Does the work plan allow Georgian Amelioration Ltd to adequately monitor and evaluate the progress of the contract?
- Does the work plan contain sufficient time for quality control and decision-making in Georgian Amelioration Ltd?
- Does the work plan contain specific activities to ensure community participation, gender analysis and sustainability analysis?

SCORE: ... 70 / 100

A4. Staff Deployment Table

- Does the staff deployment table adequately cover all the activities and competencies that are needed to implement the work plan?
- Is the time allocation to the different staff realistic? Can the staff be expected to implement the activities within the given time allocation? Is the time not over or under-estimated?
- Does the staff deployment table include all the minimally required staff functions that the ToR requires?
- Does the staff deployment table specify the names and availability of the different staff members
- Does the staff table show efficiency and cost effectiveness?
- Does it show value for money?
- Is the staff table cross-referenced to the work plan?
- Is the staff deployment table complete?

SCORE: 80 / 100

A5. Proposal Presentation

- Is the proposal easy to read and understand?
- Is it coherent and complete?
- Is it to the point?
- Does it not contain disturbing typos or errors?

SCORE: 77.5 / 100

Each will be scored from 0 to 100, with

- 100 meaning excellence (delivering all the ToR requires and substantially more or much higher quality);
- 90 to 99 means very good (delivering all the ToR requires at a very good quality level);
- 80 to 89 means above average (meaning that the proposal stands out for meeting better than the others in terms of what the ToR requires and the quality norms that are expected);
- 70 to 79 means average (meaning that the bid does not distinguish itself from the others but still satisfactorily covers the ToR requirements and minimal quality standards) and

- 1 to 69 means below average (which means that the bidder's work plan, approach and methodology do not adequately cover everything that is required in the ToR or substantially fall short in quality).

The evaluation members will score these criteria in silence, by themselves, without consultation amongst each other and fill out a scoring sheet

- o B: A convincing story how best irrigation rehabilitation and management practice are incorporated in the design

This will not exceed more than 5 pages A4. It counts for 20% of the technical proposal evaluation score. Any information beyond the maximum number of pages (in the Georgian text) will not be taken into consideration by the evaluation committee.

The committee will evaluate the best practices on two criteria

B1. Best Irrigation Rehabilitation Practices

- X Does the bidder adequately and convincingly analyse the lessons learned from other comparable rehabilitation projects of a similar size and with a similar lay-out and context in Georgia or comparable other countries?
- X Does the bid describe what the best irrigation rehabilitation practices are?
- X Does it do so in a clear way, giving references to literature and experts' findings?
- X Does it describe why these practices are considered crucial?
- ⚠ X Does it not leave out important technical, socio-organizational, institutional, socio-economic, environmental and gender aspects or practices?
- ⚠ X Do they adequately cover the common constraints in terms of community participation, optimal technical choices, good water/system maintenance and management, financial and organizational sustainability, proper quality management, and acceptable cost effectiveness?
- X Does it give convincing examples from the bidders' own track record on how these best practices were given attention – and which results they produced?
- o Are the proposed practices applicable to the Zemo Samgori project?
- o Does the bid explain completely and convincingly how these practices are incorporated in the work plan?
- X Does the bidder commit to making Zemo Samgori a best rehabilitation practice?

SCORE: 48 / 100

B2. Best Irrigation Management Practices

- X Does the bidder adequately and convincingly analyse the lessons learned from other comparable projects of a similar size and with a similar lay-out and context in Georgia or comparable other countries, in terms of how the management of the system is enhanced or constrained by the rehabilitation designs and proposed organisational arrangements?
- X Does the bid describe what the best irrigation management practices are – and how they relate to rehabilitation design?
- X Does it do so in a clear way, giving references to literature and experts' findings?
- X Does it describe why these practices are considered crucial?
- ⚠ X Does it not leave out important technical, socio-organizational, institutional, socio-economic, environmental and gender aspects or practices?
- ⚠ X Do they adequately cover the common constraints in terms of community participation, optimal technical choices, good water/system maintenance and management, financial and organizational sustainability, proper quality management, and acceptable cost effectiveness?
- X Does it give convincing examples from the bidders' own track record on how these best practices were given attention during the design stage – and which results they produced?

- o Are the proposed practices applicable to the Zemo Samgori project's design and context?
- o Does the bid explain completely and convincingly how these practices are incorporated in the work plan?
- Does the bidder commit to enable Zemo Samgori to become a best management practice?

SCORE: 40 / 100

Each will be scored from 0 to 100, with

- 100 meaning excellence (delivering all the ToR requires and substantially more or much higher quality);
- 90 to 99 means very good (delivering all the ToR requires at a very good quality level);
- 80 to 89 means above average (meaning that the proposal stands out for meeting better than the others in terms of what the ToR requires and the quality norms that are expected);
- 70 to 79 means average (meaning that the bid does not distinguish itself from the others but still satisfactorily covers the ToR requirements and minimal quality standards) and
- 1 to 69 means below average (which means that the bidder's work plan, approach and methodology do not adequately cover everything that is required in the ToR or substantially fall short in quality).

The evaluation members will score these criteria in silence, by themselves, without consultation amongst each other and fill out a scoring sheet

o C: A description of the applicable quality assurance systems

This will not exceed more than 2 pages A4. It counts for 10% of the technical proposal evaluation score. Any information beyond the maximum number of pages (in the Georgian text) will not be taken into consideration by the evaluation committee.

The committee will evaluate the best practices on two criteria

C1: Quality System Completeness

- o Does the bidder adequately and convincingly describe which quality system it will put in place to guarantee the timely, full and satisfactory implementation of the assignment?
- o Is the quality system based on international or Georgian acceptable professional quality standards for the sector?
- o Does the bidder describe the different steps and activities that he/she will put in place for quality management?
- Does this system adequately cover all major quality concerns that Georgian Amelioration Ltd may have?
- o Does it allow for adequate supervision of the technical quality of the designs?
- o Does it allow for result-based management and the accountability of staff?
- Does it include enough time and procedures for discussion/revision of drafts, incorporation of comments and possible complaints?
- Does it allow for second opinions or peer reviews?
- Does it include gender, participation and sustainability concerns?
- Does it come with adequate control measures and possible sanctions or feedback loops?
- o Is the system worked out in procedures, guidelines, manuals and checklists?
- o Does it adequately cover all deliverables?

SCORE: 20 / 100



C2: Quality System Certification

- o Is the quality system as described certified?
- o Is this certification based on international or Georgian quality norms and standards?
- o Does an independent and reputable professional party certify the quality system?
- o Does the certification come with regular checks and revisions?
- o Does the bidder attach convincing and up-to-date proof of the certification?
- o Does the certification cover the procedures, staff and deliverables?
- o Does the bidder already have the certification for a longer period?
- o Has he/she already applied it successfully in other comparable projects involving the Georgian government and international donors?
- o Is the certification compliant with RVO's CSR requirements?

SCORE: <sup>82.5</sup> ..... / 100

Each will be scored from 0 to 100, with

- 100 meaning excellence (delivering all the ToR requires and substantially more or much higher quality);
- 90 to 99 means very good (delivering all the ToR requires at a very good quality level);
- 80 to 89 means above average (meaning that the proposal stands out for meeting better than the others in terms of what the ToR requires and the quality norms that are expected);
- 70 to 79 means average (meaning that the bid does not distinguish itself from the others but still satisfactorily covers the ToR requirements and minimal quality standards) and
- 1 to 69 means below average (which means that the bidder's work plan, approach and methodology do not adequately cover everything that is required in the ToR or substantially fall short in quality).

The evaluation members will score these criteria in silence, by themselves, without consultation amongst each other and fill out a scoring sheet

o D: CVs of key staff

This will not exceed more than 2 pages A4 for each CV. It counts for 40% of the technical proposal evaluation score. Any information beyond the maximum number of pages (in the Georgian text) will not be taken into consideration by the evaluation committee.

The committee will evaluate the CVs of the key staff individually and check whether they meet the requirements in the ToR:

D1: Irrigation/Civil Engineer (deliverables 1 and 4).

Does he/she have:

- o A university degree in Irrigation/Civil Engineering or similar
- o At least fifteen years of work experience in design and rehabilitation of large-scale public irrigation infrastructure (including roads, bridges, irrigation and drainage schemes) preferably for development projects, agencies or institutions
- o Experience in leading multidisciplinary teams for the development of irrigation projects
- o Experience in irrigation and hydraulic structures, including the planning, design and costing of irrigation and drainage projects.
- o Good knowledge of irrigation requirements of relevant crops and cropping patterns,
- o Good knowledge of construction norms and regulations as applied in Georgia.

- o Good knowledge of best practices in irrigation rehabilitation and capacity to incorporate these in the detailed design
- o Experience in carrying out engineering cost estimates based on current market prices.

SCORE: 92.5 / 100

D2: Hydrologist/Water Resources Expert (deliverables 1 and 4)

Does he/she have:

- o A University degree in hydraulic and/or hydrology
- o At least ten years of work experience in water resources management and hydraulic structures development.
- o Experience in water resources development planning and water balance studies.
- o Experience in water-use efficiency improvements in the irrigated agriculture sector;
- o Experience in carrying out comprehensive water resources analysis of a specific irrigation system including various water works for multiple users.

SCORE: 100 / 100

D3: ESIA/IFC standards specialist (with a social sciences background) (deliverable 2)

- o A university degree in environmental or social sciences
- o At least ten years of work experience in environmental and social impact assessments, applying to IFC Performance Standards, especially on land issues
- o Experience in preparing reports and developing in-depth evaluations of environmental and social impact risks
- o Experience with elaborating environmental and social and management plans.

SCORE: 92.5 / 100

D4: Agro-Economist/Financial analyst (deliverable 3)

- o A university degree in economics or business management or related field
- o At least ten years of work experience in feasibility development investment studies, preferably for development projects, agencies or institutions.
- o Experience in project evaluation of water resources and agriculture development projects.
- o Experience in financial analysis of crop production, marketing and value chains
- o Good access to knowledge of development issues in rural areas of Georgia, especially related to business, marketing and agriculture development.
- o Experience in carrying out willingness and affordability to pay studies
- o Experience in recommending tariff policies

SCORE: 95 / 100

Each will be scored from 0 to 100, with

- 100 meaning excellence (delivering all the ToR requires and substantially more or much higher quality);
- 90 to 99 means very good (delivering all the ToR requires at a very good quality level);
- 80 to 89 means above average (meaning that the proposal stands out for meeting better than the others in terms of what the ToR requires and the quality norms that are expected);
- 70 to 79 means average (meaning that the bid does not distinguish itself from the others but still satisfactorily covers the ToR requirements and minimal quality standards) and

- 1 to 69 means below average (which means that the bidder's work plan, approach and methodology do not adequately cover everything that is required in the ToR or substantially fall short in quality).

The evaluation members will score these criteria in silence, by themselves, without consultation amongst each other and fill out a scoring sheet

- o The score of each of the committee members will be computed and the average is taken. In case of extreme opposite scores a brief discussion takes place to clarify the underlying reasons.
- o The average scores are confirmed in the meeting as the objective outcome of the evaluation. Minutes are made of the meeting
- o The overall technical score is calculated for each bid. Only technical proposals with an overall technical score of higher than 75% will be considered. The others are rejected.
- o The rejected bids are returned to the submitting parties with the unopened financial bid and a letter stating that they did not score sufficient points in the technical evaluation. Their financial bid will not be evaluated by the committee
- o Subsequently the financial bid is opened for all qualifying bids with a satisfactory technical evaluation score. The director does this in an official ceremony. Minutes are made.
- o The financial bids are evaluated by the technical officers who organise the bid evaluation and the project advisor - as comparative scores using the formula in the ToR:

$$S_f = 100\% \times F_m / F$$

where

$S_f$  - is the financial score of the Financial Proposal being evaluated,

$F_m$  - is the expected total price of the lowest priced Financial Proposal,

$F$  - is the expected total price of the Financial Proposal under consideration.

- o These financial scores are again confirmed in the committee meeting.
- o Subsequently the overall evaluation score is calculated, with a weighing factor of 70% for the technical evaluation and 30% for the financial evaluation. The bids are ranked as per the highest overall score. The ranking is again confirmed in the committee's meeting and minuted.
- o Subsequently the bid evaluation report is written, explaining the procedures followed and the committee's findings. The final ranking table, the opening ceremonies' minutes, the committee meetings' minutes, the declaration of the committee members, the receipt registration of the bids and a copy of the first and second ranking bid are sent to RVO with the request to grant a statement of non-objection.
- o Only thereafter the outcomes are communicated to the qualifying bidders with a sufficient technical evaluation score. The first ranked bidders will be approached first. Once his bid is confirmed and any required due diligence is terminated, the other will also be informed.

Tbilisi, 18 August 2015 - 19.08.2015

Name and signature

JAN VAN HONTFORT

All ticked boxes indicated that I witnessed that the procedure was followed accordingly

The score are made on my sound judgement of the information supplied in the bids.

The crosses mark the points at which the bid is NOT sufficient



## Declaration of no interest and confidentiality of each committee member

I, Henk Jan Gerard Jozef Maria van Montfort, in my capacity of Project Advisor of the Georgian Amelioration Ltd., will participate in the bid evaluation committee of the bids for the Detailed Engineering Design of the "Rehabilitation of Zemo Samgori Irrigation System", Georgia (ref. ORIO13/GE/01).

I solemnly declare that:

- I have read the Terms of References and Description of the Services to be provided and base all my evaluation on the criteria and specifications in these terms of reference only, as objectively as possible.
- I have no previous knowledge of the technical or financial proposals of any of the bidding parties and have not sustained any communication with them on the assignment, other than the formally approved notice and the formally approved written answers to the questions raised during the bid preparation stage.
- I have no personal, professional or business relations whatsoever with any of the bidding parties - as these would jeopardize the impartiality of my evaluations.
- I will maintain full confidentiality about all the technical and financial details in the bids to be evaluated and will leave it to the director to communicate about the scoring and ranking of the different bids outside the bid evaluation committee.

Tbilisi, 17 August 2015

  
Henk Jan Gerard Jozef Maria van Montfort

*This signed declaration is attached to the final bid evaluation report*