TECHNICAL EVALUATION GUIDELINES

FOR

SELECTION OF VENDOR

FOR

ANDHRA PRADESH TECHNOLOGY SERVICES

National Institute for Smart Government

August 2015

Document Control

Document Title: Technical Evaluation Guidelines for selection of Vendors for e-Governance Projects

Document Status: <Version Number>

Abstract: Example: <<This document details the Technical Evaluation Guidelines for selection of Vendors for e-Governance Projects >>.

Document Publication History
(All revisions made to this document must be listed in chronological order, with the most recent revision at the top.)

Date	Author	Version	Remark
25.08.2015	NISG, Hyderabad	1.2	
21.08.2015	NISG, Hyderabad	1.1	

Reviewers

Date	Reviewer	Remarks
21.08.2015	APTS	

Distribution

Version	Name	Location

Contents

List of Abbreviation

Abbreviation	Description
CV	Curriculum Vitae
CMMI	Capability Maturity Model Integration
COTS	Commercial of the Shelf
ERP	Enterprise Resource Planning
ISO	International Organization for Standardization
IE	Internet Explorer
LPC	Lowest-Priced Conforming
MMP	Mission Mode Project
MSME	Micro, Small and Medium Enterprises
PoC	Proof of Concept
OS	Operating System
QCBS	Quality and cost Based Selection
RFP	Request for Proposal
WLAN	Wireless Local Area Network

1   Introduction

The Evaluation phase covers the procurement process from close of offers to the selection of the preferred bidder and the selection of the successful bidder. The key components of an Evaluation process could also be illustrated as:

- Evaluation model
- Evaluation criteria
- Rating Scale
- Panel decision making process
- Due diligence requirements

This outcome is achieved by carefully considering each offer on an equal basis, against the evaluation criteria. In providing a broad framework for the selection of the best value-for-money bidder, the following have been covered.

The Evaluation Process (depending on whether a one- or two-stage procurement method is used) will generally follow the following steps:

• Evaluation team members complete conflict-of-interest declarations

• Evaluation team members are briefed on the evaluation process and receive training if necessary.

• Copies of the bidders' offers, scoring scale and evaluation forms are distributed to each evaluation team member.
Note: If a two-envelope method is being used (i.e. price has been requested in separate, sealed envelopes) only the non-price parts of the offers are distributed to the evaluation team members, with the price envelopes remaining unopened and securely stored

• Evaluation team members complete individual assessments of the bidders' offers. This ensures each evaluation team member has adequately reviewed the offers prior to the team evaluation meeting and that no single team member is able to exert inappropriate influence on the outcome by being better prepared.

• The evaluation team members meet and complete a "team" evaluation. Team scores may be reached by a number of methods, with averaging the individual scores and reaching a team consensus score being the two most common. Of the two, the consensus scoring method is the most frequently used, as it allows a score to be agreed based on consideration of all the evaluation team members' opinions and observations. The averaging method does ensure a persuasive or dominant individual is not able to exercise undue influence. However, it also means an individual's scores that, based on reconsideration

of the supplier response in light of other team members' comments would have been higher or lower, still form part of the calculation for a final score

• If price has been requested in separate, sealed envelopes, these envelopes are opened after the team scoring of the non-price criteria and a ranking agreed by the evaluation team. The ranking method will be determined by the evaluation model used. For example:
  - Lowest-priced conforming (LPC) offer is automatically is the most responsive bidder
  - Highest-scoring bidder based on QCBS assessment is the most responsive bidder

• As a matter of "Good Practice" undue weightage should not be given to the presentation. The key reason being that the presentations are quite often delinked from the proposal submitted and hence may not be contractually binding on the bidder. The bidders may be invited to come and discuss the areas requiring clarifications in the bids OR they can be asked to present the documents in the form submitted to the Nodal Agency highlighting all the evaluation areas. In this manner the evaluation committee can review the evaluation done by one member / support team. However this may require a higher time to be budgeted for such discussions. It may be noted that the bidders should not be allowed to change any documents (for e.g. new project citation and work order cannot be taken into cognizance at this stage). However any document substantiating the clarifications asked by the evaluation team, may be provided.

• Reference-checking or further due diligence is carried out if the bidder is not well known to the nodal agency. The purpose of the reference-checking is to verify the assessed level of performance, capability or expertise and to satisfy the agency generally that the supplier is likely to deliver what it has offered. Further due diligence, such as financial viability checks, is generally only conducted where the procurement is high risk, high profile or high value

A rightfully defined and objective technical evaluation criteria & methodology ensures that the most competent bidder offering the right quality solution/service and price is selected - the Most Responsive Bidder– best solution and not just best price.

2 Designing Technical Evaluation

As a part of the design for Technical evaluation, the Nodal Agency has to make decisions/choices on the following things, but not limited to:

- Evaluation model: lowest price/weighted attribute etc.
- Develop Rating Scale to guide evaluation panel scoring
- Determine panel decision making process: mathematical average/panel moderation
-Identify the information required from suppliers: supplier details/response to requirements/pricing/format etc.
- Identify any required additional steps: interview/presentation/site visit(s) etc.
- Identify any optional additional steps: reserve the right to interview/presentation/site visit etc.
- The need for Government department, Ministry due diligence requirements (if any).

3   Technical Evaluation Criteria

Technical Evaluation Criteria are the bid response parameters on which the evaluation is carried out to arrive at a final (technical) score for each qualified agency.
Hence, the Technical Evaluation Criteria SHOULD:

- Be as objective as possible, breaking the scoring down to individual identifiable components
- Have direct and perceptible linkage to nature and scope of work
- Use the most relevant scoring / weighting scheme to evaluate; weighting should be basis their importance to the Government or project's outcomes. The weightings must be disclosed in the tender document.
- Establish the scoring guidelines prior to contacting bidders creating the RFP. Then, when the proposals are received, score them based on the criteria established in the RFP
- Have scoring for each component of the solution rather than an overall score for the solution
- Provide weights / maximum marks for each Technical evaluation criterion; weights should be as per their importance to the project or project's outcomes and must be disclosed in the tender document.
- In case of a software solution, evaluate the coverage of or degree of match to functional and technical requirements by the solution

It may be a good practice that the evaluations should be done with the maximum score of 100 marks, so that appropriate resolution could be provided to the criterions having less marks / sub-criterions.

Based on the above advisory, the evaluation criterion has to be chosen very carefully, as it defines the filtering criterion on which the final Implementation Agency is to be shortlisted. Generally based on qualitative assessment, one can categorize the projects in two categories:

Category ONE:

Under this category, the RFP is for projects where there is high level of clarity on the technology and the solutions. These would be typical implementation of COTS/ERP projects OR any State MMPs. In e-Governance space, these projects would be applications which have a simple citizen application workflow. In such projects, the risk of technology feasibility is less.

In such RFP technical evaluation should provide clarity on solution till the Bill of Material stage in the RFP document. It may be noted that in this case, the responsibility of technical feasibility of the proposed solutions rests with the Nodal Agency.

Typically these should be on L1 basis.

Category TWO:

Under this category, the RFP is for projects where there is inadequate clarity on the solution. For e.g. these may be any large scale implementation of any Central MMP. These are risky projects and should be on QCBS evaluation 70:30 (quality: Cost).

It may be noted that in this case, the responsibility of technical feasibility of the proposed solutions rests with the Bidder. However the Proposal Evaluation Committee in this case should have expertise or should have access to expertise to objectively evaluate & compare the various solutions components proposed by the bidders.

In such projects the Nodal Agency should do a due diligence critical parameters of the project covering System Functionality, Technology, current performance on key technologies proposed in isolation & together as a stack, details on implementation experience of the bidder, Training methodology, performance in Proof of concept (in case PoC is planned), Certifications, Past experience of the bidder in executing similar assignments, size of those assignments, profile of team members and Project Methodology.

3.1 Category One: Suggested Technical Evaluation

[The X1, X2 and X3 values in the table below has to be filled in such a manner that a) it is above the value provided in the eligibility criterion b) it allows at least 8 agencies to score maximum marks for the criterion]

S.No	Criteria	Basis for Valuation	Max Marks	Supporting
	Company Profile		**10**	
1.	Average turnover from System Integration/ICT Systems Development and Implementation Work in last 3 years (Turnover in Rs. Crores)	Greater than or equal to <X1>: 10 marks Between X2 and X1: 8 marks Between X3 and X2 : 6 marks Less than X3: 0 marks [X1>X2>X3 and are average Revenue Turnover for last 3 financial years]	10	Extracts from the audited Balance sheet and Profit & Loss; OR Certificate from the statutory auditor
	Relevant Strengths		**60**	
2.	Hardware and Network Equipment Supply & maintenance services to	When No. is : equal to or more than 5 projects : 20 marks	20	Completion Certificates from the client; OR

	be demonstrated in a maximum of <5 Nos.> engagements of value more than Rs. <50% of the estimated value of the hardware being procured under this project>.The work order should have been issued within the last 5 years, as on <date>. The projects should have been either completed or an on-going project where deliverable or milestone has been successfully met. Weightages (W) In case project is completed and letter of satisfaction available : 100% weightage In case project in progress and the Work Order is more than 18 months old and letter of satisfaction available: 80% weightage In case project in progress and the Work Order is between 12- 18 months old and letter of satisfaction available: 50% weightage In case project in progress and the Work Order is less than 12 months old and letter of satisfaction available: 25% weightage	equal to 4 projects : 16 marks equal to 3 projects : 12 marks equal to 2 projects : 8 marks Less than 2 projects : 0 marks The maximum marks for each project is 4 marks. These marks would be multiplied by the weightage as defined in the previous column to arrive at a cumulative score.		Work Order + Self Certificate of Completion (Certified by the Statutory Auditor); OR Work Order + Phase Completion Certificate (for on-going projects) From the client
3.	Software Development	When No. is :	20	Completion

	& maintenance services to be demonstrated in a maximum of <Nos.> engagements of value more than <50% of the estimated value of the Software being procured under this project> that have either been completed or an on-going project where deliverable or milestone has been successfully met relevant to the experience. The work order should have been issued within the last 5 years, as on <date>. Weightages (W) In case project completed and letter of satisfaction available: 100% In case project in progress and the Work Order is more than 18 months old and letter of satisfaction available: 80% In case project in progress and the Work Order is between 12- 18 months old and letter of satisfaction available: 50% In case project in progress and the Work Order is less than 12 months old and letter of satisfaction available:	equal to or more than 5 projects : 20 marks equal to 4 projects : 16 marks equal to 3 projects : 12 marks equal to 2 projects : 8 marks Less than 2 projects : 0 marks The maximum marks for each project is 4 marks. These marks would be multiplied by the weightage as defined in the previous column to arrive at a cumulative score.		Certificates from the client; OR Work Order + Self Certificate of Completion (Certified by the Statutory Auditor); OR Work Order + Phase Completion Certificate (for on-going projects) from the client

	25%			
4.	Turnkey services to be demonstrated in a maximum of <Nos.> engagements of value more than <50% of the estimated value of the turnkey services being procured under this project> that have either been completed or an on-going project where deliverable or milestone has been successfully met relevant to the experience. The work order should have been issued within the last 5 years, as on <date>. Weightages (W) In case project completed and letter of satisfaction available: 100% In case project in progress and the Work Order is more than 18 months old and letter of satisfaction available: 80% In case project in progress and the Work Order is between 12-18 months old and letter of satisfaction available: 50% In case project in progress and the Work Order is less than 12 months old and letter of	When No. is : equal to or more than 5 projects : 20 marks equal to 4 projects : 16 marks equal to 3 projects : 12 marks equal to 2 projects : 8 marks Less than 2 projects : 0 marks The maximum marks for each project is 4 marks. These marks would be multiplied by the weightage as defined in the previous column to arrive at a cumulative score.	20	Completion Certificates from the client; OR Work Order + Self Certificate of Completion (Certified by the Statutory Auditor); OR Work Order + Phase Completion Certificate (for on-going projects) from the client

	satisfaction available: 25%			
	Approach & Methodology		**20**	
5.	Solution Proposed Demonstration of understanding of the Department's requirements	Qualitative assessment based on Demonstration of understanding of the Department's requirements through providing: – Solution proposed and its components, – Technologies used, – Scale of implementation, – Learning on Issues – Challenges – Challenges likely to be encountered – Mitigation proposed – Client references:	15	A note
6.	Approach and Methodology to perform the work in this assignment	Qualitative assessment based on – Understanding of the objectives of the assignment: The extent to which the Systems Implementer's approach and work plan respond to the objectives indicated in the Statement/Scope of Work – Completeness and responsiveness: The extent to which the proposal responds exhaustively to all the requirements of all the Terms of Reference	2.5	A note
7.	Project work break down structure	Qualitative assessment based on timelines, resource assignment, dependencies and milestones	2.5	A note

	Resource Profile		10	
8.	Resume of all key technical resources proposed for the assignment	Qualitative Assessment	10	
	Inclusion of MSME	Case to Case Basis		
9.	Bidder's inclusion of MSMEs in project delivery through allotment of at least <10%> of contract value to the project	As per Requirement	As per requirement. [2 to 5 marks to be allotted]	Letter of evidence and commitment that MSME will be contracted for the required value of work.
	Tools & Assets	Case to Case Basis		
10.	Tools and Assets which could be leveraged for the assignment [for e.g. Test Case Builders, Effort Estimators, PMU Tool, Load testing etc., depending on the relevance to the Scope of work]	As per requirement	As per requirement	A note and relevant supporting

3.2 Category Two: Suggested Technical Evaluation

S. No	Criteria	Basis for valuation	Max Marks	Supporting
1	System Functionality	Meeting the requirements of <department> in terms of how close the proposal is to the functional requirements for the solution as have been proposed for <department> (In case it is COTS, it should be measured by degree of customization required)	**20%**	Compliance Note
2	Technology	Demonstrated robustness of the technology deployed across other installations around the world, including – Scalability – Security – Ease of implementation	**20%**	**Note**
3	India Specific Capabilities	Qualitative assessment based on the number of Projects of similar nature in India and size of those projects.	**7%**	Note; and Completion Certificates from the client; OR Work Order + Self Certificate of Completion (Certified by the Statutory Auditor); OR Work Order + Phase Completion Certificate (for on-going projects) from the client
4	Industry Specific Capabilities	Qualitative assessment based on the Past experience of the bidder in executing similar assignments, size of those assignments. [The definition of "similar" should be such that it focuses on the areas which are "innovative" or where the technical feasibility is a	**7%**	Note; and Completion Certificates from the client; OR Work Order + Self Certificate of Completion (Certified by the Statutory Auditor); OR Work Order +

		challenge in the context of the project]		Phase Completion Certificate (for on-going projects) from the client
5	Training	Trainings proposed by the bidder and the amount of emphasis laid on Training the employees schedule details, locations, sessions and their description	**7%**	Note
6	Certifications and Credentials	Relevant certifications (SEI-CMMI, ISO, etc.)	**7%**	Copy of certificates
7	Profile of proposed team members	Relevant assignment experience / Years of experience / Number of Certifications in Technology specific to Solution proposed	**20%**	CVs
8	Project Methodology, Support and Documentation	Qualitative assessment based on – Understanding of the objectives of the assignment: The extent to which the Systems Implementer's approach and work plan respond to the objectives indicated in the Statement/Scope of Work – Completeness and responsiveness: The extent to which the proposal responds exhaustively to all the requirements of all the Terms of Reference	**7%**	Note

9	Inclusion of MSMEs in Project Delivery	As per requirement.	**7%**	Letter of evidence and commitment that MSME will be contracted for the required value of work.

Each of these should be evaluated further in detail based on the following checklist. There would be page, paragraph and line references for each criterion for easy reading and scoring by the evaluation Committee.

4 Detailed Methodology for Evaluation and Parameters

4.1 System Functionality: 20 Points

The Evaluation template should contain the Functional & Non Functional requirements.

<<A sample of the Evaluation checklist which should be made is as follows:>>

ID	Title	Description	Effort	Experience	Sample Demo	Comments
1.	Projected Demand for Service	Store data on the Projected Demand for Service over a planning horizon (say 3-5 years as decided by <DEPARTMENT>).	3	4	0	
2.	Information on Licensing Procedures	Store information on Licensing Procedures and related information that needs to be shared with the Applicant (This information could be displayed in the public website / printed in hard copies and dispatched to interested parties	3	4	0	
	…….	……				
	…….	……				

In the comments column of the Evaluation Template, give a score from 0 to 10 for each of the functionality.

For convenience divide the score as follows:
- Effort - 0-5 points
- Experience - 0-4 points

- Sample Demo - 0-1 points

For each functionality give scores as follows:
- "Effort"- Lower the effort, more the score
- "Experience"- Higher the experience more the score
- "Sample Demo" - Points only if answer is "Yes".

E.g.

Bidder A: If Effort = 5 days, Experience = 3, Demo = N, then score = 7(4+3+0).
Bidder B: If Effort = 8 days, Experience = 1, Demo = Y, then score = 4(2+1+1).

Add scores given to each functionality (each row) for all the Modules to arrive at System Functionality Score. Convert the each Total Score to a 20-Point Scale

Consider the following Example for explanation.

Assume that the entire Module has 160 functionalities. Each of the functionalities would carry 10 Points; hence the Full Score would be 1600. Assume that a Bidder gets a Total Score of 1100 out of the Full Score of 1600.

Then the Score on 20 Point Scale is (1100/1600) * 20 = 13.75

For large projects, even if it is a COTS solution, the evaluation can be carried out in this manner. However the scoring needs to be carried out on the following basis.

- If functionality required is readily available: 5 Points (Maximum points)
- If functionality NOT readily available but can be customized through a work-around - 4 Points
- If functionality is NOT available and cannot be customized, but can be made available in a future version within 3 months: 2 Points
- If NOT available at all: No Points – 0 (minimum).

Add score for each functionality for ALL modules to arrive at the System Functionality Score
Convert the each Bidder Total Score to a 20-Point Scale in the similar way as described above.

4.2   Technology: 20 Points

The responses by Bidders would be reviewed for the following technology aspects of the proposed solution:

- Specifications (platform, software, database design, etc.)
- Security and Scalability:
- Ease of Implementation

Also information would be collected from Bidder or references (other clients for which solutions were implemented).Bidder furnishing comprehensive information closest to <DEPARTMENT>'s expectations as listed in shall be awarded the maximum points.

Overall Scoring would be on a 20 – Point Scale.

Please refer the following table for Scoring Template.

Evaluation Criterion	Benchmark / Preferences	Rating Scale
1. Architecture		
Application architecture	Partitioned into three tiers (0-2)	0-2
	Flexibility of these layers residing in different hardware platform (0-1)	0-1
	Justification on the suggested application architecture with rationale and benefits (0-5)	0-5
Base foundation of **major sub-components. Maintenance and enhancements**	Information provided on Major sub-components and whether they are proprietary OR Open (0-1)	0-1
	Willingness to customize for <DEPARTMENT> (0-2)	0-2
	Ownership of source code for Customised solution made available to <DEPARTMENT> (0-1)	0-1
	Description of process adopted by bidders on maintenance and enhancements (0-3)	0-3
	Detailed description of Software development Methodology (0-5)	0-5

Distributed Component Architecture	As a Best practice, and considering the scalability of the solution, a Distributed Component Architecture is preferred (0-4)	0-4
	In case Bidder has suggested its own architecture other than the above, based on the reasoning provided assessment would be done (0-3)	0-3
	Clear description on customisation of modifying existing business rules / introducing new business rules (0-3)	0-3
2. Security		
Identification Data Integrity Data Encryption Data Confidentiality	Description of user authentication procedure for the proposed application (0-3)	0-3
	Details on Access Controls and Privileges through application (0-3)	0-3
Data Availability Auditability	Encrypted storage of Username and Passwords (0-1)	0-1
	Details on restriction of access to data content in the database (0-2)	0-2
Firewalls and security supported by the system.	Description of firewalls and security components (such as intrusion detection systems) in the proposed solution (0-5)	0-5
3. System Performance		
Peak Volume and associated average response times, Concurrency	Average volume handling capacity (0-4)	0-4
	Database update response time (0-3)	0-3
	Database retrieval response time (0-5)	0-5
	Compliance with over and above the minimum requirement specified for concurrent users (0-2)	0-2
Benchmark studies on technology components Performance details for previous projects in case of developed solution	Availability of Graphs, Tables, Whitepapers and related statistics of benchmarked studies on performance (0-5)	0-5
		0-3
Scalability	Descriptions of procedure for scaling up the application for additional users and additional features furnished. (0-3)	0-3
	Extent of dependency on the bidder for inclusion of new features (0-2)	0-2
	Compliance with increasing the user base to the desired level, as specified by	0-5

	<DEPARTMENT> with least effort (time and cost) would be given higher score (0-5)	
	Need for additional infrastructure such as system software licenses / new hardware requirements etc. Lower the need higher the score (0-2)	0-2
4. Supported Platform O/S		
Server platforms	Detailed information on server platform with adequate rationale would be assessed for. More options for server platforms - higher the score (0-2).	0-2
Operating System (OS)	Details of OS the product would support. More the options – higher the score (0-2)	0-2
Platform/OS combination	Statistical information on the platform / OS combination to support the rationale furnished. (0-3)	0-3
5. Client Hardware/ OS		
Hardware/OS combinations for client	Details of hardware / OS combination proposed for client systems with rationale. (0-3)	0-3
User Interfaces	Browser based user interfaces would be preferred for suggested application, considering the accepted standards in use currently. (0-3)	0-3
	In case browser based user interface not suggested, the alternatives would be judged based on the reasoning provided by bidder (0-2)	0-2
6. Database/ Directory Support		
Databases	Relational databases which are being supported adequately in present day context would carry max score (0-3)	0-3
	Hierarchical / flat files databases – low score (0-1)	0-1
Product information (MS / Oracle)	Information on the Database products with recommendation and rationale (0-1)	0-1
Directory Services	Information on system support to Directory Services (0-1)	0-1
7. Data Architecture		

Logical and/or physical data model.	Description of the proposed data models for the application, supported by data models of earlier developed applications (0-3)	0-3
Customisation	Assess build-in flexibility for introducing changes at field level	0-3
Control features for data integrity	Details on Control features to ensure data integrity such as updates, totals, cross-checks, validations etc. (0-3)	0-3
Transaction management system	Details of the transaction management system (0-2)	0-2
Database layout	Information on Database layout supported with whitepaper(s) on database (0-2)	0-2
8. System management		
Rollback, recovery, and fault tolerance	Description of database failover, rollback, recovery provisions and fault tolerance (0-3)	0-3
System management tools	Details on provision of accepted system management tools and utilities, with appropriate notification features for effective system administration. (0-2)	0-2
Accessibility of system management interfaces.	Details on accessibility of system management interfaces and provision for remote administration. (0-2)	0-2
	Facility from bidder on Web-based support (on-line) would be preferred (0-2)	0-2
9. Web Server Support		
Web servers compatibility	Considering a future scenario of web-enablement, integration with Web Server would be assessed (0-5)	0-5
Functionality reside on the web server.	Number of functionalities that can reside on the web server and the level of difficulty associated in making it possible (0-3)	0-3
10. Application Server Support		
Application Server integration	Proposed Solution running on Application Server that is established and well known would be preferred (0-3)	0-3
Interface between your product and applications servers	Details on the interface of the proposed solution with application servers would be assessed (0-2)	0-2
11. Single Sign-on		
Integration with any Single Sign-On packages	Provision to integrate with single-sign on packages (0-1)	0-1

12. Presentation requirements		
Interfacing with a presentation system	Information on presentation system would be assessed for details (0-4)	0-4
Level of in-house customisation possible	Ability to customise screens (0-2)	0-2
Browsers support	Cross-browser support would be preferred (eg. IE / Mozilla) (0-2)	0-2
Embedded browser languages	Accepted scripting language within the boundaries of sand-box. (0-2) Client side Active-X controls would not be preferred.	0-2
Interface design compliance with standards	Usage of Standards such as optimised images / 256 colour palette would be preferred (0-2)	0-2
13. Session Management		
Concurrent users, multiple sessions	Description on handling of concurrent users, multiple sessions, session cookies. (0-3)	0-3
System's policy on session time-outs.	Policy details on session time-outs (0-1)	0-1
14. Integration Capabilities		
Integration capabilities with external, third party applications	Not a very significant point at this stage for <DEPARTMENT>. However, if the bidder can substantiate capability of the proposed solution with commercially known third party solution, it would be surely preferable. (0-1)	0-1
15. Auditing / Reporting		
Log files	Complete audit trails and log filing features of the proposed COTS as well as Custom solution would be evaluated (0-5)	0-5
Log files be customization	Ability of the log files to be customized and scheduled; (0-2) Access rights to view log files (0-1)	0-2 0-1
Querying capabilities	Details of querying capabilities, and user-friendliness of the user logs (0-2)	0-2
Procedure of audit trails	Procedure of audit, reporting and review of the proposed solution (0-2)	0-2
16. Disaster Recovery and Back-up		
Disaster recovery procedures	Description of the disaster recovery procedures for data, application and client. Details of the procedure address adequate scenarios and the actions thereof (0-3)	0-3

Archival policy	Details of archival policy and procedure for the proposed solutions. Higher the degree of automatic features / scheduling in the archival procedures, more would be score (0-3)	0-3
17. General		
Additional utility package required	Completeness in the list of any additional utilities (software / infrastructure) would be assessed (0-2)	0-2
Any limitations in the software/operating system/file manager	Description of the limits in terms of number of table entries, database size would be assessed (0-2)	0-2
Interdependencies in the modules	Details of the interdependencies across modules and possible implementation constraints would be assessed. (0-2)	0-2
Import / export facilities	Provision of import / export utilities especially to facilitate data entry / report generation (0-2)	0-2
End-of-day processes	Clear write-up on the end-of-day processes and the associated dependencies (0-2)	0-2
Application support	Compatibility with WLAN environment (0-3)	0-3
Total		**183**

Assign scores for each of the line items based on Bidder responses.

Arrive at sum totals for Bidder Total Scores.

Example:

Let's say the Bidder A gets 120 out of 183.

Conversion of above score on a 20-point scale is as follows:

120 / 183 * 20 = 13.115

4.3   India Specific Capabilities: 8 points

For assessing this criterion, the projects may not be limited to India, and can also include similar countries having federal structure [or any other categorization as relevant] as India

Basis for awarding scores for this criterion is as follows:

- Number of clients using the product: 0-4 Points
    If No. of clients using the product are:
- More than 15: 4 Points
- Between 10- 14: 3 Points
- Between 5 – 9: 2 Points
- Between 1- 4: 1 Point

- Maximum Size of the Installations by bidder: 0-4 Points
- More than 150 Users: 4 Points
- Between 50 – 150 Users: 3 Points
- Between 25 - 50 users: 2 Points
- Up to 25 Users: 1 Point

Example:
Number of Clients in India are 12; The Score is 3
Average No. of users = 100,
Then Bidder Total Score is 6 (i.e., Sum Total of 3 and 3).
Scoring would be on a 8-Point Scale

4.4   Government Specific Deployment: 7 Points

Number of Govt. clients using the product: 0-4 Points
- More than 15: 4 Points
- Between 10- 14: 3 Points
- Between 5 – 9: 2 Points
- Between 1- 4: 1 Point

Average Size of the Installations: 0-3 Points
- More than 100 Users: 3 Points
- Between 50 – 100 Users: 2 Points
- Upto 50 Users: 1 Point

Scoring would be on 7-Point Scale

Example:

Number of Clients in India are 8; The Score is 2

Average No. of users = 75,

Then bidder Total Score is 4 (i.e., Sum Total of 2 and 2).

Only in this case the projects will have to be specific for the Government / Public Sector.

Based on the information provided by Bidder, <Nodal Agency> would assess the client referenced in relevant areas. The bidder must agree to allow <Nodal Agency> to check relevant details / feedback from clients OR make site visits.

Bidder would provide information on each reference assignment for which the firm was legally contracted. Based on an overall assessment, a score on a 7- point scale will be given.

4.5   Training: 10 Points

It will be based on the emphasis the bidder lays on providing training to the employees of <DEPARTMENT>.

This can be measured primarily at the time of Bidder Presentation, and on a secondary basis through the following:

- Training Methodology (including the handing over of the training material to the Nodal Agency, CBT or web based, Toolkits etc.)
- Layers of Training
- Time devoted for Training
- Training Kit
- Assessment Process

Evaluation Criterion	Benchmark / Preferences	Rating Scale
Training model		
	Broad Course Content would be checked if it addressed all the relevant modules / functionalities specified by <DEPARTMENT> (0-4) Layers of Training proposed based on types of users: Top Management, Core Team and End User Group Phases of Training depending on the Project Time Lines – Basic Training during the beginning phase (0-2) – Module specific training as the system is configured and Pilot is being build (0-3) – Hands-on Training when the system is read for User Acceptance Tests (0-3)	0-4 0-3 0-10

	– Post implementation Training (0-2)	
Training Approach		
Train the Trainer	As an accepted good practice, 'Train the Trainer' approach would be preferred (0-1) Number of Training Programs, Duration of each Program and Evaluation methods suggested for the Train the trainer would be assessed (0-3)	0-4
Alternative Approaches	In case the Bidder suggests any other alternative approaches, it would be evaluated suitable based on the rationale provided (0-3)	0-3
Training Deliverables		
Training Aids	In form of hand-outs detailing each module with suitable examples and assignments, as and when class-room trainings are organised	0-5
	Complete Training Manual on completion of all trainings, before the Go-live which would cover final configuration of the solution	0-5
Prior Training Experience	Prior training imparted during earlier project could be furnished for the following details: • Training Programme • Client • Duration • Number of Batches and Trainees	0-3
	Sample Training Documentations in earlier projects could be furnished by bidders	0-3
	Total Score	**40**

Based on Bidder's Responses, assign score to each line item detailed in the table above. Add up scores to arrive at a Bidder Total Score and convert the total score to 10-Point Scale.

For Example: If the Bidder Total is 25 out of the Total Score 40

On a 10-Point Scale the Score would be 25/40 * 10 = 6.25

4.6   Certification, Credentials: 7 points

This criterion would be used to assess the reputation of the company in the market that it is operating in. Here companywide certifications should be given scores.

The scores for this criterion may also be supplemented by response received from the Bidder references (prior clients). Responses from the Bidder References would be based on telephonic discussions / personal visits to the referred personnel (as specified by the bidders) based on Credentials submitted by Bidders in the format in the RFP document.

The following table provides the evaluation guidelines:

Evaluation Criteria	Benchmark/ Preferences	Rating Scale
Certification of Bidders		
	CMMi Level for the organisation (1 point for each level)	0-5
	ISO Certification / Six Sigma Certification	0-3
	Any other recognised certification from reputed authority for the organisation	0-2
Feedback from Bidder Responses	Based on discussions with / visits to bidder's referred clients scores would be awarded.	0-7
	Total Score	**17**

Based on Bidder's responses and Referred client feedback, assign score to each line item in above table and arrive at the Bidder Total Score.

Convert the score to 10-Point Scale. (eg. If a bidder gets 14 out of 17, then a 7-Point Scale equivalent is 5.76 (14/17*10))

4.7   Profile of Proposed Team Members: 20 Points

A consolidated spread sheet for the sub-criteria would be tabulated in an excel sheet for easier evaluation

The Scoring for this criterion will be simple yet significant.
The key parameters for evaluating the team members would be:

- Team Composition
- Years of Experience (out of which relevant experience would be considered for evaluation)
- Qualification
- Certifications
- Number and type of assignments handled

- Proficiency in Local Language

Please refer following table for line-wise breakup

Evaluation Criterion	Benchmark / Preferences	Rating Scale
Overall Project Team Structure	Composition of the Project Team Structure proposed by Bidder	
	- Appropriate Number of Team members with justification	0-5
	- Roles and Responsibilities clearly defined	0-5
Total Years of Professional Experience	Project Manager preferably to have 8 years of experience	0-16
	Functional Consultants & Technical Leads (to preferably have 5 years of experience	0-5
	Database Administrators to preferably have 5 years of experience	0-5
	Consultants / Developers to have at least 3 years of experience	0-3
	Process Consultant for Process Documentation	0-5
Qualification	Basic Qualification for each team member should be either of the following: • Bachelor's degree in Engineering • Master's degree in Computer Science / Information Systems / MBA • Membership from reputed Chartered Accountancy institute • MCA / PGDCA	0-8
Certifications	Project Management Certification for Project Manager Technology Specific Certification for Team members	0-2
Number of similar assignments	Project Manager must have handled preferably 8 assignments of similar nature	0-4
	Other team members must have worked in at least 2 complete implementation / development	0-4
	Experience in Government Sector / Utilities	0-2
Proficiency in Local Language	At least 1 team member from each module must be conversant in Local Language	0-5
	Speaking and Writing	0-3

	More members in the team knowing Local language would be seen as an advantage	
	Total	**75**

Based on Bidder's responses, assign score to each line item detailed in the table above add up scores to arrive at a Bidder total score convert the total score to 20-point scale

EXAMPLE:
If the Bidder's Total Score is 45 out of the Total Score 75
On a 20-Point Scale the Score would be 45/75 * 20 = 12

4.8 Project Methodology, Support & Documentation: 8 points

Refer to main document & addendums

Evaluation Criterion	Benchmark / Preferences	Rating Scale
Project Methodology	Software Development Methodology using the accepted standards; evaluation would be based on the rationale and clarity furnished in the bidder's response	0-8
	Implementation methodology of solution would be evaluated to assess bidder's understanding of <DEPARTMENT>'s requirements to comply with the deliverables, training, handholding and post-implementation support required to make project successful.	0-8
Support	• Problem reporting and resolution mechanism • Hotline Support • Simultaneous Support of various releases • Willingness to support customisation of solutions • Handling Change Requests • Details of User Discussion Forum (s) • Escalation Mechanism • Future Upgrades	0 - 4
Documentation	List the documents provided with your custom solutions • User manuals • System Administration manual	0-3

	• Security • System manuals – Architectures, Entity-Relationship diagrams, Source code etc. • On-line Help • Documentation updates to correspond with each software releases	
	Total Score	**23**

Based on Bidder's Responses, assign score to each line item detailed in the table above Add up scores to arrive at a Bidder Total Score Convert the total score to 8-Point Scale

Example:
If the Bidder Total is 15 out of the Total Score 23
On a 8-Point Scale the Score would be 15/23 * 8 = 5.22