

D

EVALUATION OF THE CONTRACTORS ~~THAT~~
BIDDED FOR THE CONTRACTS

REQUEST FOR PROPOSALS – CONSULTING SERVICES
NARRATIVE EVALUATION FORM – CONSULTING FIRM

RFP No.	NA	RFP NAME	TDA & TBUCA REGULATIONS
FIRM NAME	Miranda		

No.	Sub - Criteria	Rating (%)	Weight	Score	REMARKS – Basis of Rating Explain the basis of your rating – good & poor features Please refer to TOR & eligibility/ qualification requirements
1	Technical Ability/ Team composition	55%	40X.55	22	The basis of the rating is the ability to meet the specific technical abilities specified in the ToR and the background experience in the narrow area of legislative writing.
2	Critical elements to perform this Assignment				
	a. Responsiveness to ToR	50%	20X0.50	10	The sufficiency of bidder's response to the precise specifications in the ToR.
	b. Work Plan & Methodology	40%	25X.40	10	The consistency of the narration of the bidder relative to the nature of the assignment. This indicator is crucial in measuring the technical competency of the bidder.
	c. Organization, Staffing & transfer pricing know-how	30%	15X.30	6	A crucial element of the ability to perform this assignment is the ability of the bidder to put up a technical team that possesses all of the knowledge fields that are implicated in the ToR.
TOTAL SCORE			100	48	

RATING SCALE

EXCELLENT	100%	Feature evaluated substantially exceeds the sub – criteria requirements
VERY GOOD	90%	Feature evaluated exceeds the sub – criteria requirements
ABOVE AVERAGE	80%	Feature evaluated fully meets the sub – criteria requirements
AVERAGE	70%	Feature evaluated proposed adequately meets the sub – criteria requirements
BELOW AVERAGE	50%	Feature evaluated has significant deficiencies against sub – criteria requirements, with probable negative effects on assignment implementation
NON COMPLYING	0%	Feature evaluated does not comply with the sub – criteria requirements and does not provide enough information to permit a higher rating

REQUEST FOR PROPOSALS – CONSULTING SERVICES
NARRATIVE EVALUATION FORM – CONSULTANT'S PERSONNEL

RFP No.	NA	RFP NAME	TDA & TBUCA REGULATIONS
FIRM NAME	MIRANDA		

POSITION IN TEAM	TEAM LEADER
NAME OF PERSON	RITA CORREIA

No	Sub - Criteria	Rating (%)	Weight	Score	REMARKS – Basis of Rating <i>Explain the basis of your rating – good & poor features Please refer to TOR & eligibility/ qualification requirements</i>
1	General Qualifications in Oil and Gas	17%	60X.17	10	The knowledge base of team leader in the area of Oil & Gas legislations is indispensable to the success of the assignment.
2	Adequacy for this Assignment	25%	20X.25	5	It is of paramount importance that the team leader should possess the requisite knowledge of this assignment.
3	Experience in Similar Country Situation & Local Language Ability	90%	20X.90	18	Experience in similarly situated countries like Timor-Leste is a useful tool for the successful execution of this assignment.
TOTAL SCORE			100	33	WEIGHT – Consultant's Personnel (Sub Criterion Weight X 0.4)

RATING SCALE

EXCELLENT	100%	Person proposed substantially exceeds the sub – criteria requirements
VERY GOOD	90%	Person proposed exceeds the sub – criteria requirements
ABOVE AVERAGE	80%	Person proposed fully meets the sub – criteria requirements
AVERAGE	70%	Person proposed adequately meets the sub – criteria requirements
BELOW AVERAGE	50%	Person proposed has significant deficiencies against sub – criteria requirements, with probable negative effects on assignment implementation
NON COMPLYING	0%	Person does not comply with the sub – criteria requirements and does not provide enough information to permit a higher rating

REQUEST FOR PROPOSALS – CONSULTING SERVICES

SUMMARY EVALUATION FORM – TECHNICAL PROPOSALS

RFP No.	NA	RFP NAME	TDA & TBUCA REGULATIONS					
5.2b	SELECTION CRITERIA		FIRM D&T	FIRM O&B	FIRM B & M	FIRM Miranda	FIRM 5	MAX. SCORE
(i)	Technical Ability/ Team composition (40)		15	35	25	22		40
(ii)	Adequacy of proposed methodology & work plan							
	a. Responsiveness to ToR (20)		13	18	14	10		20
	b. Work Plan & Methodology (25)		13	25	14	10		25
	c. Organization, Staffing & transfer pricing know-how (15)		3	12	10	6		15
	SUBTOTAL (ii)		44	90	63	48		100
(iii)	Key professional staff qualifications & competence for the assignment							
	Team leader (100)		15	90	65	50		100
	SUBTOTAL (iii)		15	90	65	50		100
	TOTAL SCORE – TECHNICAL PROPOSAL		44	90	63	48		100
	PASS/ FAIL (≥ 70 points) ?		Fail	Pass	Fail	Fail		
	WEIGHTED TECHNICAL PROPOSAL SCORE : St (total score above x 0.7)		31	63	44.1	34		100

FINANCIAL PROPOSAL	FIRM 1: D&T	FIRM 2	FIRM 3	FIRM 4	FIRM 5
CORRECTIONS ?	NA ¹	NA	NA	NA	
ADJUSTED PRICE	NA	NA	NA		
$Sf = 100 \times Fm / F$	NA	NA	NA		
WEIGHTED FINANCIAL SCORE $Sf \times 0.3$	NA	NA	NA		
TOTAL SCORE = St + Sf	NA	NA	NA		
RANKING	NA	1st			

¹ NA: the bidder failed the technical part of the process and therefore there is no need for financial evaluation.

REQUEST FOR PROPOSALS – CONSULTING SERVICES
NARRATIVE EVALUATION FORM – CONSULTING FIRM

RFP No.	NA	RFP NAME	TDA & TBUCA REGULATIONS		
FIRM NAME	D & T				

No	Sub - Criteria	Rating (%)	Weight	Score	REMARKS – Basis of Rating Explain the basis of your rating – good & poor features Please refer to TOR & eligibility/ qualification requirements
1	Technical Ability/ Team composition	37%	40X0.37	15	The basis of the rating is the ability to meet the specific technical abilities specified in the ToR and the background experience in the narrow area of legislative writing.
2	Critical elements to perform this Assignment				
	a. Responsiveness to ToR	66%	20X0.66	13	The sufficiency of bidder's response to the precise specifications in the ToR.
	b. Work Plan & Methodology	52%	25X0.52	13	The consistency of the narration of the bidder relative to the nature of the assignment. This indicator is crucial in measuring the technical competency of the bidder.
	c. Organization, Staffing & transfer pricing know-how	20%	15X0.20	3	A crucial element of the ability to perform this assignment is the ability of the bidder to put up a technical team that possesses all of the knowledge fields that are implicated in the ToR.
TOTAL SCORE			100	44	

RATING SCALE

EXCELLENT	100%	Feature evaluated substantially exceeds the sub – criteria requirements
VERY GOOD	90%	Feature evaluated exceeds the sub – criteria requirements
ABOVE AVERAGE	80%	Feature evaluated fully meets the sub – criteria requirements
AVERAGE	70%	Feature evaluated proposed adequately meets the sub – criteria requirements
BELOW AVERAGE	50%	Feature evaluated has significant deficiencies against sub – criteria requirements, with probable negative effects on assignment implementation
NON COMPLYING	0%	Feature evaluated does not comply with the sub – criteria requirements and does not provide enough information to permit a higher rating

REQUEST FOR PROPOSALS – CONSULTING SERVICES
NARRATIVE EVALUATION FORM – CONSULTANT'S PERSONNEL

RFP No.	NA	RFP NAME	TDA & TBUCA REGULATIONS
FIRM NAME	D & T		

POSITION IN TEAM	TEAM LEADER
NAME OF PERSON	Karen Green

No	Sub - Criteria	Rating (%)	Weight	Score	REMARKS – Basis of Rating <i>Explain the basis of your rating – good & poor features Please refer to TOR & eligibility/ qualification requirements</i>
1	General Qualifications in Oil and Gas	8%	60X0.08	5	The knowledge base of team leader in the area of Oil & Gas legislations is indispensable to the success of the assignment.
2	Adequacy for this Assignment	8%	20X0.08	5	It is of paramount importance that the team leader should possess the requisite knowledge of this assignment.
3	Experience in Similar Country Situation & Local Language Ability	8%	20X0.08	5	Experience in similarly situated countries like Timor-Leste is a useful tool for the successful execution of this assignment.
TOTAL SCORE			100	15	WEIGHT – Consultant's Personnel (Sub Criterion Weight X 0.4)

RATING SCALE

EXCELLENT	100%	Person proposed substantially exceeds the sub – criteria requirements
VERY GOOD	90%	Person proposed exceeds the sub – criteria requirements
ABOVE AVERAGE	80%	Person proposed fully meets the sub – criteria requirements
AVERAGE	70%	Person proposed adequately meets the sub – criteria requirements
BELOW AVERAGE	50%	Person proposed has significant deficiencies against sub – criteria requirements, with probable negative effects on assignment implementation
NON COMPLYING	0%	Person does not comply with the sub – criteria requirements and does not provide enough information to permit a higher rating

REQUEST FOR PROPOSALS – CONSULTING SERVICES
SUMMARY EVALUATION FORM – TECHNICAL PROPOSALS

RFP No.	NA	RFP NAME	TDA & TBUCA REGULATIONS					
5.2b	SELECTION CRITERIA		FIRM D&T	FIRM 2	FIRM 3	FIRM 4	FIRM 5	MAX. SCORE
(i)	Technical Ability/ Team composition (40)		15					40
(ii)	Adequacy of proposed methodology & work plan							
	a. Responsiveness to ToR (20)		13					20
	b. Work Plan & Methodology (25)		13					25
	c. Organization, Staffing & transfer pricing know-how (15)		3					15
	SUBTOTAL (ii)		44					100
(iii)	Key professional staff qualifications & competence for the assignment							
	Team leader (100)		15					100
	SUBTOTAL (iii)		59					200
	TOTAL SCORE – TECHNICAL PROPOSAL		45.5					100
	PASS/ FAIL (≥ 70 points) ?		Fail					
	WEIGHTED TECHNICAL PROPOSAL SCORE : St (total score above x 0.7)		32					100

FINANCIAL PROPOSAL	FIRM 1: D&T	FIRM 2 O&B	FIRM 3 B&M	FIRM 4 MIRANDA	FIRM 5
CORRECTIONS ?	NA ¹				
ADJUSTED PRICE	NA				
$S_f = 100 \times F_m / F$	NA				
WEIGHTED FINANCIAL SCORE $S_f \times 0.3$	NA				
TOTAL SCORE = $S_t + S_f$	NA				
RANKING	4th				

¹ NA: the bidder failed the technical part of the process and therefore there is no need for financial evaluation.

REQUEST FOR PROPOSALS – CONSULTING SERVICES
NARRATIVE EVALUATION FORM – CONSULTING FIRM

RFP No.	NA	RFP NAME	Bayu-Undan Engineering & Tax Audit
FIRM NAME	C-BLUE		

No	Sub - Criteria	Rating (%)	Weight	Score	REMARKS – Basis of Rating Explain the basis of your rating – good & poor features Please refer to TOR & eligibility/ qualification requirements
1	Technical Ability/ Team composition	58%	60X.58	43	The basis of the rating is the ability to meet the specific technical abilities specified in the ToR and the background experience in the narrow area of legislative writing.
2	Critical elements to perform this Assignment				
	a. Responsiveness to ToR	75%	20x.75	15	The sufficiency of bidder's response to the precise specifications in the ToR.
	b. Work Plan & Methodology	50%	10x.50	5	The consistency of the narration of the bidder relative to the nature of the assignment. This indicator is crucial in measuring the technical competency of the bidder.
	c. Organization, Staffing & transfer pricing know-how	70%	10X.70	7	A crucial element of the ability to perform this assignment is the ability of the bidder to put up a technical team that possesses all of the knowledge fields that are implicated in the ToR.
TOTAL SCORE			100	70	

RATING SCALE

EXCELLENT	100%	Feature evaluated substantially exceeds the sub – criteria requirements
VERY GOOD	90%	Feature evaluated exceeds the sub – criteria requirements
ABOVE AVERAGE	80%	Feature evaluated fully meets the sub – criteria requirements
AVERAGE	70%	Feature evaluated proposed adequately meets the sub – criteria requirements
BELOW AVERAGE	50%	Feature evaluated has significant deficiencies against sub – criteria requirements, with probable negative effects on assignment implementation
NON COMPLYING	0%	Feature evaluated does not comply with the sub – criteria requirements and does not provide enough information to permit a higher rating

REQUEST FOR PROPOSALS – CONSULTING SERVICES
NARRATIVE EVALUATION FORM – CONSULTANT'S PERSONNEL

RFP No.	NA	RFP NAME	Bayu-Undan Engineering/Tax-Audit
FIRM NAME	C-Blue		

POSITION IN TEAM	TEAM LEADER
NAME OF PERSON	Ravi Dulip

No	Sub - Criteria	Rating (%)	Weight	Score	REMARKS – Basis of Rating <i>Explain the basis of your rating – good & poor features Please refer to TOR & eligibility/ qualification requirements</i>
1	General Qualifications in Oil and Gas	50%	60X.50	30	The knowledge base of team leader in the area of Oil & Gas legislations is indispensable to the success of the assignment.
2	Adequacy for this Assignment	50%	20X.50	10	It is of paramount importance that the team leader should possess the requisite knowledge of this assignment.
3	Experience in Similar Country Situation & Local Language Ability	50%	20X.50	10	Experience in similarly situated countries like Timor-Leste is a useful tool for the successful execution of this assignment.
TOTAL SCORE			100	55	WEIGHT – Consultant's Personnel (Sub Criterion Weight X 0.4)

RATING SCALE

EXCELLENT	100%	Person proposed substantially exceeds the sub – criteria requirements
VERY GOOD	90%	Person proposed exceeds the sub – criteria requirements
ABOVE AVERAGE	80%	Person proposed fully meets the sub – criteria requirements
AVERAGE	70%	Person proposed adequately meets the sub – criteria requirements
BELOW AVERAGE	50%	Person proposed has significant deficiencies against sub – criteria requirements, with probable negative effects on assignment implementation
NON COMPLYING	0%	Person does not comply with the sub – criteria requirements and does not provide enough information to permit a higher rating

REQUEST FOR PROPOSALS – CONSULTING SERVICES
SUMMARY EVALUATION FORM – TECHNICAL PROPOSALS

RFP No.	NA	RFP NAME	Bayu-Undan Engineering & Tax Audit				
5.2b	SELECTION CRITERIA		FIRM BAIK OM	FIRM D & T	FIRM C- Blue	FIRM 5	MAX. SCORE
(i)	Technical Ability/ Team composition (40)				45		40
(ii)	Adequacy of proposed methodology & work plan				15		
	a. Responsiveness to ToR (20)				5		20
	b. Work Plan & Methodology (25)				7		25
	c. Organization, Staffing & transfer pricing know-how (15)						15
	SUBTOTAL (ii)				70		100
(iii)	Key professional staff qualifications & competence for the assignment						
	Team leader (100)				55		100
	SUBTOTAL (iii)						100
	TOTAL SCORE – TECHNICAL PROPOSAL				70		100
	PASS/ FAIL (≥ 70 points) ?				Pass		
	WEIGHTED TECHNICAL PROPOSAL SCORE : St (total score above x 0.7)				52.5		100

FINANCIAL PROPOSAL	FIRM 1: Baikom	FIRM Deloitte	FIRM 3 C-Blue	FIRM 4	FIRM 5
CORRECTIONS ?	NA ¹	NA	NA		
ADJUSTED PRICE	NA	NA	NA		
$S_f = 100 \times F_m / F$	NA	NA	NA		
WEIGHTED FINANCIAL SCORE $S_f \times 0.3$	NA	NA	NA		
TOTAL SCORE = $S_t + S_f$	NA	NA	NA		
RANKING	NA	3rd	NA		

¹ NA: the bidder failed the technical part of the process and therefore there is no need for financial evaluation.

REQUEST FOR PROPOSALS – CONSULTING SERVICES
NARRATIVE EVALUATION FORM – CONSULTING FIRM

RFP No.	NA	RFP NAME	GAS PIPELINE-Engineering & Tax Audit
FIRM NAME	BayPhase		

No.	Sub - Criteria	Rating (%)	Weight	Score	REMARKS – Basis of Rating Explain the basis of your rating – good & poor features Please refer to TOR & eligibility/ qualification requirements
1	Technical Ability/ Team composition	73%	60X.73	50	The basis of the rating is the ability to meet the specific technical abilities specified in the ToR and the background experience in the narrow area of legislative writing.
2	Critical elements to perform this Assignment				
	a. Responsiveness to ToR	100%	20x.100	20	The sufficiency of bidder's response to the precise specifications in the ToR.
	b. Work Plan & Methodology	50%	10x.50	5	The consistency of the narration of the bidder relative to the nature of the assignment. This indicator is crucial in measuring the technical competency of the bidder.
	c. Organization, Staffing & transfer pricing know-how	50%	10X.50	5	A crucial element of the ability to perform this assignment is the ability of the bidder to put up a technical team that possesses all of the knowledge fields that are implicated in the ToR.
TOTAL SCORE			100	80	

RATING SCALE

EXCELLENT	100%	Feature evaluated substantially exceeds the sub – criteria requirements
VERY GOOD	90%	Feature evaluated exceeds the sub – criteria requirements
ABOVE AVERAGE	80%	Feature evaluated fully meets the sub – criteria requirements
AVERAGE	70%	Feature evaluated proposed adequately meets the sub – criteria requirements
BELOW AVERAGE	50%	Feature evaluated has significant deficiencies against sub – criteria requirements, with probable negative effects on assignment implementation
NON COMPLYING	0%	Feature evaluated does not comply with the sub – criteria requirements and does not provide enough information to permit a higher rating

REQUEST FOR PROPOSALS – CONSULTING SERVICES
NARRATIVE EVALUATION FORM – CONSULTANT'S PERSONNEL

RFP No.	NA	RFP NAME	GAS PIPELINE-Engineering & Tax Audit
FIRM NAME	BAYPHASE		

POSITION IN TEAM	TEAM LEADER
NAME OF PERSON	Geoff Eyre

No	Sub - Criteria	Rating (%)	Weight	Score	REMARKS – Basis of Rating <i>Explain the basis of your rating – good & poor features Please refer to TOR & eligibility/ qualification requirements</i>
1	General Qualifications in Oil and Gas	100%	60X.100	60	The knowledge base of team leader in the area of Oil & Gas legislations is indispensable to the success of the assignment.
2	Adequacy for this Assignment	75%	20X.75	15	It is of paramount importance that the team leader should possess the requisite knowledge of this assignment.
3	Experience in Similar Country Situation & Local Language Ability	75%	20X.75	15	Experience in similarly situated countries like Timor-Leste is a useful tool for the successful execution of this assignment.
TOTAL SCORE			100	90	WEIGHT – Consultant's Personnel (Sub Criterion Weight X 0.4)

RATING SCALE

EXCELLENT	100%	Person proposed substantially exceeds the sub – criteria requirements
VERY GOOD	90%	Person proposed exceeds the sub – criteria requirements
ABOVE AVERAGE	80%	Person proposed fully meets the sub – criteria requirements
AVERAGE	70%	Person proposed adequately meets the sub – criteria requirements
BELOW AVERAGE	50%	Person proposed has significant deficiencies against sub – criteria requirements, with probable negative effects on assignment implementation
NON COMPLYING	0%	Person does not comply with the sub – criteria requirements and does not provide enough information to permit a higher rating

REQUEST FOR PROPOSALS – CONSULTING SERVICES
SUMMARY EVALUATION FORM – TECHNICAL PROPOSALS

RFP No.	NA	RFP NAME	GAS PIPELINE-Engineering & Tax Audit					
5.2b	SELECTION CRITERIA		FIRM Bayp hase	FIRM	FIRM	FIRM	FIRM 5	MAX. SCORE
(i)	Technical Ability/ Team composition (40)		50					40
(ii)	Adequacy of proposed methodology & work plan							
	a. Responsiveness to ToR (20)		20					20
	b. Work Plan & Methodology (25)		5					25
	c. Organization, Staffing & transfer pricing know-how (15)		5					15
	SUBTOTAL (ii)		80					100
(iii)	Key professional staff qualifications & competence for the assignment							
	Team leader (100)		90					100
	SUBTOTAL (iii)		170					200
	TOTAL SCORE – TECHNICAL PROPOSAL		80					100
	PASS/ FAIL (≥ 70 points) ?		Pass					
	WEIGHTED TECHNICAL PROPOSAL SCORE : St (total score above x 0.7)		62.3					100

FINANCIAL PROPOSAL	FIRM 1: Accumyn	FIRM 2 BIACOM	FIRM Bayphase	FIRM 4	FIRM 5
CORRECTIONS ?	NA ¹	NA	NA		
ADJUSTED PRICE	NA	NA	NA		
$S_f = 100 \times F_m / F$	NA	NA	NA		
WEIGHTED FINANCIAL SCORE $S_f \times 0.3$	NA	NA	NA		
TOTAL SCORE = $S_t + S_f$	NA	NA	NA		
RANKING	NA	NA	1st		

¹ NA: the bidder failed the technical part of the process and therefore there is no need for financial evaluation.

REQUEST FOR PROPOSALS – CONSULTING SERVICES
NARRATIVE EVALUATION FORM – CONSULTING FIRM

RFP No.	NA	RFP NAME	TDA & TBUCA REGULATIONS
FIRM NAME	Baker & McKenzie		

No.	Sub - Criteria	Rating (%)	Weight	Score	REMARKS – Basis of Rating Explain the basis of your rating – good & poor features Please refer to TOR & eligibility/ qualification requirements
1	Technical Ability/ Team composition	62%	40X0.62	25	The basis of the rating is the ability to meet the specific technical abilities specified in the ToR and the background experience in the narrow area of legislative writing.
2	Critical elements to perform this Assignment				
	a. Responsiveness to ToR	70%	20X0.70	14	The sufficiency of bidder's response to the precise specifications in the ToR.
	b. Work Plan & Methodology	56%	25X0.56	14	The consistency of the narration of the bidder relative to the nature of the assignment. This indicator is crucial in measuring the technical competency of the bidder.
	c. Organization, Staffing & transfer pricing know-how	66%	15X0.66	10	A crucial element of the ability to perform this assignment is the ability of the bidder to put up a technical team that possesses all of the knowledge fields that are implicated in the ToR.
TOTAL SCORE			100	63	

RATING SCALE

EXCELLENT	100%	Feature evaluated substantially exceeds the sub – criteria requirements
VERY GOOD	90%	Feature evaluated exceeds the sub – criteria requirements
ABOVE AVERAGE	80%	Feature evaluated fully meets the sub – criteria requirements
AVERAGE	70%	Feature evaluated proposed adequately meets the sub – criteria requirements
BELOW AVERAGE	50%	Feature evaluated has significant deficiencies against sub – criteria requirements, with probable negative effects on assignment implementation
NON COMPLYING	0%	Feature evaluated does not comply with the sub – criteria requirements and does not provide enough information to permit a higher rating

REQUEST FOR PROPOSALS – CONSULTING SERVICES
NARRATIVE EVALUATION FORM – CONSULTANT'S PERSONNEL

RFP No.	NA	RFP NAME	TDA & TBUCA REGULATIONS
FIRM NAME	Baker & McKenzie		

POSITION IN TEAM	TEAM LEADER
NAME OF PERSON	Chris Hughes

No	Sub - Criteria	Rating (%)	Weight	Score	REMARKS – Basis of Rating <i>Explain the basis of your rating – good & poor features Please refer to TOR & eligibility/ qualification requirements</i>
1	General Qualifications in Oil and Gas	58	60X.58	35	The knowledge base of team leader in the area of Oil & Gas legislations is indispensable to the success of the assignment.
2	Adequacy for this Assignment	75%	20X.75	15	It is of paramount importance that the team leader should possess the requisite knowledge of this assignment.
3	Experience in Similar Country Situation & Local Language Ability	50%	20X.50	10	Experience in similarly situated countries like Timor-Leste is a useful tool for the successful execution of this assignment.
TOTAL SCORE			100	60	WEIGHT – Consultant's Personnel (Sub Criterion Weight X 0.4)

RATING SCALE

EXCELLENT	100%	Person proposed substantially exceeds the sub – criteria requirements
VERY GOOD	90%	Person proposed exceeds the sub – criteria requirements
ABOVE AVERAGE	80%	Person proposed fully meets the sub – criteria requirements
AVERAGE	70%	Person proposed adequately meets the sub – criteria requirements
BELOW AVERAGE	50%	Person proposed has significant deficiencies against sub – criteria requirements, with probable negative effects on assignment implementation
NON COMPLYING	0%	Person does not comply with the sub – criteria requirements and does not provide enough information to permit a higher rating

REQUEST FOR PROPOSALS – CONSULTING SERVICES
SUMMARY EVALUATION FORM – TECHNICAL PROPOSALS

RFP No.	NA	RFP NAME	TDA & TBUCA REGULATIONS					
5.2b	SELECTION CRITERIA		FIRM D&T	FIRM O&B	FIRM B & M	FIRM 4	FIRM 5	MAX. SCORE
(i)	Technical Ability/ Team composition (40)				25			40
(ii)	Adequacy of proposed methodology & work plan							
	a. Responsiveness to ToR (20)				14			20
	b. Work Plan & Methodology (25)				13			25
	c. Organization, Staffing & transfer pricing know-how (15)				10			15
	SUBTOTAL (ii)				62			100
(iii)	Key professional staff qualifications & competence for the assignment							
	Team leader (100)				50			100
	SUBTOTAL (iii)				112			200
	TOTAL SCORE – TECHNICAL PROPOSAL				67			100
	PASS/ FAIL (≥ 70 points) ?				Fail			
	WEIGHTED TECHNICAL PROPOSAL SCORE : St (total score above x 0.7)				47			100

FINANCIAL PROPOSAL	FIRM 1: D&T	FIRM 2 O&B	FIRM 3 B&M	FIRM 4 MIRANDA	FIRM 5
CORRECTIONS ?	NA ¹	NA	NA		
ADJUSTED PRICE			NA		
$S_f = 100 \times F_m / F$			NA		
WEIGHTED FINANCIAL SCORE $S_f \times 0.3$			NA		
TOTAL SCORE = St + Sf			NA		
RANKING			2nd		

¹ NA: the bidder failed the technical part of the process and therefore there is no need for financial evaluation.

REQUEST FOR PROPOSALS – CONSULTING SERVICES
NARRATIVE EVALUATION FORM – CONSULTING FIRM

RFP No.	NA	RFP NAME	Bayu-Undan Engineering & Tax Audit
FIRM NAME	BAIKOM		

No	Sub - Criteria	Rating (%)	Weight	Score	REMARKS – Basis of Rating Explain the basis of your rating – good & poor features Please refer to TOR & eligibility/ qualification requirements
1	Technical Ability/ Team composition	16%	60X.16	10	The basis of the rating is the ability to meet the specific technical abilities specified in the ToR and the background experience in the narrow area of legislative writing.
2	Critical elements to perform this Assignment				
	a. Responsiveness to ToR	50%	20x.50	10	The sufficiency of bidder's response to the precise specifications in the ToR.
	b. Work Plan & Methodology	50%	10x.50	5	The consistency of the narration of the bidder relative to the nature of the assignment. This indicator is crucial in measuring the technical competency of the bidder.
	c. Organization, Staffing & transfer pricing know-how	50%	10X.50	5	A crucial element of the ability to perform this assignment is the ability of the bidder to put up a technical team that possesses all of the knowledge fields that are implicated in the ToR.
TOTAL SCORE			100	30	

RATING SCALE

EXCELLENT	100%	Feature evaluated substantially exceeds the sub – criteria requirements
VERY GOOD	90%	Feature evaluated exceeds the sub – criteria requirements
ABOVE AVERAGE	80%	Feature evaluated fully meets the sub – criteria requirements
AVERAGE	70%	Feature evaluated proposed adequately meets the sub – criteria requirements
BELOW AVERAGE	50%	Feature evaluated has significant deficiencies against sub – criteria requirements, with probable negative effects on assignment implementation
NON COMPLYING	0%	Feature evaluated does not comply with the sub – criteria requirements and does not provide enough information to permit a higher rating

REQUEST FOR PROPOSALS – CONSULTING SERVICES
NARRATIVE EVALUATION FORM – CONSULTANT’S PERSONNEL

RFP No.	NA	RFP NAME	Bayu-Undan Engineering/Tax-Audit
FIRM NAME	BAIKOM		

POSITION IN TEAM	TEAM LEADER
NAME OF PERSON	Joseph Martin

No	Sub - Criteria	Rating (%)	Weight	Score	REMARKS – Basis of Rating <i>Explain the basis of your rating – good & poor features Please refer to TOR & eligibility/ qualification requirements</i>
1	General Qualifications in Oil and Gas	16%	60X.16	10	The knowledge base of team leader in the area of Oil & Gas legislations is indispensable to the success of the assignment.
2	Adequacy for this Assignment	10%	20X.10	2	It is of paramount importance that the team leader should possess the requisite knowledge of this assignment.
3	Experience in Similar Country Situation & Local Language Ability	10%	20X.10	2	Experience in similarly situated countries like Timor-Leste is a useful tool for the successful execution of this assignment.
TOTAL SCORE			100	14	WEIGHT – Consultant’s Personnel (Sub Criterion Weight X 0.4)

RATING SCALE

EXCELLENT	100%	Person proposed substantially exceeds the sub – criteria requirements
VERY GOOD	90%	Person proposed exceeds the sub – criteria requirements
ABOVE AVERAGE	80%	Person proposed fully meets the sub – criteria requirements
AVERAGE	70%	Person proposed adequately meets the sub – criteria requirements
BELOW AVERAGE	50%	Person proposed has significant deficiencies against sub – criteria requirements, with probable negative effects on assignment implementation
NON COMPLYING	0%	Person does not comply with the sub – criteria requirements and does not provide enough information to permit a higher rating

REQUEST FOR PROPOSALS – CONSULTING SERVICES
SUMMARY EVALUATION FORM – TECHNICAL PROPOSALS

RFP No.	NA	RFP NAME	Bayu-Undan Engineering & Tax Audit					
5.2b	SELECTION CRITERIA		FIRM BAIK OM	FIRM	FIRM	FIRM	FIRM 5	MAX. SCORE
(i)	Technical Ability/ Team composition (40)		10					40
(ii)	Adequacy of proposed methodology & work plan							
	a. Responsiveness to ToR (20)		10					20
	b. Work Plan & Methodology (25)		5					25
	c. Organization, Staffing & transfer pricing know-how (15)							15
	SUBTOTAL (ii)		30					100
(iii)	Key professional staff qualifications & competence for the assignment							
	Team leader (100)		20					100
	SUBTOTAL (iii)		20					100
	TOTAL SCORE – TECHNICAL PROPOSAL		30					100
	PASS/ FAIL (≥ 70 points) ?		Fail					
	WEIGHTED TECHNICAL PROPOSAL SCORE : St (total score above x 0.7)		22.4					100

FINANCIAL PROPOSAL	FIRM 1: Baikom	FIRM 2	FIRM 3	FIRM 4	FIRM 5
CORRECTIONS ?	NA ¹	NA	NA		
ADJUSTED PRICE	NA	NA	NA		
Sf = 100 x Fm/ F	NA	NA	NA		
WEIGHTED FINANCIAL SCORE Sf x 0.3	NA	NA	NA		
TOTAL SCORE = St + Sf	NA	NA	NA		
RANKING	NA	3rd	NA		

¹ NA: the bidder failed the technical part of the process and therefore there is no need for financial evaluation.

REQUEST FOR PROPOSALS – CONSULTING SERVICES
NARRATIVE EVALUATION FORM – CONSULTING FIRM

RFP No.	NA	RFP NAME	GAS PIPELINE-Engineering & Tax Audit		
FIRM NAME	BAIKOM				

No	Sub - Criteria	Rating (%)	Weight	Score	REMARKS – Basis of Rating Explain the basis of your rating – good & poor features Please refer to TOR & eligibility/ qualification requirements
1	Technical Ability/ Team composition	16%	60X.16	10	The basis of the rating is the ability to meet the specific technical abilities specified in the ToR and the background experience in the narrow area of legislative writing.
2	Critical elements to perform this Assignment				
	a. Responsiveness to ToR	50%	20x.50	10	The sufficiency of bidder's response to the precise specifications in the ToR.
	b. Work Plan & Methodology	50%	10x.50	5	The consistency of the narration of the bidder relative to the nature of the assignment. This indicator is crucial in measuring the technical competency of the bidder.
	c. Organization, Staffing & transfer pricing know-how	50%	10X.50	5	A crucial element of the ability to perform this assignment is the ability of the bidder to put up a technical team that possesses all of the knowledge fields that are implicated in the ToR.
TOTAL SCORE			100	30	

RATING SCALE

EXCELLENT	100%	Feature evaluated substantially exceeds the sub – criteria requirements
VERY GOOD	90%	Feature evaluated exceeds the sub – criteria requirements
ABOVE AVERAGE	80%	Feature evaluated fully meets the sub – criteria requirements
AVERAGE	70%	Feature evaluated proposed adequately meets the sub – criteria requirements
BELOW AVERAGE	50%	Feature evaluated has significant deficiencies against sub – criteria requirements, with probable negative effects on assignment implementation
NON COMPLYING	0%	Feature evaluated does not comply with the sub – criteria requirements and does not provide enough information to permit a higher rating

REQUEST FOR PROPOSALS – CONSULTING SERVICES
NARRATIVE EVALUATION FORM – CONSULTANT’S PERSONNEL

RFP No.	NA	RFP NAME	Gas Pipeline Tax-Audit
FIRM NAME	BAIKOM		

POSITION IN TEAM	TEAM LEADER
NAME OF PERSON	Joseph Martin

No	Sub - Criteria	Rating (%)	Weight	Score	REMARKS – Basis of Rating <i>Explain the basis of your rating – good & poor features Please refer to TOR & eligibility/ qualification requirements</i>
1	General Qualifications in Oil and Gas	16%	60X.16	10	The knowledge base of team leader in the area of Oil & Gas legislations is indispensable to the success of the assignment.
2	Adequacy for this Assignment	10%	20X.10	2	It is of paramount importance that the team leader should possess the requisite knowledge of this assignment.
3	Experience in Similar Country Situation & Local Language Ability	10%	20X.10	2	Experience in similarly situated countries like Timor-Leste is a useful tool for the successful execution of this assignment.
TOTAL SCORE			100	14	WEIGHT – Consultant’s Personnel (Sub Criterion Weight X 0.4)

RATING SCALE

EXCELLENT	100%	Person proposed substantially exceeds the sub – criteria requirements
VERY GOOD	90%	Person proposed exceeds the sub – criteria requirements
ABOVE AVERAGE	80%	Person proposed fully meets the sub – criteria requirements
AVERAGE	70%	Person proposed adequately meets the sub – criteria requirements
BELOW AVERAGE	50%	Person proposed has significant deficiencies against sub – criteria requirements, with probable negative effects on assignment implementation
NON COMPLYING	0%	Person does not comply with the sub – criteria requirements and does not provide enough information to permit a higher rating

REQUEST FOR PROPOSALS – CONSULTING SERVICES
SUMMARY EVALUATION FORM – TECHNICAL PROPOSALS

RFP No.	NA	RFP NAME	Gas Pipeline					
5.2b	SELECTION CRITERIA		FIRM BAIK OM	FIRM	FIRM	FIRM	FIRM 5	MAX. SCORE
(i)	Technical Ability/ Team composition (40)		10					40
(ii)	Adequacy of proposed methodology & work plan							
	a. Responsiveness to ToR (20)		10					20
	b. Work Plan & Methodology (25)		5					25
	c. Organization, Staffing & transfer pricing know-how (15)							15
	SUBTOTAL (ii)		30					100
(iii)	Key professional staff qualifications & competence for the assignment							
	Team leader (100)		20					100
	SUBTOTAL (iii)		50					200
	TOTAL SCORE – TECHNICAL PROPOSAL		30					100
	PASS/ FAIL (≥ 70 points) ?		Fail					
	WEIGHTED TECHNICAL PROPOSAL SCORE : St (total score above x 0.7)		22.4					100

FINANCIAL PROPOSAL	FIRM 1: Accumyn	FIRM 2 Baikom	FIRM 3 Bayphase	FIRM 4	FIRM 5
CORRECTIONS ?	NA ¹	NA	NA		
ADJUSTED PRICE	NA	NA	NA		
Sf = 100 x Fm/ F	NA	NA	NA		
WEIGHTED FINANCIAL SCORE Sf x 0.3	NA	NA	NA		
TOTAL SCORE = St + Sf	NA	NA	NA		
RANKING	NA	3rd	NA		

¹ NA: the bidder failed the technical part of the process and therefore there is no need for financial evaluation.

REQUEST FOR PROPOSALS – CONSULTING SERVICES
NARRATIVE EVALUATION FORM – CONSULTING FIRM

RFP No.	NA	RFP NAME	Bayu-Undan Engineering & Tax Audit
FIRM NAME	ANDAZ		

No .	Sub - Criteria	Rating (%)	Weight	Score	REMARKS – Basis of Rating Explain the basis of your rating – good & poor features Please refer to TOR & eligibility/ qualification requirements
1	Technical Ability/ Team composition	33%	60X.33	20	The basis of the rating is the ability to meet the specific technical abilities specified in the ToR and the background experience in the narrow area of legislative writing.
2	Critical elements to perform this Assignment				
	a. Responsiveness to ToR	25%	20x.25	5	The sufficiency of bidder's response to the precise specifications in the ToR.
	b. Work Plan & Methodology	50%	10x.50	5	The consistency of the narration of the bidder relative to the nature of the assignment. This indicator is crucial in measuring the technical competency of the bidder.
	c. Organization, Staffing & transfer pricing know-how	50%	10X.50	5	A crucial element of the ability to perform this assignment is the ability of the bidder to put up a technical team that possesses all of the knowledge fields that are implicated in the ToR.
TOTAL SCORE			100	35	

RATING SCALE

EXCELLENT	100%	Feature evaluated substantially exceeds the sub – criteria requirements
VERY GOOD	90%	Feature evaluated exceeds the sub – criteria requirements
ABOVE AVERAGE	80%	Feature evaluated fully meets the sub – criteria requirements
AVERAGE	70%	Feature evaluated proposed adequately meets the sub – criteria requirements
BELOW AVERAGE	50%	Feature evaluated has significant deficiencies against sub – criteria requirements, with probable negative effects on assignment implementation
NON COMPLYING	0%	Feature evaluated does not comply with the sub – criteria requirements and does not provide enough information to permit a higher rating

REQUEST FOR PROPOSALS – CONSULTING SERVICES
NARRATIVE EVALUATION FORM – CONSULTANT'S PERSONNEL

RFP No.	NA	RFP NAME	Bayu-Undan Engineering/Tax-Audit
FIRM NAME	ANDAZ		

POSITION IN TEAM	TEAM LEADER
NAME OF PERSON	Zvwzaan Randelovic

No	Sub - Criteria	Rating (%)	Weight	Score	REMARKS – Basis of Rating <i>Explain the basis of your rating – good & poor features Please refer to TOR & eligibility/ qualification requirements</i>
1	General Qualifications in Oil and Gas	16%	60X.16	10	The knowledge base of team leader in the area of Oil & Gas legislations is indispensable to the success of the assignment.
2	Adequacy for this Assignment	25%	20X.25	5	It is of paramount importance that the team leader should possess the requisite knowledge of this assignment.
3	Experience in Similar Country Situation & Local Language Ability	50%	20X.50	10	Experience in similarly situated countries like Timor-Leste is a useful tool for the successful execution of this assignment.
TOTAL SCORE			100	25	WEIGHT – Consultant's Personnel (Sub Criterion Weight X 0.4)

RATING SCALE

EXCELLENT	100%	Person proposed substantially exceeds the sub – criteria requirements
VERY GOOD	90%	Person proposed exceeds the sub – criteria requirements
ABOVE AVERAGE	80%	Person proposed fully meets the sub – criteria requirements
AVERAGE	70%	Person proposed adequately meets the sub – criteria requirements
BELOW AVERAGE	50%	Person proposed has significant deficiencies against sub – criteria requirements, with probable negative effects on assignment implementation
NON COMPLYING	0%	Person does not comply with the sub – criteria requirements and does not provide enough information to permit a higher rating

REQUEST FOR PROPOSALS – CONSULTING SERVICES
SUMMARY EVALUATION FORM – TECHNICAL PROPOSALS

RFP No.	NA	RFP NAME	Bayu-Undan Engineering & Tax Audit					
5.2b	SELECTION CRITERIA		FIRM BAIK OM	FIRM D& T	FIRM C- Blue	FIRM Acc my n	FIRM Anda z	MAX. SCORE
(i)	Technical Ability/ Team composition (40)						20	40
(ii)	Adequacy of proposed methodology & work plan							
	a. Responsiveness to ToR (20)						5	20
	b. Work Plan & Methodology (25)						5	25
	c. Organization, Staffing & transfer pricing know-how (15)						5	15
	SUBTOTAL (ii)						35	100
(iii)	Key professional staff qualifications & competence for the assignment							
	Team leader (100)						25	100
	SUBTOTAL (iii)						25	100
	TOTAL SCORE – TECHNICAL PROPOSAL						35	100
	PASS/ FAIL (≥ 70 points) ?						Fail	
	WEIGHTED TECHNICAL PROPOSAL SCORE : St (total score above x 0.7)						42	100

FINANCIAL PROPOSAL	FIRM 1: Baikom	FIRM Deloitte	FIRM 3 C-Blue	FIRM 4 Accumyn	FIRM 5 Andaz
CORRECTIONS ?	NA ¹	NA	NA	NA	NA
ADJUSTED PRICE	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA
$Sf = 100 \times Fm / F$	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA
WEIGHTED FINANCIAL SCORE $Sf \times 0.3$	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA
TOTAL SCORE = St + Sf	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA
RANKING	NA	3rd	NA	NA	NA

¹ NA: the bidder failed the technical part of the process and therefore there is no need for financial evaluation.

REQUEST FOR PROPOSALS – CONSULTING SERVICES
NARRATIVE EVALUATION FORM – CONSULTING FIRM

RFP No.	NA	RFP NAME	GAS PIPELINE-Engineering & Tax Audit
FIRM NAME	ACCUMYN		

No.	Sub - Criteria	Rating (%)	Weight	Score	REMARKS – Basis of Rating Explain the basis of your rating – good & poor features Please refer to TOR & eligibility/ qualification requirements
1	Technical Ability/ Team composition	73%	60X.73	43	The basis of the rating is the ability to meet the specific technical abilities specified in the ToR and the background experience in the narrow area of legislative writing.
2	Critical elements to perform this Assignment				
	a. Responsiveness to ToR	75%	20x.75	15	The sufficiency of bidder's response to the precise specifications in the ToR.
	b. Work Plan & Methodology	60%	10x.60	6	The consistency of the narration of the bidder relative to the nature of the assignment. This indicator is crucial in measuring the technical competency of the bidder.
	c. Organization, Staffing & transfer pricing know-how	60%	10X.60	6	A crucial element of the ability to perform this assignment is the ability of the bidder to put up a technical team that possesses all of the knowledge fields that are implicated in the ToR.
TOTAL SCORE			100	70	

RATING SCALE

EXCELLENT	100%	Feature evaluated substantially exceeds the sub – criteria requirements
VERY GOOD	90%	Feature evaluated exceeds the sub – criteria requirements
ABOVE AVERAGE	80%	Feature evaluated fully meets the sub – criteria requirements
AVERAGE	70%	Feature evaluated proposed adequately meets the sub – criteria requirements
BELOW AVERAGE	50%	Feature evaluated has significant deficiencies against sub – criteria requirements, with probable negative effects on assignment implementation
NON COMPLYING	0%	Feature evaluated does not comply with the sub – criteria requirements and does not provide enough information to permit a higher rating

REQUEST FOR PROPOSALS – CONSULTING SERVICES
NARRATIVE EVALUATION FORM – CONSULTANT'S PERSONNEL

RFP No.	NA	RFP NAME	GAS PIPELINE-Engineering & Tax Audit
FIRM NAME	ACCUMYN		

POSITION IN TEAM	TEAM LEADER
NAME OF PERSON	SCOTT A. BAYLEY

No	Sub - Criteria	Rating (%)	Weight	Score	REMARKS – Basis of Rating <i>Explain the basis of your rating – good & poor features Please refer to TOR & eligibility/ qualification requirements</i>
1	General Qualifications in Oil and Gas	66%	60X.66	40	The knowledge base of team leader in the area of Oil & Gas legislations is indispensable to the success of the assignment.
2	Adequacy for this Assignment	40%	20X.0.4	8	It is of paramount importance that the team leader should possess the requisite knowledge of this assignment.
3	Experience in Similar Country Situation & Local Language Ability	20%	20X0.2	2	Experience in similarly situated countries like Timor-Leste is a useful tool for the successful execution of this assignment.
TOTAL SCORE			100	50	WEIGHT – Consultant's Personnel (Sub Criterion Weight X 0.4)

RATING SCALE

EXCELLENT	100%	Person proposed substantially exceeds the sub – criteria requirements
VERY GOOD	90%	Person proposed exceeds the sub – criteria requirements
ABOVE AVERAGE	80%	Person proposed fully meets the sub – criteria requirements
AVERAGE	70%	Person proposed adequately meets the sub – criteria requirements
BELOW AVERAGE	50%	Person proposed has significant deficiencies against sub – criteria requirements, with probable negative effects on assignment implementation
NON COMPLYING	0%	Person does not comply with the sub – criteria requirements and does not provide enough information to permit a higher rating

REQUEST FOR PROPOSALS – CONSULTING SERVICES
SUMMARY EVALUATION FORM – TECHNICAL PROPOSALS

RFP No.	NA	RFP NAME	GAS PIPELINE-Engineering & Tax Audit					
5.2b	SELECTION CRITERIA		FIRM Accu myn	FIRM	FIRM	FIRM	FIRM 5	MAX. SCORE
(i)	Technical Ability/ Team composition (40)		43					40
(ii)	Adequacy of proposed methodology & work plan							
	a. Responsiveness to ToR (20)		15					20
	b. Work Plan & Methodology (25)		6					25
	c. Organization, Staffing & transfer pricing know-how (15)		6					15
	SUBTOTAL (ii)		70					100
(iii)	Key professional staff qualifications & competence for the assignment							
	Team leader (100)		60					100
	SUBTOTAL (iii)		130					200
	TOTAL SCORE – TECHNICAL PROPOSAL		70					100
	PASS/ FAIL (≥ 70 points) ?		Pass					
	WEIGHTED TECHNICAL PROPOSAL SCORE : St (total score above x 0.7)		53.2					100

FINANCIAL PROPOSAL	FIRM 1: Accumyn	FIRM Baikom	FIRM BayPhase	FIRM 4	FIRM 5
CORRECTIONS ?	NA ¹	NA	NA		
ADJUSTED PRICE	NA	NA	NA		
$Sf = 100 \times Fm / F$	NA	NA	NA		
WEIGHTED FINANCIAL SCORE $Sf \times 0.3$	NA	NA	NA		
TOTAL SCORE = St + Sf	NA	NA	NA		
RANKING	2nd	NA	NA		

¹ NA: the bidder failed the technical part of the process and therefore there is no need for financial evaluation.

REQUEST FOR PROPOSALS – CONSULTING SERVICES
NARRATIVE EVALUATION FORM – CONSULTING FIRM

RFP No.	NA	RFP NAME	Bayu-Undan Engineering & Tax Audit
FIRM NAME	Deloitte		

No.	Sub - Criteria	Rating (%)	Weight	Score	REMARKS – Basis of Rating Explain the basis of your rating – good & poor features Please refer to TOR & eligibility/ qualification requirements
1	Technical Ability/ Team composition	58%	60X.58	35	The basis of the rating is the ability to meet the specific technical abilities specified in the ToR and the background experience in the narrow area of legislative writing.
2	Critical elements to perform this Assignment				
	a. Responsiveness to ToR	75%	20x.75	15	The sufficiency of bidder's response to the precise specifications in the ToR.
	b. Work Plan & Methodology	40%	10x.40	4	The consistency of the narration of the bidder relative to the nature of the assignment. This indicator is crucial in measuring the technical competency of the bidder.
	c. Organization, Staffing & transfer pricing know-how	60%	10X.60	6	A crucial element of the ability to perform this assignment is the ability of the bidder to put up a technical team that possesses all of the knowledge fields that are implicated in the ToR.
TOTAL SCORE			100	60	

RATING SCALE

EXCELLENT	100%	Feature evaluated substantially exceeds the sub – criteria requirements
VERY GOOD	90%	Feature evaluated exceeds the sub – criteria requirements
ABOVE AVERAGE	80%	Feature evaluated fully meets the sub – criteria requirements
AVERAGE	70%	Feature evaluated proposed adequately meets the sub – criteria requirements
BELOW AVERAGE	50%	Feature evaluated has significant deficiencies against sub – criteria requirements, with probable negative effects on assignment implementation
NON COMPLYING	0%	Feature evaluated does not comply with the sub – criteria requirements and does not provide enough information to permit a higher rating

REQUEST FOR PROPOSALS – CONSULTING SERVICES
NARRATIVE EVALUATION FORM – CONSULTANT'S PERSONNEL

RFP No.	NA	RFP NAME	Bayu-Undan Engineering/Tax-Audit
FIRM NAME	Deloitte		

POSITION IN TEAM	TEAM LEADER
NAME OF PERSON	Karen Green

No	Sub - Criteria	Rating (%)	Weight	Score	REMARKS – Basis of Rating <i>Explain the basis of your rating – good & poor features Please refer to TOR & eligibility/ qualification requirements</i>
1	General Qualifications in Oil and Gas	33%	60X.33	20	The knowledge base of team leader in the area of Oil & Gas legislations is indispensable to the success of the assignment.
2	Adequacy for this Assignment	25%	20X.25	5	It is of paramount importance that the team leader should possess the requisite knowledge of this assignment.
3	Experience in Similar Country Situation & Local Language Ability	25%	20X.25	5	Experience in similarly situated countries like Timor-Leste is a useful tool for the successful execution of this assignment.
TOTAL SCORE			100	30	WEIGHT – Consultant's Personnel (Sub Criterion Weight X 0.4)

RATING SCALE

EXCELLENT	100%	Person proposed substantially exceeds the sub – criteria requirements
VERY GOOD	90%	Person proposed exceeds the sub – criteria requirements
ABOVE AVERAGE	80%	Person proposed fully meets the sub – criteria requirements
AVERAGE	70%	Person proposed adequately meets the sub – criteria requirements
BELOW AVERAGE	50%	Person proposed has significant deficiencies against sub – criteria requirements, with probable negative effects on assignment implementation
NON COMPLYING	0%	Person does not comply with the sub – criteria requirements and does not provide enough information to permit a higher rating

REQUEST FOR PROPOSALS – CONSULTING SERVICES
SUMMARY EVALUATION FORM – TECHNICAL PROPOSALS

RFP No.	NA	RFP NAME	Bayu-Undan Engineering & Tax Audit					
5.2b	SELECTION CRITERIA		FIRM BAIK OM	FIRM D& T	FIRM	FIRM	FIRM 5	MAX. SCORE
(i)	Technical Ability/ Team composition (40)			35				40
				15				
(ii)	Adequacy of proposed methodology & work plan							
	a. Responsiveness to ToR (20)			4				20
	b. Work Plan & Methodology (25)			6				25
	c. Organization, Staffing & transfer pricing know-how (15)							15
	SUBTOTAL (ii)			60				100
(iii)	Key professional staff qualifications & competence for the assignment							
	Team leader (100)			30				100
	SUBTOTAL (iii)			30				100
	TOTAL SCORE – TECHNICAL PROPOSAL							100
	PASS/ FAIL (≥ 70 points) ?			Fail				
	WEIGHTED TECHNICAL PROPOSAL SCORE : St (total score above x 0.7)			47.2				100

FINANCIAL PROPOSAL	FIRM 1: Baikom	FIRM Deloitte	FIRM 3 C-Blue	FIRM 4	FIRM 5
CORRECTIONS ?	NA ¹	NA	NA		
ADJUSTED PRICE	NA	NA	NA		
$S_f = 100 \times F_m / F$	NA	NA	NA		
WEIGHTED FINANCIAL SCORE $S_f \times 0.3$	NA	NA	NA		
TOTAL SCORE = St + Sf	NA	NA	NA		
RANKING	NA	3rd	NA		

¹ NA: the bidder failed the technical part of the process and therefore there is no need for financial evaluation.

REQUEST FOR PROPOSALS – CONSULTING SERVICES
NARRATIVE EVALUATION FORM – CONSULTING FIRM

RFP No.	NA	RFP NAME	TDA & TBUCA REGULATIONS
FIRM NAME	Opus & Best Law Services, LLC		

No	Sub - Criteria	Rating (%)	Weight	Score	REMARKS – Basis of Rating Explain the basis of your rating – good & poor features Please refer to TOR & eligibility/ qualification requirements
1	Technical Ability/ Team composition	87%	40X0.87	35	The basis of the rating is the ability to meet the specific technical abilities specified in the ToR and the background experience in the narrow area of legislative writing.
2	Critical elements to perform this Assignment				
	a. Responsiveness to ToR	90%	20X0.90	18	The sufficiency of bidder's response to the precise specifications in the ToR.
	b. Work Plan & Methodology	100%	25X100	25	The consistency of the narration of the bidder relative to the nature of the assignment. This indicator is crucial in measuring the technical competency of the bidder.
	c. Organization, Staffing & transfer pricing know-how	80%	15X0.80	12	A crucial element of the ability to perform this assignment is the ability of the bidder to put up a technical team that possesses all of the knowledge fields that are implicated in the ToR.
TOTAL SCORE			100	90	

RATING SCALE

EXCELLENT	100%	Feature evaluated substantially exceeds the sub – criteria requirements
VERY GOOD	90%	Feature evaluated exceeds the sub – criteria requirements
ABOVE AVERAGE	80%	Feature evaluated fully meets the sub – criteria requirements
AVERAGE	70%	Feature evaluated proposed adequately meets the sub – criteria requirements
BELOW AVERAGE	50%	Feature evaluated has significant deficiencies against sub – criteria requirements, with probable negative effects on assignment implementation
NON COMPLYING	0%	Feature evaluated does not comply with the sub – criteria requirements and does not provide enough information to permit a higher rating

REQUEST FOR PROPOSALS – CONSULTING SERVICES
NARRATIVE EVALUATION FORM – CONSULTANT'S PERSONNEL

RFP No.	NA	RFP NAME	TDA & TBUCA REGULATIONS
FIRM NAME	Opus & Best		

POSITION IN TEAM	TEAM LEADER
NAME OF PERSON	Dominic Lucas

No	Sub - Criteria	Rating (%)	Weight	Score	REMARKS – Basis of Rating <i>Explain the basis of your rating – good & poor features Please refer to TOR & eligibility/ qualification requirements</i>
1	General Qualifications in Oil and Gas	100	60X.100	60	The knowledge base of team leader in the area of Oil & Gas legislations is indispensable to the success of the assignment.
2	Adequacy for this Assignment	90%	20X.90	18	It is of paramount importance that the team leader should possess the requisite knowledge of this assignment.
3	Experience in Similar Country Situation & Local Language Ability	90%	20X.90	18	Experience in similarly situated countries like Timor-Leste is a useful tool for the successful execution of this assignment.
TOTAL SCORE			100	96	WEIGHT – Consultant's Personnel (Sub Criterion Weight X 0.4)

RATING SCALE

EXCELLENT	100%	Person proposed substantially exceeds the sub – criteria requirements
VERY GOOD	90%	Person proposed exceeds the sub – criteria requirements
ABOVE AVERAGE	80%	Person proposed fully meets the sub – criteria requirements
AVERAGE	70%	Person proposed adequately meets the sub – criteria requirements
BELOW AVERAGE	50%	Person proposed has significant deficiencies against sub – criteria requirements, with probable negative effects on assignment implementation
NON COMPLYING	0%	Person does not comply with the sub – criteria requirements and does not provide enough information to permit a higher rating

REQUEST FOR PROPOSALS – CONSULTING SERVICES
SUMMARY EVALUATION FORM – TECHNICAL PROPOSALS

RFP No.	NA	RFP NAME	TDA & TBUCA REGULATIONS					
5.2b	SELECTION CRITERIA		FIRM D&T	FIRM O&B	FIRM 3	FIRM 4	FIRM 5	MAX. SCORE
(i)	Technical Ability/ Team composition (40)			35				40
(ii)	Adequacy of proposed methodology & work plan							
	a. Responsiveness to ToR (20)			18				20
	b. Work Plan & Methodology (25)			25				25
	c. Organization, Staffing & transfer pricing know-how (15)			12				15
	SUBTOTAL (ii)			90				100
(iii)	Key professional staff qualifications & competence for the assignment							
	Team leader (100)			90				100
	SUBTOTAL (iii)			180				200
	TOTAL SCORE – TECHNICAL PROPOSAL			90				100
	PASS/ FAIL (≥ 70 points) ?			Pass				
	WEIGHTED TECHNICAL PROPOSAL SCORE : St (total score above x 0.7)			70				100

FINANCIAL PROPOSAL	FIRM 1: D&T	FIRM 2	FIRM 3	FIRM 4	FIRM 5
CORRECTIONS ?		NA			
ADJUSTED PRICE		NA			
Sf = 100 x Fm/ F		NA			
WEIGHTED FINANCIAL SCORE Sf x 0.3		NA			
TOTAL SCORE = St + Sf		NA			
RANKING		1st			

REQUEST FOR PROPOSALS – CONSULTING SERVICES
NARRATIVE EVALUATION FORM – CONSULTING FIRM

RFP No.	NA	RFP NAME	Bayu-Undan Engineering & Tax Audit
FIRM NAME	Deloitte		

No.	Sub - Criteria	Rating (%)	Weight	Score	REMARKS – Basis of Rating Explain the basis of your rating – good & poor features Please refer to TOR & eligibility/ qualification requirements
1	Technical Ability/ Team composition	58%	60X.58	35	The basis of the rating is the ability to meet the specific technical abilities specified in the ToR and the background experience in the narrow area of legislative writing.
Critical elements to perform this Assignment					
2	a. Responsiveness to ToR	75%	20X.75	15	The sufficiency of bidder's response to the precise specifications in the ToR.
	b. Work Plan & Methodology	40%	10X.40	4	The consistency of the narration of the bidder relative to the nature of the assignment. This indicator is crucial in measuring the technical competency of the bidder.
	c. Organization, Staffing & transfer pricing know-how	60%	10X.60	6	A crucial element of the ability to perform this assignment is the ability of the bidder to put up a technical team that possesses all of the knowledge fields that are implicated in the ToR.
TOTAL SCORE			100	60	

RATING SCALE

EXCELLENT	100%	Feature evaluated substantially exceeds the sub – criteria requirements
VERY GOOD	90%	Feature evaluated exceeds the sub – criteria requirements
ABOVE AVERAGE	80%	Feature evaluated fully meets the sub – criteria requirements
AVERAGE	70%	Feature evaluated adequately meets the sub – criteria requirements
BELOW AVERAGE	50%	Feature evaluated has significant deficiencies against sub – criteria requirements, with probable negative effects on assignment implementation
NON COMPLYING	0%	Feature evaluated does not comply with the sub – criteria requirements and does not provide enough information to permit a higher rating

REQUEST FOR PROPOSALS – CONSULTING SERVICES
NARRATIVE EVALUATION FORM – CONSULTANT'S PERSONNEL

RFP No.	NA	RFP NAME	Bayu-Undan Engineering/Tax-Audit
FIRM NAME	Deloitte		

POSITION IN TEAM	TEAM LEADER
NAME OF PERSON	Karen Green

No.	Sub - Criteria	Rating (%)	Weight	Score	REMARKS – Basis of Rating <i>Explain the basis of your rating – good & poor features Please refer to TOR & eligibility/ qualification requirements</i>
1	General Qualifications in Oil and Gas	33%	60X.33	20	The knowledge base of team leader in the area of Oil & Gas legislations is indispensable to the success of the assignment.
2	Adequacy for this Assignment	25%	20X.25	5	It is of paramount importance that the team leader should possess the requisite knowledge of this assignment.
3	Experience in Similar Country Situation & Local Language Ability	25%	20X.25	5	Experience in similarly situated countries like Timor-Leste is a useful tool for the successful execution of this assignment.
TOTAL SCORE			100	30	WEIGHT – Consultant's Personnel (Sub Criterion Weight X 0.4)

RATING SCALE

EXCELLENT	100%	Person proposed substantially exceeds the sub – criteria requirements
VERY GOOD	90%	Person proposed exceeds the sub – criteria requirements
ABOVE AVERAGE	80%	Person proposed fully meets the sub – criteria requirements
AVERAGE	70%	Person proposed adequately meets the sub – criteria requirements
BELOW AVERAGE	50%	Person proposed has significant deficiencies against sub – criteria requirements, with probable negative effects on assignment implementation
NON COMPLYING	0%	Person does not comply with the sub – criteria requirements and does not provide enough information to permit a higher rating

REQUEST FOR PROPOSALS – CONSULTING SERVICES
SUMMARY EVALUATION FORM – TECHNICAL PROPOSALS

RFP No.	NA	RFP NAME	Bayu-Undan Engineering & Tax Audit					
5.2b	SELECTION CRITERIA		FIRM BAIK OM	FIRM D& T	FIRM	FIRM	FIRM 5	MAX. SCORE
(i)	Technical Ability/ Team composition (40)			35				40
				15				
(ii)	Adequacy of proposed methodology & work plan							
	a. Responsiveness to ToR (20)			4				20
	b. Work Plan & Methodology (25)			6				25
	c. Organization, Staffing & transfer pricing know-how (15)							15
	SUBTOTAL (ii)			60				100
(iii)	Key professional staff qualifications & competence for the assignment							
	Team leader (100)			30				100
	SUBTOTAL (iii)			30				100
	TOTAL SCORE – TECHNICAL PROPOSAL							100
	PASS/ FAIL (≥ 70 points) ?			Fail				
	WEIGHTED TECHNICAL PROPOSAL SCORE : St (total score above x 0.7)			47.2				100

FINANCIAL PROPOSAL	FIRM 1: Baikom	FIRM Deloitte	FIRM 3 C-Blue	FIRM 4	FIRM 5
CORRECTIONS ?	NA ¹	NA	NA		
ADJUSTED PRICE	NA	NA	NA		
Sf = 100 x Fm/ F	NA	NA	NA		
WEIGHTED FINANCIAL SCORE Sf x 0.3	NA	NA	NA		
TOTAL SCORE = St + Sf	NA	NA	NA		
RANKING	NA	3rd	NA		

¹ NA: the bidder failed the technical part of the process and therefore there is no need for financial evaluation.

PROJECT 1: Gas Pipeline: Engineering & Tax Audit

A proposal from the NDPR to the Minister of Finance (HE Emilia Pires) for the above-mentioned project was approved on January 31, 2012. The Minister and the PM were briefed about the importance of the project and the urgency underlying the project i.e. statute of limitation and potential revenue of approximately \$814 million. The project was approved by the PM and the Minister of Finance. The approval is attached herewith.

HE Emilia Pires directed NDPR to begin the process through advertisement.

- Invitation for bidding and EOI was uploaded into the MoF's website on February 16 2012
- Additional advert for bidding was placed with The Economist magazine of February 25.
- The closing date for all bids was April 17, 2012. The Economist has approximately 2.5 million weekly circulation

At the end of the bid period, the following corporations submitted EOI and firm bidding documentations:

1. Baikom Resources LLC (Texas, USA)
2. Accumyn Consulting (Houston, Texas)
3. Bayphase Geologists (Surrey, UK)

NDPR Review Committee consisting of DG Cândia, the National Director (Ms. Monica Rangel) and the Petroleum Legal Adviser met on 4/3/2012 to review the bids from each of the bidders named above. The overriding criteria for the ranking of the bidders were the technical competence as exemplified on the bidding documents and the resume of the key members of the technical team. Bobby also performed a summary review of the websites of each of the bidders and provided the NDPR Review team with some relevant information

Based on technical competence and the ability of the team to perform the exercise, the NDPR Review team recommended **BAYPHASE GEOLOGIST** as best bidder.

The recommendation was presented to the Permanent Bidding & Quotation Committee, comprising of:

1. DG Santana JRF Viegas Cardoso;
2. Dr. Rui Maria de Araujo-SMA to Corporate Services
3. Domingos Marques-Head of Admin. Department
4. Mr. Cândia Oliveira (DG, DGRC)
5. Ms. Monica Da Cruz Rangel (NDPR-National Director); and
6. Mr. Bobby Boye (NDPR-Legal Advisor)

The permanent Bidding & Quotation met on Wednesday the 4th of April to review the recommendations from the NDPR Review Committee and to independently assess the bidders. A scoring Matrix was developed for the project and the ranking of each bidder was based on the scoring system that was largely predicated on technical competence and the ability of the bidders to perform the exercise.

The Matrix, Summary Scoring, bid documentation and the individual bidder's score sheet are attached herewith.

The scoring sheet summary and the matrix were presented by the **Permanent Bidding & Quotation Committee** to the **Procurement Commission** on **Wednesday the 4th of April, 2012.**

Based on the scoring Matrix, the Permanent Bidding & Quotation Committee selected BAYPHASE GEOLOGISTS as the winner of the bid for the Gas Pipeline: Engineering & Tax Audit

NDPR Review Committee

1. DG Cândia Oliveira
2. Monica Da Cruz Rangel
3. Bobby Boye

Permanent Bidding & Quotation Committee

1. DG Santana JRF Viegas Cardoso:
2. Dr. Rui Maria de Araujo-SMA to Corporate Services:
3. Domingos Marques-Head of Admin. Department:
4. Mr. Cândia Oliveira (DG, DGRC):
5. Ms. Monica Da Cruz Rangel (NDPR-National Director):
6. Mr. Bobby Boye (NDPR-Legal Advisor):

Approved By:

H.E Emilia Pires
Minister of Finance