

**TENDER EVALUATION GUIDANCE DOCUMENT
FOR
MEDICAL WASTE SERVICES**

**SOUTHERN ZONE
OF THE
GOVERNORATE OF CAIRO, EGYPT**

Prepared for:

Governorate of Cairo
United State Agency for International Development

Prepared by:

Abt Associates, Inc.
SCS Engineers
Community & Institutional Development
The Institute for Public-Private Partnerships

May 20, 2003

TABLE OF CONTENTS

SECTION 1 INTRODUCTION	1
OVERVIEW	1
TENDER EVALUATION CRITERIA – SUBMITTAL REQUIREMENTS	1
TENDER EVALUATION CRITERIA - TECHNICAL PROPOSAL	1
Quality of Draft Work Plans	1
Quality of Facilities and Equipment	1
Quality of Key Personnel.....	2
General Quality of Technical Proposal.....	2
NUMERICAL SCORES AND WEIGHTS	2
Numerical Scores	2
Evaluation Criteria Weighting	3
Service Weighting.....	3
EVALUATION FORMS	3
SECTION 2 STEP 1 – COMPLIANCE WITH SUBMITTAL REQUIREMENTS	4
SPECIFIC SUBMITTAL CRITERIA	4
Tender Offer Submittal Date	4
Packaging and Labeling of Tender Offer (RFT 5.1.1 and 5.2).....	4
Signing of the Tender Offer (RFT 5.1.2)	4
Modification of the Tender Offer (RFT 5.5.2)	4
Bid Letter of Guarantee (RFT 4.7.1 and 4.7.2).....	4
Joint Ventures (RFT 4.4.1, 4.4.2, 4.4.3, 4.5.2, and 4.7.3).....	5
Bidders Commitment Letter (RFT 4.5)	5
SECTION 3 STEP 2 – TECHNICAL PROPOSAL EVALUATION	6
STEP 2(D) – QUALITY OF DRAFT WORK PLANS	6
Evaluation Criteria – Medical Waste Management Services	6
STEP 2(C) – FACILITIES AND EQUIPMENT	9
Evaluation Criteria – Medical Waste Management Facilities and Equipment.....	9
STEP 2(B) – KEY PERSONNEL (SOLID WASTE MANAGEMENT AND MEDICAL WASTE MANAGEMENT)	11
Evaluation Criteria – Proposed Resident Manager.....	11
Evaluation Criteria – Other Key Personnel	11
Evaluation Criteria – Staffing Plan	12
STEP 2(A) – OVERALL QUALITY	12
Evaluation Criteria	12

STEP 3 – FINANCIAL PROPOSAL OPENING	12
PROCEDURES.....	12
MANDATORY FINANCIAL CRITERIA.....	13
Contents of the Financial Proposal. (RFT 4.6)	13
BID SHEET TABULATION	13
STEP 4 – CONTRACT AWARD	13
PROCEDURES.....	13
APPENDIX A - TENDER EVALUATION FORMS	14
APPENDIX B - BID TABULATION FORMS.....	1

SECTION 1 INTRODUCTION

OVERVIEW

The purpose of this guidance document is to provide the Governorate of Cairo (GOC) with information to assist the Tender Evaluation Committee (TEC) conduct the evaluation of Tender Offers for Solid Waste Management and Cleaning Services for the Southern Zone.

The Tender Offer evaluation procedures and suggested evaluation criteria in this guidance document are specific to the Request for Tenders (RFT) issued by the GOC and titled “Cairo Governorate Request for Tenders: Solid Waste Management and Cleaning Services for the Southern Zone – June 1, 2003.” It should not be used to evaluate other Tender Offers, or by other governorates, unless it is revised and made applicable to the specific needs and requirements stated in the RFTs.

TENDER EVALUATION CRITERIA – SUBMITTAL REQUIREMENTS

The RFT contains specific instructions to the Bidders. Bidders must perform certain activities and provide specific information and documents.

The Submittal Requirements may be evaluated by asking questions that have either Yes or No answers. If the Bidder met the Requirement, then the answer to the question is “Yes”. When reviewing the Tender Offers, if a Bidder receives a “No” for any Submittal Requirement, the Bidder may be disqualified from further consideration.

Submittal requirements are listed in Section 2 of this report. For each requirement, there is a reference to where the requirement is located in the RFT for the Southern Zone. A form is included in Appendix A where the results of this analysis can be tabulated.

TENDER EVALUATION CRITERIA - TECHNICAL PROPOSAL

The Request For Tender specifies that the technical evaluation must consider four distinct subject areas of the Technical Proposals: the draft work plans, facilities and equipment, key personnel, and overall quality of the Technical Proposal.

Quality of Draft Work Plans

The Southern Zone RFT for Medical Waste Management Services solicits Tender Offers for the collection, treatment and disposal of Infectious Medical Wastes. The Technical Evaluation Criteria for this Service must be based on the specific requirements set forth in the Request for Tender.

Quality of Facilities and Equipment

The TEC should evaluate the *quality* of the facilities and equipment being offered by the Bidder for the service. Quality means whether the facility construction or equipment is durable, reliable, made of appropriate materials, and thus likely to serve the functions proposed by the Bidder. For example, if facilities or equipment have never before been

utilized for solid waste management purposes, the quality and applicability may be judged to be inadequate. This part of the evaluation does not consider the *adequacy* of the facilities and equipment being offered by the Bidder. Consideration of this issue is incorporated into the evaluation of the Quality of Draft Work Plans.

Quality of Key Personnel

The TEC should evaluate the *qualifications* of the senior level personnel, i.e., the general manager and the managers proposed to report directly to the general manager. The senior level personnel qualifications should include the following:

- Experience in managing medical waste management service contracts.
- Experience in large urban areas in developing countries.
- Experience in their particular area of responsibility.

General Quality of Technical Proposal

The TEC should evaluate the overall *responsiveness* and *clarity* of the Bidders' Technical Proposals and *approach* to the unique conditions of the Southern Zone. Technical Proposals should present, in a clear and concise manner, detailed information responding to the RFT. Evaluation of the overall quality of the Bidders' Technical Proposals allows the GOC to account for those factors that are not otherwise considered.

NUMERICAL SCORES AND WEIGHTS

The TEC should utilize a uniform numerical scoring and weighting system to compare the content of the Tender Offer with the requirements of the Request for Tender.

Numerical Scores

The technical evaluation criteria are qualitative in nature. They are open-ended questions that may be scored using a numerical rating system. The following rating system is recommended:

- 0 – unacceptable: The Tender Offer does not meet the minimum requirements stated in the RFT
- 1 – acceptable: The Tender Offer meets the minimum criteria stated in the RFT.
- 2 – more than acceptable: The Tender Offer clearly exceeds the minimum criteria stated in the RFT
- N/A – not applicable – The specific evaluation criteria is not applicable to the Technical Proposal (e.g., if the Bidder does not propose to compost any waste, then composting evaluation criteria would not be applicable).

Evaluation Criteria Weighting

Some evaluation criteria are more important than others. Therefore, each criterion should be assigned a numerical weight based on its relative importance to other criterion. The recommended weighting system is defined as follows:

- 1 = less important when compared to all other criterion
- 2 = important when compared to all other criterion
- 3 = more important when compared to all other criterion

The criteria weighting should be completed before beginning the numerical scoring of the Tender Offer evaluation criteria. The criteria weighting can be established by each entity (individual or sub-committee) completing the evaluation.

Service Weighting

In accordance with the RFT, Section 6.3.1 (Step 2(d)), a total of 50 points are assigned to the evaluation of the Draft Work Plan. Since there is only one service related to the Medical Waste Management Tender Offer, all 50 points will be assigned to the single service.

EVALUATION FORMS

This Appendix to this document contains one set of evaluation forms for each Contractor who has submitted a Tender Offer. Each person or sub-committee (if a sub-committee is formed to evaluate part or all of a Tender Offer) of the Tender Evaluation Committee should complete the column entitled "Enter Numerical Score (1,2, or 3)" and "Enter Criteria Weight (1,2, or 3) for each evaluation form for the assigned evaluation area. Once the evaluation is completed, the information will be entered into the computer "EXCEL" spreadsheet which will make the required calculations to determine whether the Contractor's Tender Offer meets or exceeds the minimum evaluation criteria.

SECTION 2
STEP 1 – COMPLIANCE WITH SUBMITTAL REQUIREMENTS

“Each Technical Proposal will be examined first to confirm or otherwise determine whether there has been full compliance with the RFT and the Bidder’s pre-qualification submission.”

The purpose of Step 1 is to examine the Technical Proposals and qualify or disqualify Bidders according to the specific Submittal Requirements defined by the GOC.

SPECIFIC SUBMITTAL CRITERIA

The following paragraphs contain specific criteria presented in the form of questions. Each of the following Submittal Requirements is required by the terms of the RFT. Appendix A includes a form (Evaluation Form for Technical Proposal Submittal Requirements – Shown Below) that can be used to tabulate the yes or no answers to the questions contained in the following paragraphs.

Tender Offer Submittal Date

1. Did the Bidder submit its Technical and Financial Proposals on or before 12 o’clock noon on the date specified in the RFT?

Packaging and Labeling of Tender Offer (RFT 5.1.1 and 5.2)

1. Did the Bidder submit an original of its Tender Offer in Arabic and clearly indicate which one is the original?
2. Did the Bidder submit an original of their Tender Offer in English and clearly indicate which one is the original?
3. Did the Bidder properly seal the Technical and Financial Proposals in separate envelopes and properly mark the envelopes?

Signing of the Tender Offer (RFT 5.1.2)

1. Did the Bidder, or a duly authorized person(s), sign the original and all copies of the Tender Offer?

Modification of the Tender Offer (RFT 5.5.2)

1. If any modifications were submitted, did the Bidder properly prepare, seal, mark, and deliver such modifications?

Bid Letter of Guarantee (RFT 4.7.1 and 4.7.2)

1. Is the Bid Letter of Guarantee provided by a reputable bank located in Egypt?

2. Did the Bidder provide as part of its Technical Proposal a Bid Letter of Guarantee in the amount of LE 500,000 for each Bidder's Price Form Schedule submitted?
3. Is the Bid Letter of Guarantee in accordance with the content included in Annex B to the RFT?

Joint Ventures (RFT 4.4.1, 4.4.2, 4.4.3, 4.5.2, and 4.7.3)

1. If the Tender Offer is from a Joint Stock Company, does the Tender Offer contain a description of the shareholding and respective responsibilities for each participant making up the Joint Stock Company?
2. Did the Bidder submit a letter signed by a responsible officer for each Joint Stock Company Participant providing a written formal commitment to the Joint Venture, acceptance of the arrangements of the Joint Venture, and willingness to provide a joint and several guarantee?
3. Did the Bidder identify one company that will serve the leading role in the Joint Venture and will have the authority to commit all participants?
4. Is the Bid Letter of Guarantee in the name of all the participants in the Joint Venture?

Bidders Commitment Letter (RFT 4.5)

1. Does the Technical Proposal contain a formal Bidder's Commitment Letter providing the commitments listed in the RFT?
2. Does the Technical Proposal contain a copy of all Addenda issued by the GOC?

SECTION 3
STEP 2 – TECHNICAL PROPOSAL EVALUATION

“The Technical Proposal shall then be examined in detail to determine whether the Bidder has demonstrated sufficient capability to undertake performance of the services and activities. A total of 100 points will be assigned to this category. Bidders must achieve a total of at least 70 points AND the minimum number of points specified for each of the four key areas of technical evaluation listed below. Only those Bidders achieving both the overall score of 70 points and the minimum required for each element will be included in Step 3.”

The purpose of Step 2 is to determine whether or not the Tender Offer - Technical Proposal meets the minimum requirements stated in the Request for Tender. Step 2 is divided into four separate areas of evaluation. Those four areas are:

- Quality of Draft Work Plans
- Quality of Facilities and Equipment
- Quality of Personnel
- Quality of Overall Submittal

Appendix A contains all of the forms necessary to perform a complete analysis of the Technical Proposal for each of the above areas of evaluation.

STEP 2(D) – QUALITY OF DRAFT WORK PLANS

“50 points for the quality of the proposed Draft Work Plan to meeting the requirements of the Scope of Services. The minimum number of points required for this element is 35.”

The evaluation system for “Medical Waste Management Services” has not been subdivided into separate services. Only one set of evaluation criteria is presented for the evaluation of the Tender Offer for these services.

Evaluation Criteria – Medical Waste Management Services

1. Collection Route Maps. (2.1.2) Does the Draft Work Plan provide maps of proposed collection routes, and are the proposed routes acceptable?
2. Route Time Schedules. (2.1.2) Does the Draft Work Plan contain schedules for collection, and are the schedules acceptable?
3. Personnel and Staffing. (2.1.2 & 2.1.6) Does the Draft Work Plan contain the required information on the personnel to be deployed, and are the staff qualifications and staffing plan acceptable?
4. Equipment List. (2.1.2) Does the Draft Work Plan contain a comprehensive list of equipment to be used by the Bidder and do the numbers and types of equipment appear to be sufficient to meet the requirements?

5. Treatment Facility Site Plans. (2.1.3) Does the Draft Work Plan contain a Site Plan that includes a vicinity map at the specified scale and does it delineate all of the areas and facilities required?
6. Description of Design and Operations. (2.1.4) Does the Draft Work Plan contain a detailed written description of treatment facility design and operation, and does it provide the required information for each item listed in the specification?
7. Record Keeping and Reporting. (2.1.1) Does the Draft Work Plan provide a detailed description of the record keeping and reporting system, and is the plan acceptable?
8. Description of Procedures for Communicating with GOC. (2.1.1) Does the Draft Work Plan describe procedures for communicating with GOC Project Administration personnel, and are the procedures acceptable?
9. Equipment Preventative Maintenance. (2.1.5) Does the Draft Work Plan describe the preventative maintenance program for collection and treatment equipment, and is the program acceptable?
10. Commitment to Provide Final Work Plan(FWP). (2.2) Does the Bidder commit to providing a FWP within the required time frame?
11. Commitment to Provide Preparation Work Plan (PWP). (2.2) Does the Bidder commit to providing a PWP within the required time frame?
12. Contents of Preparation Work Plan. (2.2) Does the Bidder provide a schedule indicating sufficient planning for each of the Preparation Period activities listed?
13. Use of Designated Facilities. (2.4) Does the Bidder commit to transport all Treated Infectious Medical Waste to the Designated Disposal Facility?
14. Hours and Days of Operation. (2.6) Does the Bidder commit to operate all Treatment Facilities in accordance with the requirements?
15. Containers. (2.9.2) Does the Bidder commit to providing and delivering Infectious Medical Waste storage containers to all HCFs?
16. Collection Frequency. (2.9.3) Does the Bidder commit to collect Infectious Medical Waste from all HCFs according to the requirements?
17. Disposal. (2.8.4) Does the Bidder commit to deliver all collected Infectious Medical Waste to the Treatment Facility(s) within the specified time limit?
18. Container Technical Specifications. (3.1.2) Do the Infectious Medical Waste storage containers specified by the Bidder meet the technical requirements?
19. Compliance with Local Ordinances. (2.13) Does the Bidder commit to complying with all laws and GOC ordinances?
20. Waste Receiving. (2.17.2) Does the Bidder commit to delivery of Infectious Medical waste to the Treatment Facility(s) to the hours specified?

21. Weighing and Materials Classification System. (2.17.3 & 3.4.1) Does the Bidder commit to procuring, installing, and operating a system for weighing and recording each load of incoming Infectious Medical Waste that meets the requirements?
22. Complaints. (2.22) Does the Bidder commit to maintaining an office and handling complaints in conformance with each of the requirements in this paragraph?
23. Infectious Medical Waste Handling Procedures. (3.1.1 through 3.1.5) Do the collection and packaging procedures described in the Draft Work Plan meet the requirements?
24. Receipt Documentation. (3.2.1) Does the Bidder's Draft Work Plan describe how each HCF will be provided with signed receipt for each collection of Infectious Medical Waste?
25. Storage Location for Collection Vehicles. (3.3.12) Does the Draft Work Plan identify where Infectious Medical Waste Collection Vehicles will be stored and do these places meet the minimum requirements?
26. Storage Time. (3.4.2) Does the Draft Work Plan demonstrate how the Infectious Medical Waste will be stored and treated in conformance with the requirements?
27. Treatment Facility Components. (3.5.3) Do the plans and descriptions of each Treatment Facility demonstrate that the required components will be provided?
28. Waste Handling. (3.5.5) Does the waste handling system include automated offloading of Infectious Medical Waste?
29. Record Keeping and Testing Standards. (3.5.8) Does the Bidder demonstrate that the Treatment Facility(s) have computerized process control systems capable of meeting the requirements?
30. Environmental Standards. (3.5.9) Does the Bidder demonstrate that the Treatment Facility(s) are capable of meeting all applicable local and national environmental standards?
31. Uniforms. (3.6.5) Does the Bidder commit to providing uniforms for all employees that meets all of the requirements?
32. Off-site Runoff (3.7.1) Do the Site Plans demonstrate that all contact and non-contact water will be diverted and handled according to the requirements?
33. Wash-down Water. (3.7.2) Does the Bidder demonstrate that wash-down water will be separated and treated in compliance with the requirements?
34. Leakage and Spillage Control. (3.7.5) Does the Bidder demonstrate that each occurrence of fuel, Infectious Medical Waste, Infectious Medical Waste residue and contaminated water leakage or spillage will be managed in accordance with the requirements?
35. Worker Health and Safety. (3.7.7) Does the Bidder provide information on a worker health and safety and emergency response program that will meet all of the requirements In 3.7.7.1 through 3.7.7.5?

STEP 2(C) – FACILITIES AND EQUIPMENT

“20 points for the quality of the proposed equipment and facilities. The minimum points required for this element is 15.”

Evaluation Criteria – Medical Waste Management Facilities and Equipment

1. Equipment Manufacturer’s Literature and Specifications. (2.1.5) Does the Draft Work Plan contain equipment specifications and manufacturer’s literature for all proposed collection and treatment equipment?
2. Infectious Medical Waste Container Technical Specifications. (3.1.2) Do the Infectious Medical Waste containers specified by the Bidder meet all of the minimum technical requirements?
3. Outer Storage Containers (3.1.5) Has the Bidder proposed to supply Outer Storage Containers that meet all of the minimum technical requirements
4. Cargo Area Integrity. (3.3.3) Do the waste storage (cargo) areas of Infectious Medical Waste Collection Vehicles proposed to be used by the Bidder meet the minimum technical requirement for containment of liquid and solid wastes?
5. Weighing and Materials Classification System (3.4.1) Is the weighing equipment proposed by the Bidder capable of weighing and classifying Infectious Medical Waste in accordance with the requirements at the proposed design capacity?
6. Treatment Facility Components (3.5.3) Does the Infectious Medical Waste Treatment Facility proposed by the Bidder incorporate all of the components listed in this specification?
7. Proven Technology. (3.5.4) Does the treatment technology proposed by the Bidder meet each of the minimum technical requirements?
8. Waste Handling System. (3.5.5) Does the system proposed to be used by the Bidder for receiving and disposing of wastes meet the minimum technical requirements?
9. Treatment Standards. (3.5.6) Does the Bidder submit laboratory evidence that demonstrates that the technology is capable of meeting the required pathogen treatment standards at the proposed design capacity?
10. Fail-Safe System. (3.5.6) Does the Treatment Facility(s) have a built-in fail-safe technology that meets the requirements?
11. Operational Standards. (3.5.7) Does the Bidder guarantee that the Treatment Facility(s) can meet the on-line operational standards and cold storage requirements?
12. Record keeping and Testing Standards. (3.5.8) Does the Infectious Medical Waste Treatment Facility have the appropriate processes controllable via a computerized system to make a print-out available for each and every cycle undertaken for each of the data requirements?

13. Environmental Standards. (3.5.9) Does the Infectious Medical Waste Treatment Facility proposed by the Bidder capable of meeting all local and national air emission requirements, as well as all local and national public health and safety standards, and incorporate technology to meet all of the minimum technical requirements listed specified in (3.5.9.1) through (3.5.9.4)?

STEP 2(B) – KEY PERSONNEL (SOLID WASTE MANAGEMENT AND MEDICAL WASTE MANAGEMENT)

“15 points for the numbers, qualifications, and competence of the key personnel proposed for the assignment distributed as follows:

- 1. qualifications and experience of the proposed resident general manager (20%)*
- 2. qualifications and experience of other key personnel for the assignment including experience in the required areas of expertise (40%)*
- 3. consistency of the staffing plan with the work plan including the type and numbers of personnel compared to the services to be provided (40%)*

The minimum number of points required for this element is 10.”

Evaluation Criteria – Proposed Resident Manager

1. Job Description. Does the Bidder provide information defining the duties and responsibilities for the Resident Manager?
2. Completeness of CV. Does the CV of the proposed Resident Manager contain sufficient information to evaluate the individual's experience and qualifications relating to the position?
3. Qualifications of Individual. Is the proposed Resident Manager qualified for the position?
4. Signed Commitment Letter. Is there a signed commitment letter from the proposed Resident Manager to accept the position?

Evaluation Criteria – Other Key Personnel

1. Job Description. Does the Bidder provide information defining the duties and responsibilities for all, and no less than five, of the other key personnel that report directly to the Resident Manager?
2. Completeness of CV. Do the CVs of the other key personnel proposed for specific assignment contain sufficient information to evaluate the individuals experience and qualifications?
3. Qualifications of Individual. Are the other key personnel proposed for specific assignment qualified for their positions?
4. Signed Commitment Letter. Are there signed commitment letters from each of the other key personnel that they will accept their proposed positions?

Evaluation Criteria – Staffing Plan

1. Staffing Plan Quality/Detail. Does the Bidder provide a senior management plan with sufficient quality and level of detail to properly assess the staffing plan?
2. Staffing Level. Does the Bidder’s senior management plan provide the staff positions and number of personnel consistent with the proposed Work Plan, the types of services, and scale of the proposed Contract?
3. Appropriate Work Assignments. Do the job descriptions for the other key personnel match the needs of the positions with regard to the scope and scale of the proposed Contract?

STEP 2(A) – OVERALL QUALITY

“15 points for the quality and level of detail of the Technical Proposal. The minimum points required for this element is ten (10).”

Evaluation Criteria

1. Level of Detail. Is the Bidder’s Technical Proposal responsive to the RFT in terms of providing the level of detail required to perform the Technical Evaluation?
2. Comprehension. Does the Bidder’s Technical Proposal demonstrate comprehension of the scope and scale of providing the Service(s) in the Southern Zone of Cairo?
3. Clarity. Is the Bidder’s Technical Proposal organized in a manner that clearly presents its organization, approach, Key Personnel and Draft Work Plans?
4. Appropriate to Requirements. Are the Draft Work Plans in the Bidder’s Technical Proposal appropriate for the requirements of the Service(s)?
5. Overall Quality. Is the overall quality of the Bidder’s Technical Proposal acceptable?

STEP 3 – FINANCIAL PROPOSAL OPENING

The Financial Proposal of each Bidder that has achieved the minimum number of points specified for each of the four key areas of technical evaluation as required in Step 2 above will then be publicly opened in accordance with the time schedules and procedures indicated in this RFT. The Financial Proposals of Bidders that have not achieved the minimum points required in Step 2 will be returned unopened in due course.

PROCEDURES

The opening and tabulation of the Financial Proposals must be completed by a Financial Committee that is separate from the Technical Committee only upon completion of the evaluation of the Technical Proposals.

The Financial Committee must then open the Financial Proposal of each Bidder that has achieved the minimum points required for the Technical Evaluation. The Committee must examine each Proposal to determine whether it meets certain Mandatory Financial Requirements. Financial Proposals that do not meet all the Mandatory Financial Requirements are rejected from further consideration. The Committee will then tabulate the Bidding Schedules in all the Financial Proposals that meet the Mandatory Financial Requirements and determine which Bidder has the lowest price.

MANDATORY FINANCIAL CRITERIA

Contents of the Financial Proposal. (RFT 4.6)

1. Completed Price Forms. Does the Financial Proposal contain Bidder's Price Form Schedules, fully completed and without qualifications, for all services that the Bidder proposes to provide?
2. Currency. Are all prices quoted in Egyptian Pounds?

BID SHEET TABULATION

Appendix B provides draft bid tabulation forms.

STEP 4 – CONTRACT AWARD

PROCEDURES

The Committee shall then recommend to the GOC the Bidder that has met all the requirements and submitted the lowest price for each of the Contracts. The lowest bid price will be determined by comparing the Total Annual Price of each Bidder's Bidding Schedule contained in the Financial Proposals.

APPENDIX A - TENDER EVALUATION FORMS

NAME OF CONTRACTOR: _____

Evaluation Form for Technical Proposal Submittal Requirements MEDICAL WASTE MANAGEMENT SERVICES			
Name of Evaluator:			
Reference	Criteria	Yes	No
	1. Tender Offer Submittal Date		
RFT 5.3.1	Was the Tender Offer submitted by the deadline?		
	2. Packaging and Labeling of Tender Offer		
RFT 5.1.1	Original in Arabic?		
RFT 5.1.1	Original in English?		
RFT 5.2.1	Properly sealed and marked?		
	3. Signing of Tender Offer		
RFT 5.1.2	Signed by duly authorized person?		
	4. Modification of Tender Offer		
RFT 5.5.2	Modifications properly submitted?		
	5. Bid Letter of Guarantee		
RFT 4.7.2	Backed by reputable bank in Egypt?		
RFT 4.7.1	Is it for the proper amount for each Price Form?		
RFT 4.7.2	Is it in accordance with the required content?		
	6. Joint Ventures		
RFT 4.4.1	Is this a JV arrangement?		
RFT 4.4.3	If JV, is description of shareholding & responsibilities provided?		
RFT 4.5.2	Commitment letter from each participant?		
RFT 4.5.2	Lead company identified?		
RFT 4.7.3	Bid Letter of Guarantee in name of all participants?		
	7. Content of Technical Proposal		
RFT 4.5.1	Formal Bidder's Commitment Letter?		
	Does the Technical Proposal meet all the requirements?		

Signature of Evaluator:

NAME OF CONTRACTOR:

**Medical Waste Management Services - Southern Zone
Technical Evaluation Form - Facilities & Equipment**

Name of Evaluator:

Technical Reference	Criteria	Enter Numerical Score (0,1,or 2)	Enter Criteria Weight (1,2,or 3)	Input Not Required (Calculated Score)
	Equipment Manufacturer's Literature & Specifications			
3.1.2	Infectious Medical Waste Container Technical Specifications			
3.1.5	Outer Storage Containers			
3.3.3	Cargo Area Integrity			
3.4.1	Weighing and Materials Classification System			
3.5.3	Treatment Facility Components			
3.5.4	Proven Technology			
3.5.5	Waste handling System			
3.5.6	Treatment Standards			
3.5.6	Fail-safe System			
3.5.7	Operational Standards			
3.5.8	Recordkeeping and Testing Standards			
3.5.9	Environmental Standards			
Weighted Score				0
Possible Weighted Score				0
Service Score				0%
Score for Step 2(c)				0.0
Note: must score minimum of 15 out of 20 possible points				

Signature of Evaluator:

NAME OF CONTRACTOR:

**Medical Waste Management Services - Southern Zone
Technical Evaluation Form - Key Personnel**

Name of Evaluator:

Technical Reference	Enter Numerical Score (0,1,or 2)	Enter Criteria Weight (1,2,or 3)	Input Not Required (Calculated Score)
Proposed Resident Manager			
Job Description Provided			
Completeness of CV			
Qualifications of Individual			
Signed Commitment Letter			
Weighted Score			0
Possible Weighted Score			0
Resident Manager Score			
Other Key Personnel			
Job Descriptions Provided			
Completeness of CVs			
Qualifications of Individuals			
Signed Commitment Letters			
Weighted Score			0
Possible Weighted Score			0
Service Score			
Staffing Plan			
Staffing Plan Quality/Detail			
Staffing Levels			
Appropriate Work Assignments			
Weighted Score			0
Possible Weighted Score			0
Service Score			
Service	Service Score	Service Weight	Weighted Score
Proposed Resident Manager		1	
Other Key Personnel			
Staffing Plan			
Score for Step 2(b)			0.0
Note: must score minimum of 10 out of 15 possible points			

Signature of Evaluator:

NAME OF CONTRACTOR:

**Medical Waste Management Services - Southern Zone
Technical Evaluation Form - Overall Quality**

Name of Evaluator:

Technical Reference	Enter Numerical Score (0,1,or 2)	Enter Criteria Weight (1,2,or 3)	Input Not Required (Calculated Score)
Level of Detail			
Comprehension			
Clarity			
Appropriate to Requirements			
Overall Quality			
Weighted Score			0
Possible Weighted Score			0
Quality Score			0%
Score for Step 2(a)			0.0
Note: must score minimum of 10 out of 15 possible points			

Signature of Evaluator:

SUMMARY OF EVALUATION RESULTS

Evaluation Category	Score	Required	
Overall Quality	0.0	10	Failed
Personnel	0.0	10	Failed
Equipment and Facilities	0.0	15	Failed
Work Plan	0.0	35	Failed
Total	0.0	70	Failed

APPENDIX B - BID TABULATION FORMS

BID TABULATION SUMMARY

CAIRO SOUTHERN ZONE

MEDICAL WASTE MANAGEMENT SERVICES

CONTRACTOR

CONTRACTOR

CONTRACTOR

CONTRACTOR

SERVICE	ANNUAL PRICE
MEDICAL WASTE MANAGEMENT SERVICES	
COLLECTION	
TREATMENT	
TOTAL ANNUAL PRICE	

ANNUAL PRICE

ANNUAL PRICE

ANNUAL PRICE

