

**THE REPUBLIC OF RWANDA**



**SCHOOL OF FINANCIAL AND BANKING (SFB)**

**TECHNICAL EVALUATION REPORT CONSULTANT FIRMS FOR  
DEVELOPMENT OF MIS SOFTWARE FOR ACADEMIC SERVICES**

**Subject of Procurement: Development of  
management information system  
software for academic services.**

**Procurement Reference Number:  
015/S/2010-2011/SFB**

**Procurement Method: Open competitive  
bidding.**

**Date of Issue:**

**30<sup>th</sup> May, 2011**



## Technical Evaluation Report

- 1. Background** This is the technical evaluation report for development of an on line students' registration system (SRS), Teaching, Examinations Time tables' management, Work load management system and Academic transcript management system software. The software is composed of seven module including Students' registration system module, Library module, Teaching examinations' module, Workload management system and Human resource module, Catering and Accommodation module, MSM module and E-learning module.

Objectively, a comprehensive information system is needed by SFB as a public institution of higher learning education to efficiently and effectively manage its resources which all included in the above mentioned modules as the scope of work.

- 2. The Selection Process (Prior to Technical Evaluation)** The tender was made open to the general public, all potential and interested bidders came towards SFB needs through submitting their both technical and financial proposals within different envelopes. Technical proposals were opened in public and prior to technical evaluation, among the five companies who responded to SFB' s invitation for bids, only two (2) were accepted to be technically evaluated because they were fulfilling the administrative requirements as asked in the request for proposals.

The following are the companies that were not accepted by evaluation committee to be technically evaluated due to non fulfillment of the requirements.

1. **COMPUTER POINT:** Submitted MOU which has no stamp for its joint venture, not printed on headed paper with address and logo of its joint venture. The trade license does not bear business related to our assignment (not registered in similar business).
2. **National University of Rwanda (NUR):** Neither bid security issued by the bank or any authorized insurance company as the format included in the request for proposals, nor RRA tax clearance certificate and Social Security Fund certificates submitted within their technical proposal as required in the request for proposals. The submitted guarantee document was rejected because of not being issued by a bank or any authorized insurance company instead it drafted and signed by NUR and it is legally unacceptable.
3. **MSV Technologies Ltd:** Trade license does not bear similar assignment (Not registered in similar business) and the **MOU** this company has with Garve technologies ltd as its joint

ventures does not indicate the joint venture's engagement in SFB assignment.

### **3. Technical Evaluation**

During technical evaluation, among nine (9) evaluation committee members, only six members remained and continued with the evaluation process while other three members excused themselves and went for other urgent office work for interest of the institution. Those are; **UWIZEYE Odethe, Barigye Vianney and MUNYABUGINGO Bonaventure.** The members decided to evaluate the accepted proposals individually and make the average of the scored marks per consultant firm. The following consultant firms scored as follow;

NB: During pre-evaluation of technical proposals, the evaluation committee revealed the indifference of dates in the manufacturer's authorization letter submitted by Advantage Technologies Ltd but they all agreed to tolerate that error. Since the company was fulfilling all other requirements. They recommended that the company should be communicated in writing to bring the manufacturer's authorization letter with clear dates before technical evaluation proceeds.

Technical scores by Consultant

Minimum qualifying score 70%

Consultants' names and legal status	Technical scores
1. <b><i>ADVANTAGE TECHNOLOGIES LTD</i></b>	93.7%
2. <b>FILMAX WEB TECHNOLOGIES LTD</b>	72.7%

2.18 Evaluation Criteria/subcriteria:

(a) Consultants' experience

(i) General experience

Weight /20

(ii) Specific experience

Weight /30

(b) methodology

(i) Technical approach

Weight /15

(ii) Work plan

Weight /10

(iii) Organization and staffing

Weight /5

(iv) Transfer of knowledge

Weight /10

(Training of user  
technicians)

(c) Participation by nationals

Weight /10



### Evaluation Summary

Consultants' names	<i>ADVANTAGE TECHNOLOGIES LTD</i>	<b>FILMAX WEB TECHNOLOGIES LTD</b>
Criteria	Scores	Scores
<b>Experience/50</b>	45.7%	30%
<b>Methodology/40</b>	38.2%	32.7%
<b>Local participation/10</b>	9.8%	10%
<b>Total score</b>	93.7%	72.7%
<b>Rank</b>	<b>R1</b>	<b>R2</b>

#### Individual Evaluations and Comparison

#### CONSULTANT FIRM: Advantage Technologies

Evaluator's Names	RUSHINGA BIGWI Francoise	<i>MBABAZI HOPE</i>	NTEZIRY AYO Christophe	HARERI MANA Fabien	UZARERW A Agnes	<i>KANYANGI RA Benoit</i>	Average
Criteria Experience	48/50	45/50	46/50	45/50	45/50	45/50	45.7%
Methodology	40/40	40/40	40/40	34/40	40/40	35/40	38.2%
Participation by nationals	10/10	10/10	10/10	10/10	9/10	10/10	9.8%
<b>Total average</b>	96/100	95/100	98/100	89/100	94/100	90/100	93.7%

1. Evaluator's Name & Position: \_\_\_\_\_  
Date:

Signature:

2. Evaluator's Name & position: \_\_\_\_\_  
Date:

Signature:

3. Evaluator's Name & position: \_\_\_\_\_  
Date:

Signature:

4. Evaluator's Name & position: \_\_\_\_\_  
Date:

Signature:

5. Evaluator's Name & position: \_\_\_\_\_  
Date:

Signature:

6. Evaluator's Name & position: \_\_\_\_\_  
Date:

Signature:

## Individual Evaluations and Comparison

### CONSULTANT FIRM: FILMAX TECHNOLOGIES

<b>Evaluator's Names</b>	<b>RUSHINGABI GWI Francoise</b>	<b>MBABAZI HOPE</b>	<b>NTEZIRY AYO Christophe</b>	<b>HARERI MANA Fabien</b>	<b>UZARER WA Agnes</b>	<b>KANYAN GIRA Benoit</b>	<b>Average</b>
<b>Criteria Experience</b>	27/50	30/50	30/50	38/50	25/50	30/50	30%
<b>Methodology</b>	36/40	25/40	38/40	32/40	35/40	30/40	32.7%
<b>Participation by nationals</b>	10/10	10/10	10/10	10/10	10/10	10/10	10%
<b>Total Average</b>	73/100	65/100	78/100	80/100	70/100	70/100	72.7%

1. Evaluator's Name: \_\_\_\_\_  
Date:

Signature: \_\_\_\_\_

2. Evaluator's Name: \_\_\_\_\_  
Date:

Signature: \_\_\_\_\_

3. Evaluator's Name: \_\_\_\_\_  
Date:

Signature: \_\_\_\_\_

4. Evaluator's Name: \_\_\_\_\_  
Date:

Signature: \_\_\_\_\_

5. Evaluator's Name: \_\_\_\_\_  
Date:

Signature: \_\_\_\_\_

6. Evaluator's Name: \_\_\_\_\_  
Date:

Signature: \_\_\_\_\_

### Currency Conversion—Evaluated Prices

Consultants' Names	Proposals' prices <sup>a</sup>		Adjustments <sup>b</sup>	Evaluated price(s)	Conversion to currency of evaluation <sup>c</sup>		Financial scores <sup>d</sup>
	Currency	Amounts (1)	(2)	(3) = (1) + (2)	Exchange rate(s) <sup>e</sup> (4)	Proposals' prices (5) = (3)(4)	(6)
<b>Advantage Technologies</b>							
<b>FILMAX Technologies</b>							

### QCBS—Combined Technical/Financial Evaluation

Consultants' names	Technical Evaluation			Financial Evaluation		Combined Evaluation	
	Technical scores S(t)	Weighted scores S(t) × T	Technical score	Financial scores <sup>c</sup> S(f)	Weighted scores S(f) × F	Scores S(t) T + S(f) F	Rank
<b>Advantage Technologies</b>	93.7%	93.7*0.7 = 65.6/70	65.6/70				
<b>FILMAX Technologies</b>	72.7%	72.7*0.7 =	50.9/70				
Award recommendation	To highest combined technical/financial score. Consultant's name: _____						

**Technical weight S(t) = 0.7**

**Financial weight S(f) = 0.3**

### Individual Evaluations/criteria-sub-criteria

Consultant's Name: Advantage Technologies, Filmax Technologies

Criteria	Maximum Scores	Advantage Technologies Scores	FILMAX Technologies Scores
Criteria 1. Experience	<b>50</b>	<b>35/50</b>	<b>25/50</b>
Sub-criteria	30	28/30	16/30
✓ Specific experience			
✓ General experience		20/20	11/20
	20		
2. Methodology	<b>40</b>	<b>30/40</b>	<b>25/40</b>
Sub-criteria			
- Technical approach	15	15/15	15/15
- Work plan			
- Organization & staffing	10	10/10	6/10
- Transfer of knowledge (Training)	5	5/5	5/5
	10	10/10	10/10
1. Participation by nationals (Local preference)	<b>10</b>	<b>8/10</b>	<b>10/10</b>
<b>Total</b>	<b>100</b>	<b>96/100</b>	<b>73/100</b>

Name of Evaluator: RUSHINGABIGWI Francoise. Signature: \_\_\_\_\_ Date:

### Individual Evaluations/criteria-sub-criteria

Consultant's Name: Advantage Technologies, Filmax Technologies

Criteria	Maximum Scores	Advantage Technologies Scores	FILMAX Technologies Scores
Criteria 1. Experience Sub-criteria ✓ Specific experience ✓ General experience	50	<b>46/50</b>	<b>30/50</b>
	30	20/30	10/30
	20	18/20	20/20
2. Methodology Sub-criteria - Technical approach - Work plan - Organization & staffing - Transfer of knowledge (Training)	40	<b>40/40</b>	<b>38 /40</b>
	15	15/15	15 /15
	10	10/10	8/10
	5	5/5	5/5
	10	10/10	6/10
3 Participation by nationals (Local preference)	10	<b>10/10</b>	<b>10/10</b>
<b>Total</b>	100	<b>96/100</b>	<b>78/100</b>

Name of Evaluator: **NTEZIRYAYO Christoph**. Signature: \_\_\_\_\_ Date: \_\_\_\_\_

### Individual Evaluations/criteria-sub-criteria

Consultant's Name: Advantage Technologies, Filmax Technologies

Criteria	Maximum Scores	Advantage Technologies Scores	FILMAX Technologies Scores
Criteria 1. Experience Sub-criteria ✓ Specific experience ✓ General experience	50	<b>45/50</b>	<b>25/50</b>
	30	25/30	10/30
	20	20/20	15/20
2. Methodology Sub-criteria - Technical approach - Work plan - Organization & staffing - Transfer of knowledge (Training)	40	<b>40/40</b>	<b>35/40</b>
	15	15/15	15 /15
	10	10/10	5/10
	5	5/5	5/5
	10	10/10	10/10
4 Participation by nationals (Local preference)	10	<b>9/10</b>	<b>10/10</b>
<b>Total</b>	<b>100</b>	<b>94/100</b>	<b>70/100</b>

Name of Evaluator: **UZARERWA Agnes**. Signature: \_\_\_\_\_ Date:

### Individual Evaluations/criteria-sub-criteria

Consultant's Name: Advantage Technologies, Filmax Technologies

Criteria	Maximum Scores	Advantage Technologies Scores	FILMAX Technologies Scores
Criteria 1. Experience	<b>50</b>	<b>45/50</b>	<b>30/50</b>
Sub-criteria	30	25/30	10/30
✓ Specific experience			
✓ General experience			
	20	20/20	20/20
2. Methodology	<b>40</b>	<b>35/40</b>	<b>30/40</b>
Sub-criteria			
- Technical approach			
- Work plan	15	10/15	10/15
- Organization & staffing	10	10/10	5/10
- Transfer of knowledge (Training)	5	5/5	5/5
	10	10/10	10/10
5 Participation by nationals (Local preference)	<b>10</b>	<b>10/10</b>	<b>10/10</b>
<b>Total</b>	<b>100</b>	<b>90/100</b>	<b>70/100</b>

Name of Evaluator: **KANYANGIRA Benoit**. Signature: \_\_\_\_\_ Date: \_\_\_\_\_

### Individual Evaluations/criteria-sub-criteria

Consultant's Name: Advantage Technologies, Filmax Technologies

Criteria	Maximum Scores	Advantage Technologies Scores	FILMAX Technologies Scores
Criteria. 1. Experience	50	<b>32/50</b>	<b>30/50</b>
Sub-criteria ✓ Specific experience ✓ General experience	30	15/30	20/30
	20	15/20	10/20
2. Methodology	40	<b>31/40</b>	<b>25/40</b>
Sub-criteria - Technical approach - Work plan - Organization & staffing - Transfer of knowledge (Training)	15	12/15	9/15
	10	7/10	7/10
	5	3/5	3/5
	10	9/10	6/10
3. Participation by nationals (Local preference)	10	<b>10/10</b>	<b>10/10</b>
<b>Total</b>	<b>100</b>	<b>73/100</b>	<b>65/100</b>

Name of Evaluator: **MBABAZI Hope**. Signature: \_\_\_\_\_ Date:

### Individual Evaluations/criteria-sub-criteria

**Consultant's Name: Advantage Technologies, Filmax Technologies**

Criteria	Maximum Scores	Advantage Technologies Scores	FILMAX Technologies Scores
Criteria 1. Experience	50	<b>28/50</b>	<b>30/50</b>
Sub-criteria	30	16/30	20/30
✓ Specific experience			
✓ General experience	20	12/20	10/20
2. Methodology	40	<b>28/40</b>	<b>24/40</b>
Sub-criteria			
- Technical approach	15	11/15	10/15
- Work plan	10	7/10	6/10
- Organization & staffing	5	2/5	3/5
- Transfer of knowledge (Training)	10	8/10	5/10
3. Participation by nationals (Local preference)	10	<b>10/10</b>	<b>10/10</b>
<b>Total</b>	<b>100</b>	<b>66/100</b>	<b>64/100</b>

Name of Evaluator: **HARERIMANA Fabien**. Signature: \_\_\_\_\_ Date

## **RECOMMENDATIONS FOR TECHNICAL EVALUATION**

Based on the scores for the two (2) Consultant firms mentioned above that have fulfilled the requirements and technically evaluated as required in the standard request for proposals, both companies (**Advantage Technologies, FILMAX Technologies**) have been technically qualified due to the fact that they have scored high marks, they are all above the pass mark (70% or 49/70) scores.

Therefore, the evaluation committee is now provisionally considering **Advantage Technologies and FILMAX Technologies** as technically evaluated and qualified for financial evaluation. Then, after financial evaluation an evaluation committee shall determine based on the results a successful consultant firm to carry out SFB assignment for development of academic software as described in the request for proposals.