

Guidelines on Preparation of Technical Proposal **(For NEC3 PSC)**

(A) Requirements of Technical Proposal

The consultant shall submit (i) the Contract Data Part two (Section 1); (ii) the technical proposal; and (iii) other technical information, if any, as specified in the Invitation Letter for Submission of Technical and Fee Proposals, in the envelope for technical proposal. Completion of the Contract Data Part two (Section 1) in full is required to create a complete contract. The items (i) and (iii) above shall not be counted towards the pages of the technical proposal.

The consultant is encouraged to use electronic format in submitting his proposal. The consultant is nevertheless free to choose the format (i.e. paper or CD-ROM). The technical proposal should be limited to **【30】** pages in A4 size, excluding attachments of appendices, figures/drawings and curriculum vitae, with a minimum font size of 12 points Times New Roman or equivalent. The appendices attached to the technical proposal should be limited to **【30】** pages in A4 size (excluding pages of manning schedule in A3 size, the table indicating the listed and unlisted Subconsultants (The term "Subconsultant" in this guideline shall, for the purposes of construing DEVB TC(W) Nos. 2/2016 and 5/2018 and the EACSB/AACSB* Handbook as amended from time to time, bear the same meaning as "Sub-consultant" and "sub-consultant" in those documents.) to be employed and the subcontracting service undertaken, any letter of association, curriculum vitae and any declarations/confirmations required in A4 size), the figures/drawings/illustrations limited to **【30】** pages in A3 size and the curriculum vitae of all key staff proposed for the *services* limited to **【2】** pages per staff in A4 size. The technical proposal including the attachments shall be inexpensively bound, printed on both sides.

For exceedance of the specified number of pages of technical proposal, appendices, figures/drawings/illustrations and curriculum vitae in the second paragraph above, all the exceeded pages shall be discarded prior to the assessment. For non-compliance with the specified format in the second paragraph above, such as font size, paper size, double-sided printing, etc., mark(s) shall be deducted from the overall technical score (see Note (5) in Part B).

If the technical proposal contains any indication of prices or rates, the consultant's submissions shall not be considered further in the consultant selection exercise.

The technical proposal shall be divided into sections and sub-sections under main headings as shown below.

1. CONSULTANT'S EXPERIENCE

- (a) The relevant consultancy assignments conducted; and
- (b) Relevant experience and knowledge.

2. RESPONSE TO THE SCOPE

- (a) Identification of key issues/problems in the contract, including but not limited to project constraints/risks, special requirements, etc.; and
- (b) Suggestions of practicable solutions to address the key issues/problems identified, including presentation of design approach and ideas (in regard to aspects such as general arrangement, layout, functionality, green measures, heritage conservation, aesthetics and overall appearance where appropriate).

3. APPROACH TO COST-EFFECTIVENESS AND SUSTAINABILITY

To include sub-sections on –

- (a) examples and discussion of past projects to demonstrate the consultant's will, ability and physical measures to produce cost-effective, energy efficient and environmentally friendly solutions which are applicable to this project; and
- (b) approach to achieve cost-effectiveness (including life-cycle costs vis-à-vis initial project cost), energy efficiency and environmental friendliness on this project.

4. METHODOLOGY AND WORK PROGRAMME

To include sub-sections on –

- (a) technical approach to enable delivery of the project practicably having regard to the reasonable time required and other technical constraints vis-à-vis the project requirements (including construction methods to facilitate mechanization, prefabrication and other productivity enhancements where appropriate, especially where they can reduce manpower demands of trades of labour shortage);
- (b) health, safety and environmental issues to be addressed in delivering the project;
- (c) work programme with highlights to demonstrate ways to expedite the programme where practicable, to deal with programme constraints and interfaces, and to level and reduce the resources peak; and

- (d) arrangements for contract management and site supervision including a proposed system of monitoring site supervision.

5. INNOVATION AND CREATIVITY

To include sub-sections on –

- (a) particular design aspects/issues/requirements (as identified and specified by the department); and
- (b) particular construction aspects/issues/requirements (as identified and specified by the department).

6. STAFFING

To include sub-sections on –

- (a) staff organisation chart with highlights on the efficiency and effectiveness of the organisation;
- (b) relevant experience (including design constructability and risk management where applicable) and qualifications of key staff. In particular, the post qualification experience and relevant job reference of the specified *key people* (The term "*key people*" in this guideline shall, for the purposes of construing DEVB TC(W) Nos. 2/2016 and 5/2018 and the EACSB/AACSB* Handbook as amended from time to time, bear the same meaning as "Core Personnel" and "core personnel" in those documents.) in Note (2) of Part B below shall be included;
- (c) responsibilities and degree of involvement of key staff; and
- (d) adequacy of professional and technical manpower input.

7. APPENDICES

- (a) Previous relevant experience and projects completed;
- (b) Current projects, listing total and outstanding cost and duration and staff expertise and deployment;
- (c) Manning schedule (**without** any indication of prices or rates). Where errors are identified in the manning schedule during tender assessment, the correction rules in

Annex 【_】 【Inclusion of Annex A to the Sample Template for Guidelines on Preparation of Technical Proposal as an Annex】 shall be followed; and

(d) Brief curriculum vitae and employment status of key staff.

(B) Marking Scheme

- (1) The marks to be allocated to each main section of the technical proposal shall be within the range indicated below and shall total 100%:

	Section	Percentage mark to be allocated (%)	
		Sub-section	Section
(1)	Consultant's Experience	-	【XX】
(2)	Response to the Scope	-	【XX】
(3)	Approach to Cost-effectiveness and Sustainability	-	【XX】
	Sub-section 3(a)	【XX】	-
	Sub-section 3(b)	【XX】	-
(4)	Methodology and Work Programme	-	【XX】
	Sub-section 4(a)	【XX】	-
	Sub-section 4(b)	【XX】	-
	Sub-section 4(c)	【XX】	-
	Sub-section 4(d)	【XX】	-
(5)	Innovation and Creativity	-	【XX】
	Sub-section 5(a)	【XX】	-
	Sub-section 5(b)	【XX】	-
(6)	Staffing	-	【XX】
	Sub-section 6(a)	【XX】	-
	Sub-section 6(b)	【XX】	-
	Sub-section 6(c)	【XX】	-
	Sub-section 6(d)	【XX】	-
(7)	Past Performance	-	【XX】
	Past Performance of the consultant	【XX】	-
	Past Performance of Subconsultants	【XX】	-
		Total	100

- (2) Each Assessment Panel Member shall grade each section/sub-section, except the “past performance” section/sub-sections and the “adequacy of professional and technical manpower input” sub-section of the “Staffing” section, as either “very good”, “good”, “fair” or “poor”. The marks corresponding to these grades are:

Grade	Marks (%)
Very Good (VG)	1.0 × Y
Good (G)	0.8 × Y
Fair (F)	0.6 × Y
Poor (P)	0.3 × Y

where Y is the percentage mark allocated to the criterion.

For selection criteria “Consultant’s experience”, “Response to the Scope” and “Staffing” which adopt the “Full Marks Approach”, full marks should normally be given if the quantitative specifications set out by the Assessment Panel in the following tables are able to be met as assessed by the Assessment Panel Members:

Consultant’s experience

For attaining full mark (i.e. grade VG), a consultant should possess experience on having conducted **【5】** or more relevant consultancy assignments within **【10】** years on or before the original or the extended technical and fee proposal submission closing date.

No. of relevant consultancies involved	Grade
[5] or more	VG
[3] to [4]	G
[1] to [2]	F
0	P

Response to the Scope

For attaining full mark (i.e. grade VG), a consultant should identify in the assignment **【5】** or more key issues/problems with practicable suggestions on ways of addressing them.

No. of key issues/problems identified	Grade
[5] or more	VG
[3] to [4]	G
[1] to [2]	F
0	P

Staffing – Staff organization chart

The pre-set descriptions for the four different grades are follows:

Description	Grade
Very efficient and effective staff organization with strong teams of experts and professionals and comprehensive communication and collaboration platforms	VG
Efficient and effective staff organization with well-defined teams of experts and professionals and suitable communication and collaboration platforms	G
Fair staff organization showing reasonable teams of experts and professionals and communication and collaboration platforms	F
No information or a poor staff organization	P

Staffing – Relevant experience and qualification of key staff

For attaining full mark (i.e. grade VG), a consultant should provide the minimum number of *key people* who should possess the corresponding minimum qualification and experience as mentioned in the tables below. Same marks shall be allocated to the *key people* under the same designation. If the number of *key people* proposed by the consultant for a particular designation is more than that specified in the invitation documents, the average marks attained by the *key people* for that particular designation would be adopted in tender assessment. If the number of *key people* proposed by the consultant for a particular designation is less than that specified in the invitation documents, the *key people* proposed will be marked based on the relevant selection criteria while the *key people* missing in the submission will be graded “P”.

<i>key people</i> Designation	Post Qualification Experience	Relevant Job Reference	Grade
[Project Director] (Mark: XX%) Minimum number: [1] Minimum qualification of a [P/D] category	Not less than [20] years	Not less than [5] projects	VG
	Not less than [18] years	Not less than [3] projects	G
	Not less than [15] years	Not less than [1] project	F
	Fail to provide the <i>key people</i> or meet the standard above		P

<i>key people</i> Designation	Post Qualification Experience	Relevant Job Reference	Grade
[Project Manager] (Mark: YY%)	Not less than [18] years (professional); or	Not less than [5] projects	VG

Minimum number: 1 Minimum qualification of a [CP] category	Not less than [23] years (academic)		
	Not less than [15] years (professional); or Not less than [20] years (academic)	Not less than [3] projects	G
	Not less than [12] years (professional); or Not less than [17] years (academic)	Not less than [1] project	F
	Fail to provide the <i>key people</i> or meet the standard above		P

<i>key people</i> Designation	Post Qualification Experience	Relevant Job Reference	Grade
[Team Leader] (Mark: ZZ%) Minimum number: 1 Minimum qualification of a [CP] category	Not less than [18] years (professional)	Not less than [5] projects	VG
	Not less than [15] years (professional)	Not less than [3] projects	G
	Not less than [12] years (professional)	Not less than [1] project	F
Fail to provide the <i>key people</i> or meet the standard above			P

<i>key people</i> Designation	Post Qualification Experience	Relevant Job Reference	Grade
[Team Leader] (Mark: ZZ%) Minimum number: 1 Minimum qualification of a [CP] category	Not less than [18] years (professional); or Not less than [23] years (academic)	Not less than [5] projects	VG
	Not less than [15] years (professional); or Not less than [20] years (academic)	Not less than [3] projects	G
	Not less than [12] years (professional); or Not less than [17] years (academic)	Not less than [1] project	F
Fail to provide the <i>key people</i> or meet the standard above			P

(N.B:

- (i) The sum of marks allocated to all *key people* shall be 100.
- (ii) To add additional tables if required.
- (iii) To elaborate “Relevant Job Reference” in view of the specific nature of the project where appropriate.
- (iv) To review whether post qualification experience (academic) for *key people* is applicable. In particular, where there are professional institutions in the relevant discipline, it is less likely that post qualification experience (academic) may be relevant.)

Staffing – Responsibility and degree of involvement of key staff

For attaining full mark (i.e. grade VG), a consultant should propose at least **【80%】** of the weighted total manpower input to be named staff with professional category or above.

Degree of Involvement (X)	Grade
$X \geq [80]\%$	VG
$[60]\% \leq X < [80]\%$	G
$[40]\% \leq X < [60]\%$	F
$X < [40]\%$	P

where X is calculated by using the following formula:

$$\frac{\text{Weighted manpower input of named staff with professional category or above}}{\text{Weighted total manpower input}} \times 100\%$$

For other selection criteria not adopting the “Full Marks Approach”, if the Scope or other relevant requirements are just fulfilled, a “fair” grading at most should normally be given.

The weighted marks of Assessment Panel Members shall be accumulated to produce the final marks for each sub-section. Summation of all sub-section final marks will produce a total mark for the technical proposal.

(3) [Applicable for AACSB consultancies]

The method of assessing the “adequacy of professional and technical manpower input” sub-section of the “Staffing” section is set out in Appendix C of DEVB TC(W) Nos. 2/2016 and 5/2018 and their subsequent updates (if any). For the purpose of assessment of adequacy of professional and technical manpower input only, “conforming bids” mean those technical proposals which have been checked and

found to be conforming before the opening of the fee proposals.

If the consultant’s proposed staff claimed to be in a particular staff category do not meet the minimum academic/professional qualifications and/or minimum experience requirements, the procedures set out in item 4, Appendix C to DEVB TC(W) Nos. 2/2016 and 5/2018 and their subsequent updates (if any) should be followed. Where the information, together with clarifications from the consultant (if any), reveals non-compliance with the minimum academic/professional qualifications and/or minimum experience for one or more than one staff member, the “adequacy of professional and technical manpower input” attribute shall be adjusted by the Assessment Panel using the table below.

If the consultant does not input the staff category for any particular staff in the manning schedule of his technical proposal, the consultant may be approached, before the opening of the fee proposal, for clarification on the staff category for that particular staff, if any, input in the manning schedule of his fee proposal. In case the consultant clarifies that no staff category has been input for the staff in both technical and fee proposals, that particular staff shall be counted as non-compliance with the minimum academic/professional qualifications and/or minimum experience requirements for the purpose of assessment on this aspect only and the “adequacy of professional and technical manpower input” attribute shall be adjusted by the Assessment Panel using the table below. In determining the degree of non-compliance under this circumstance, the staff category and the academic/professional qualifications and/or experience of that particular staff shall be determined from the information in the curriculum vitae for named staff or the declaration to meet the minimum academic/professional qualifications and/or minimum experience requirements in the relevant staff categories for unnamed staff submitted in the technical proposal together with any clarification from the consultant on the factual information of the staff if appropriate.

Degree of non-compliance	Calculated Percentage = $B/A \times 100\%$ where A = Weighted total manpower input of the consultant B = Weighted manpower input of the proposed staff claimed to be in a particular staff category not meeting the minimum academic/professional qualifications and/or minimum experience requirements	Mark for the “adequacy of professional and technical manpower input” attribute shall be multiplied by
Minor	$> 0\% \text{ and } \leq [5]\%$	[XX]
Medium	$> [5]\% \text{ and } < [10]\%$	[XX]
Serious	$\geq [10]\%$	[XX]

[Applicable for EACSB consultancies]

The method of assessing the “adequacy of professional and technical manpower input” sub-section of the “Staffing” section is set out in Appendix C of DEVB TC(W) Nos. 2/2016 and 5/2018 and their subsequent updates (if any). For the purpose of assessment of adequacy of professional and technical manpower input only, “conforming bids” mean those technical proposals which have been checked and found to be conforming before the opening of the fee proposals.

If the consultant’s proposed staff claimed to be in a particular staff category do not meet the minimum academic/professional qualifications and/or minimum experience requirements, the procedures set out in item 4, Appendix C to DEVB TC(W) Nos. 2/2016 and 5/2018 and their subsequent updates (if any) should be followed. Where the information, together with clarifications from the consultant (if any), reveals non-compliance with the minimum academic/professional qualifications and/or minimum experience for one or more than one staff member, the “adequacy of professional and technical manpower input” attribute shall be adjusted by the Assessment Panel using the table below.

If the consultant does not input the staff category for any particular staff in the manning schedule of his technical proposal, the consultant may be approached, before the opening of the fee proposal, for clarification on the staff category for that particular staff, if any, input in the manning schedule of his fee proposal. In case the consultant clarifies that no staff category has been input for the staff in both technical and fee proposals, that particular staff shall be counted as non-compliance with the minimum academic/professional qualifications and/or minimum experience requirements for the purpose of assessment on this aspect only and the “adequacy of professional and technical manpower input” attribute shall be adjusted by the Assessment Panel using the table below. In determining the degree of non-compliance under this circumstance, the staff category and the academic/professional qualifications and/or experience of that particular staff shall be determined from the information in the curriculum vitae for named staff or the declaration to meet the minimum academic/professional qualifications and/or minimum experience requirements in the relevant staff categories for unnamed staff submitted in the technical proposal together with any clarification from the consultant on the factual information of the staff if appropriate.

For trades where appropriate professional institutions are available, the weighted total manpower input of the consultant’s proposed Senior Professional (SP) and Professional (P) adopting the academic route (i.e. Route 1) must not be more than 30% of the weighted total manpower input of SP and P of the consultant.

For staff who only possess university degree or equivalent in other disciplines (i.e. disciplines other than those assessed as appropriate by the Assessment Panel) but with experience in project coordination and/or executive support (i.e. Route 2), the

weighted manpower input of the consultant’s proposed P adopting this Route 2 must not be more than 10% of the weighted manpower input of P of the consultant.

For the avoidance of doubt, if the Assessment Panel assesses and considers that the consultant’s proposed P can only meet the minimum qualification and experience requirements of both Routes 1 and 2 (e.g. double degrees), its weighted manpower input will be taken into account in checking for compliance under Route 1 only but not under Route 2.

If the Assessment Panel assesses that the weighted total manpower input of the proposed SP and P adopting the Route 1 exceeds 30% of the weighted total manpower input of SP and P, and/or the weighted manpower input of the proposed P adopting the Route 2 exceeds 10% of the weighted manpower input of P, the consultant may be approached for clarification before opening of the fee proposal. If the information, together with clarification from the consultant (if any), reveals that the weighted total manpower input of the proposed SP and P adopting the Route 1 exceeds 30% of the weighted total manpower input of SP and P, and/or the weighted manpower input of the proposed P adopting the Route 2 exceeds 10% of the weighted manpower input of P, the “adequacy of professional and technical manpower input” attribute shall be adjusted by the Assessment Panel using the table below.

Total degree of non-compliance		Mark for the “adequacy of professional and technical manpower input” attribute shall be multiplied by
Minor	> 0% and ≤ [5]%	[XX]
Medium	> [5]% and < [10]%	[XX]
Serious	≥ [10]%	[XX]

Total degree of non-compliance =
 degree of non-compliance with the minimum academic/professional qualifications and/or minimum experience
 + degree of non-compliance due to exceedance under Route 1
 + degree of non-compliance due to exceedance under Route 2
 where

Degree of non-compliance with the minimum academic/ professional qualifications and/or minimum experience
 = B/A x 100%
 - A = Weighted total manpower input of the consultant
 - B = Weighted manpower input of the proposed staff claimed to be in a particular staff category not meeting the minimum academic/professional qualifications and/or minimum experience requirements

Degree of non-compliance due to exceedance under Route 1

$$= D/C \times 100\% - 30\%$$

- C = Weighted total manpower input of SP and P of the consultant
- D = Weighted total manpower input of the proposed SP and P adopting the Route 1
- Degree of non-compliance shall be considered as zero if the calculated value is negative

Degree of non-compliance due to exceedance under Route 2

$$= F/E \times 100\% - 10\%$$

- E = Weighted manpower input of P of the consultant
- F = Weighted manpower input of the proposed P adopting the Route 2
- Degree of non-compliance shall be considered as zero if the calculated value is negative

Staff working under an overloading situation

The manpower input as at end of **【February, May, August or November YYYY】** ***[Procuring department shall input the end month of the reporting quarter as at which the manpower input is as captured in the final snapshot taken immediately before the tender closing date of the tender under assessment.]*** captured in the final snapshot taken by the Public Works Consultants Resources Allocation Register (PWCRAR) as detailed in DEVB TC(W) No. 5/2018 will be used for checking if any named professional staff or above proposed in the manning schedule of his technical proposal is working under an overloading situation. If overloading is identified for a particular named professional staff or above, the consultant may be approached for clarification.

Where the manpower input data in the PWCRAR, together with relevant clarifications from the consultant (if any) reveals overloading situation, mark to be given for the “adequacy of professional and technical manpower input” attribute shall be adjusted by the Assessment Panel using the following table:

Overloading Situation	Degree of Overloading	Mark for “Adequacy of professional & technical manpower input” shall be multiplied by
Minor	> 0% and ≤ [5]%	[XX]
Medium	> [5]% and < [10]%	[XX]
Serious	≥ [10]%	[XX]

Notwithstanding the above, the following circumstances shall be considered by the

Assessment Panel as “Serious” overloading situation:

- (a) Where the consultant or any of its proposed Subconsultant is the main consultant (or if the main consultant is a joint venture, a participant or shareholder of the joint venture) of an on-going consultancy (a “**Relevant Consultant**”), and in respect of the on-going consultancy:
 - (i) the Relevant Consultant did not submit any manning schedule in its technical proposal which could enable the proper performance of an assessment of overloading situation in accordance with DEVB TC(W) No. 5/2018; and
 - (ii) the Relevant Consultant has failed to provide the first manpower input updating and its manpower input could not be endorsed in the PWCRAR in accordance with paragraph 2 of Appendix 3.7 to DEVB TC(W) No. 5/2018 before the closing date of the tender under assessment.

OR

- (b) Where the consultant:
 - (i) fails to submit a manning schedule with its Technical Proposal; or
 - (ii) only submits a manning schedule in a bar chart format or other format with its Technical Proposal, which makes the assessment of overloading situation in accordance with DEVB TC(W) No. 5/2018 unable to be properly performed.
- (4) The following method shall be used in the assessment of past performance of the consultant and Subconsultants:
- (a) Assessment of past performance of a consultant and his Subconsultants (if applicable) should be carried out separately, based on their updated Past Performance Rating (PPR) under the purview of the board which the consultancy is procured in the CNPIS. Details of PPR shall be referred to DEVB TC(W) No. 3/2016. For any unincorporated joint venture making a submission, his PPR shall be taken as the average of PPRs of all his participants having a PPR *(or the weighted average of PPRs of all his participants having a PPR if approved by EACSB/AACSB/relevant DCSC). The latest PPR issued by DEVB on or before the due date for submission of the technical and fee proposals shall be used for the marking of the past performance of the consultant and Subconsultants in the nomination stage.
 - (b) Those consultants proposing no Subconsultant should be assessed under the

criterion “past performance of Subconsultants” as if they were Subconsultants to themselves.

- (c) Where a consultant proposes more than one Subconsultant, the PPR shall be taken as the average of PPRs of those Subconsultants who have a PPR.
- (d) Where none of the proposed Subconsultants of a consultant has a PPR, the consultant should be assessed under the criterion “past performance of Subconsultants” as if he was a Subconsultant to himself.
- (e) The following formula shall be used to calculate the mark for “past performance of the consultant” (same for Subconsultants):

$$\text{Mark assigned to consultant "i"} = \text{Mark allocated for the criterion of past performance} \times \frac{R_i}{R_{\text{highest}}}$$

where: (i) R_i is the current PPR of consultant "i".

- (ii) R_{highest} is the highest current PPR among all of the consultants involved in the exercise.
- (iii) In case there is only one consultant in the exercise having a PPR, his mark in the criterion of past performance shall be calculated by:

$$\text{Mark allocated for the criterion of past performance} \times \frac{\text{PPR of the consultant}}{100}$$

and the calculated mark shall then be taken as a “cap” for all the other consultants' marks calculated using the method in the item (B)(4)(f) below.

- (f) For a consultant having less than 4 performance scores under the relevant consultants selection board concerned in the past three years, his PPR shall not be considered. The “past performance of the consultant” sub-section shall then be marked based on the consultant’s weighted average percentage mark (not the grade) in the remaining sections excluding the “past performance of Subconsultants” sub-section if any, subject to the cap derived in item (B)(4)(e)(iii) above for the case with only one consultant having a PPR if applicable.
- (g) A consultant who is under suspension from bidding shall not be shortlisted for submission of technical and fee proposals for further consultancy assignments until the suspension is lifted. Bids already submitted by the shortlisted consultant in response to invitations before the suspension from bidding, which is imposed after submission of technical and fee proposals, should continue to be assessed subject to further consideration as given in item

(B)(4)(h) below. Bids submitted by the shortlisted consultant who is under suspension from bidding, which is imposed before submission of technical and fee proposals, shall not be considered further.

- (h) For a consultant who is suspended from bidding after he has submitted technical and fee proposals or a consultant, although not suspended from bidding but serious default or non-performance of him (such as those mentioned in paragraph 22 of Annex I of DEVB TC(W) No. 3/2016) has been made known to the Assessment Panel, the Assessment Panel shall carefully consider whether the proposals of such consultant should be further processed. If the Assessment Panel decides not to further process the bid of such consultant, the Assessment Panel should seek endorsement from the AACSB/EACSB (or the relevant DCSC) on such decision before continuing with the consultant selection exercise.
- (5) **【One [1] mark】** shall be deducted for non-compliance with the format.
- (6) Combined score assessment of Technical and Fee Proposals will be carried out in accordance with DEVB TC(W) Nos. 2/2016 and 5/2018 and their subsequent updates (if any).
- (7) The Assessment Panel comprises **【insert the number】** marking members from **【insert the department names and respective numbers】** and **【insert the number】** non-marking members (Chairperson and Secretary) from **【insert the department name】** .

* Delete as appropriate.

Remarks:

1. It is the procuring department's responsibility to select an appropriate page limit that suits the nature of an assignment under consideration. The page limits set in the second paragraph should generally be used under normal circumstances. Guidelines on the page limits for normal and special circumstances are given below:

	Page Limits		
	Technical proposal	Appendices	Figures/ Drawings/ Illustrations
Normal circumstances	8 to 15	Up to 20	Up to 15
Special circumstances (e.g. assignments of high complexity, large scale or other circumstances that the Assessment Panel considers appropriate)	Up to 30	Up to 30	Up to 30

Page limits deviating from the above table can also be adopted, subject to the approval by an officer of D3 rank or above. The justifications including deliberations by the Assessment Panel should be properly recorded.

Project offices may solicit comments from consultants on the page limits at the pre-submission meeting if necessary. In case any subsequent adjustment of the page limits is considered appropriate by the Assessment Panel, the consultants should be notified of the change and be given adequate time for preparing the technical proposals in response to the revised submission requirement.

2. The marks to be allocated to each main section of the technical proposals shall be within the range indicated below and shall total 100%:

Section (Each Section to be expanded into Sub-sections with a percentage mark to be allocated to each Sub-section which should be made known to the bidders)	Percentage mark to be allocated (%) [Percentage mark (%) in square brackets is to be adopted if EOI is not used]
	EACSB
1. Consultant's Experience	0 – 5 * [5 – 10 *]
2. Response to the Scope	5 – 15
3. Approach to Cost-effectiveness and Sustainability	10 – 25
4. Methodology and Work Programme	20 – 30

5. Innovation and Creativity	5 – 15
6. Staffing#	25 – 35
7. Past Performance	10 – 25
Past Performance of the consultant	10 – 20
Past Performance of Subconsultants	0 – 10

* For major tunnel/cavern projects with difficult geological and ground conditions, or major projects with high risks of scope changes and project complexities, the top mark of “10” or “5”, whichever is appropriate, could be adopted so as to assign a greater weight for consultants' experience and knowledge on geotechnical conditions and risk management.

The “adequacy of professional and technical manpower input” sub-section of the “Staffing” section should carry 7–12% of the overall marks.

3. The end month of the reporting quarter to be input is determined as follows:

End month to be input	Final snapshot captured on	Applicable to tender closing dates between
February XXXX	00:00 of 23 March	23 March to 22 June
May XXXX	00:00 of 23 June	23 June to 22 September
August XXXX	00:00 of 23 September	23 September to 22 December
November XXXX	00:00 of 23 December	23 December to 22 March

For more details, please refer to **Appendix 3.20F** of the EACSB Handbook.

4. The procuring department should make reference to DEVB TC(W) Nos. 2/2016 and 5/2018 and their subsequent updates (if any) and amend the guidelines as appropriate.
5. The procuring department may update the figures in brackets to suit the project specific circumstances.
6. For one-stage consultants selection process, reference should be made to the provisions in Appendix 3.10 of the EACSB Handbook.

Annex A to Sample Template for Guidelines on Preparation of Technical Proposal

Correction rules for Manning Schedule

1. The manning schedule should be submitted in both the prescribed electronic format and hard copy format in accordance with the manning schedule template provided in the invitation documents. No amendment should be made on the prescribed format of the manning schedule template such as addition or deletion of columns, changing the commencement date of the agreement, etc.
2. Where a correction rule in this paragraph is applicable, the error shall be corrected in accordance with that rule.
 - a. If the manning schedule is submitted in both the electronic format and hard copy format, the electronic format shall prevail. If the manning schedule is submitted in hard copy format only, the provision of the same manning schedule in the prescribed electronic format may be requested. In such circumstance, the manning schedule in hard copy format in the submission made on or before the tender closing date shall prevail.
 - b. Any manpower input data with more than 2 decimal places will be rounded off to 2 decimal places.
 - c. If there is any discrepancy between the total manpower input calculated from the monthly breakdown in the manning schedule and the one input in the manning schedule, the total manpower input calculated from the monthly breakdown (after correction if any) in the manning schedule shall prevail.
 - d. If there is no monthly breakdown input for a month of a particular staff, the manpower input for that month of the staff in concern will be marked as zero.
 - e. If a negative manpower input is inserted for a month of a particular staff, the following corrections will be adopted:
 - (i) the manpower input for that month of the staff concerned will be marked as zero;
 - (ii) the last month of the staff concerned with positive manpower input will be adjusted downward to even out the net increase in the manpower input due to the correction in item (i) of this paragraph; and
 - (iii) if the manpower input of the month becomes zero after the correction in item (ii)

of this paragraph but the net increase has yet been fully evened out, the correction in item (ii) will be applied to the second last month with positive manpower input and so on until the net increase is fully evened out.

- f. If the number of months shown in the manning schedule submitted is more than the number of months shown in the template provided in the invitation documents, the manpower input in the manning schedule prior to the first month and/or beyond the last month shown in the template will not be considered in the tender assessment and will be discarded. If any number of months shown in the template is omitted in the submitted manning schedule, the manpower input for those omitted month(s) in the submitted manning schedule will be taken as zero in the tender assessment.
 - g. If the manpower input of a month of a particular staff is input in two separate rows in the manning schedule, the manpower input for that month of the staff in concern will be equal to the sum of the manpower input for that month in those two rows.
 - h. In the occasion where the consultant has proposed a staff member with the submission of its qualification and experience (e.g. CVs) in the Technical Proposal but such staff member is NOT a named staff member in the manning schedule, such staff member shall be treated as an unnamed staff member and its qualification and experience mentioned in the Technical Proposal shall not be considered in the tender assessment.
3. In the event that none of the above correction rules is applicable, where the error relates to factual information, and there is no room for manipulation by virtue of subsequent correction; or where the correction of such error would not give the bidder an advantage over the other bidders, clarification may be sought from the bidder and modification to the manning schedule may be allowed.
 4. In the event that any of the above correction rule(s) is applicable and resulting in update of the total manpower input of any staff category, confirmation from the bidder to abide by the bid with the corrected total manpower input may be sought. If the bidder fails to confirm its agreement to abide by the bid with the total manpower input so corrected in writing by a specified deadline, its bid shall not be considered further for the consultant selection exercise.