

Appendix 3.1A – Sample Template for Shortlisting Criteria

The selection criteria for ~~screening the long list into~~forming a short-list are given below:-

Selection Criterion	Percentage mark to be allocated (%)
1. Appreciation of the key requirements and constraints/risks (See Note 2)	XX
2. Approach and strategy to meet the requirements of the assignment [Procuring department may include sub-criteria where appropriate, to cover the consultants' approach and strategy on innovation, creativity, mechanisation, prefabrication, other productivity enhancements, cost reduction, expenditure leveling, etc.] (See Note 3)	XX
3. Previous relevant experience both in Hong Kong and elsewhere (See Note 4)	XX
4. Knowledge, experience and capability of key staff (See Note 5)	XX
5. Past performance of the consultant (See Note 46)	XX
6. Past performance of sub-consultants (See Note 46)	XX
Total	100

Notes:

- 1) For each selection criterion for shortlisting, each Assessment Panel Member should grade the particular aspect 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.

- 2) Criterion (1) shall be assessed based on the consultants’ appreciation of key requirements and constraints/risks additional to those set out in the Brief. If no additional appreciation is included, a “fair” grading at most should be given.
- 3) The consultants’ detailed proposals for Criterion (2) are not expected and shall not be assessed in the shortlisting stage but the consultants are encouraged to indicate their broad approach and strategy, particularly on innovative ideas, productivity enhancements, cost savings which may demonstrate their edge in undertaking the assignment.
- 4) 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 expression of interest submission closing date.

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

- 5) For attaining full mark (i.e. grade VG), a consultant should provide the minimum number of core personnel who should possess the corresponding minimum qualification and experience as mentioned in the tables below. Marks allocated to each core personnel under the same designation are on equal basis.

If the undertakings signed by non-fulltime core personnel to confirm their involvement in undertaking the designations of Project Manager, Project Director and/or Team Leaders **【the procuring department shall amend it where appropriate to align with the assessment criteria】** cannot be produced, the staff concerned shall be considered as failure to meet the requirements and “P” shall be marked for the staff concerned accordingly.

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

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

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

(N.B: The sum of XX, YY and ZZ shall be 100. Add additional tables if required. In addition,

the job reference to be counted as relevant may be elaborated to suit the specific nature of project where appropriate.)

The minimum qualification and experience requirements of individual categories of staff are shown in the table below. Only the qualification and experience obtained by the proposed staff on or before the closing date of submission of EOI for this tender shall be counted.

<u>Staff category</u>	<u>Minimum academic / professional qualifications</u>	<u>Minimum experience requirement</u>
<u>Partners/ Directors</u>	<u>Corporate member of an appropriate professional institution or equivalent</u>	<u>15 years relevant post-qualification experience (applicable to professional membership only)</u>
<u>Chief Professional</u>	<u>Corporate member of an appropriate professional institution or equivalent</u>	<u>12 years relevant post-qualification experience</u>
	<u>University degree or equivalent in an appropriate discipline for specialist trades, such as geology, transport, environmental science or other trades where appropriate professional institutions are not commonly in existence</u>	<u>17 years relevant post-qualification experience</u>

(N.B: Include other categories of staff if required.)

4)6) The following method shall be used in the assessment of past performance of the consultant and sub-consultants:

- (a) Assessment of past performance of a consultant and his sub-consultants (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 Consultants' Performance Information System (CNPIS). Details of PPR shall be referred to Development Bureau (DEVB) Technical Circular (Works) (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 expression of interest shall be used for the marking of the past performance of the consultant and sub-consultants in the shortlisting stage.
- (b) Those consultants proposing no sub-consultant should be assessed under the criterion "past performance of sub-consultants" as if they were sub-consultants to themselves.

- (c) Where a consultant proposes more than one sub-consultant, the PPR shall be taken as the average of PPRs of those sub-consultants who have a PPR.
- (d) Where none of the proposed sub-consultants of a consultant has a PPR, the consultant should be assessed under the criterion “past performance of sub-consultants” as if he was a sub-consultant to himself.

~~(e) Where a proposed sub-consultant is suspended from bidding under a category relevant to his work under the consultancy concerned, the weighted mark for such sub-consultant shall be zero.~~

~~(f)~~(e) The following formula shall be used to calculate the mark for “past performance of the consultant” (same for sub-consultants):

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

- 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 Note ~~46(gf)~~ below.

~~(g)~~(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 sub-consultants” sub-section if any, subject to the cap derived in Note ~~46(fe)~~(iii) above for the case with only one consultant having a PPR if applicable.

~~(h)~~(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. Submission already submitted by the consultant in response to invitations before the suspension is imposed should continue to be assessed subject to further consideration as given in Note ~~46(ih)~~ below.

(i)(h) For a consultant who is suspended from bidding after he has submitted expression of interest 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 submission of such consultant should be further processed. If the Assessment Panel decides not to further process the proposal 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)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].

Remarks:

1. The procuring department ~~should~~shall make reference to DEVB TC(W) No. 2/2016 and No. 5/2018 and amend the ~~shortlisting criteria~~guidelines as appropriate.
2. The procuring department should update the information in square brackets to suit specific project need as appropriate.

* Delete as appropriate.