

## Instructions for the Evaluation of Feasibility Reports - Committee of Experts

Code: **PE.CGEDx.PE.REG.006.2024.IN.02**

Edition: **1**

	Responsible
Prepared	Digital Transformation Management Juan Alarcón
Revised	Digital Transformation Management Cristian Ormazabal
Approved	Strategic Planning and Regulation Director Gladys Cárcamo Alarcón
Approval records in the Regulatory Documentary Manager	

## Index

	Page
Page	2
1. Object	3
2. Scope	3
3. Reference documents	3
4. Definitions	3
5. Responsibilities	3
5.1. Document Responsibilities	4
6. Development	4
6.1. Basic Principles	4
• Objectivity: Decisions are based on the evidence presented.	4
• Transparency: The evaluation process and criteria are publicly available.	4
• Consensus: The final verdict is the result of the unified agreement of the committee.	4
• Efficiency: The process is designed to optimize the time of participants.	4
6.2. Description of the Procedure	4
6.3. Basic Principles	6
7. Records and data. Applicable formats	6
8. List of Annexes	6

# Instructions for the Evaluation of Feasibility Reports

## Committee of Experts

### 1. Purpose

This document establishes the methodology and formal procedure for the evaluation of feasibility reports for Digitization projects, in order to ensure objective, transparent and standardized decision making.

### 2. Scope

These instructions are mandatory for all digitization projects that, due to their nature or amount of investment, require a formal evaluation by the Expert Review Committee.

### 3. Documents of reference

- PE.CGEDx.PE.REG.006.2024: Approval Management Procedure for Digitization Projects in CGE Chile.
- PE.CGEDx.PE.REG.006.2024-FO.06: Expert Committee Decision Report.
- PE.CGEDx.PE.REG.006.2024-FO.07: Evaluation Panel for Experts.

### 4. Definitions

- **Digital Experts Committee:** Multidisciplinary team, responsible for issuing a "Consolidated Opinion" on the viability of the projects submitted.
- **Claimant Department:** Business unit that promotes a project.
- **Project Manager:** Person from the Claimant Department in charge of presenting the project to the committee.
- **Coordinator:** Administrative role, located in the Digital Transformation Management, responsible for the correct execution of this procedure.
- **Decision Report:** Official document that formalizes the verdict (**Approved / Rejected**), the basis for the decision, the score and the observations issued by the Committee. Formerly called Decision Minutes.

### 5. Responsibilities

This section identifies the specific responsibilities for the execution of the activities described in these instructions. The general responsibilities of each unit in the complete life cycle of the Digitization projects are detailed in procedure PE.CGEDx.PE.REG.006.2024.

#### Requesting Department

- Prepare the Requirement Form ensuring its quality and completeness.
- Designate the Responsible Project Manager for the executive presentation.
- Provide clarifications requested by the Committee during the session.

# Instructions for the Evaluation of Feasibility Reports

## Committee of Experts

### Coordinator (Digital Transformation Manager)

- Execute Phases I and III of these instructions (Intake, Distribution, Consolidation, Issuance and Distribution of the Decision Report).
- Convene and moderate the Expert Committee session (Phase II).

### Expert Review Committee

- Conduct individual pre-evaluation using the Evaluation Panel (PE.CGEdx.PE.REG.006.2024-FO.07).
- Actively participate in deliberation to reach consensus.
- Apply the Veto criteria and determine the score according to the methodology.
- Validate the final Decision Report.

### 5.1. Responsibilities of Document

Responsibility for maintaining and updating this document should be incorporated.

## 6. Development

### 6.1. Basic Principles

- Objectivity: Decisions are based on the evidence presented.
- Transparency: The evaluation process and criteria are public.
- Consensus: The final verdict is the result of the unified agreement of the committee.
- Efficiency: The process is designed to optimize the time of the participants.

### 6.2. Description of the Procedure Phase

#### I: Preparation and Preliminary Evaluation

1. Reception and Admission: The Coordinator receives the "Request Form" and the "Feasibility Report". He/she performs a first completeness check. If the documents are incomplete or lack justifications for omissions, they will be returned and the project will not be scheduled.
2. Distribution and Individual Evaluation: Once admitted, the Coordinator distributes the documents and the "Evaluation Panel for Experts" (PE.CGEdx.PE.REG.006.2024-FO.07) to the committee members for prior analysis. Each expert completes the panel individually.
3. Consolidation of Evaluations: The Coordinator consolidates the results to generate an aggregated view to guide the committee session.

# Instructions for the Evaluation of Feasibility Reports

## Committee of Experts

### Phase II: Evaluation Committee Session

#### 4. Session Set-Up and Presenters:

- **Decision Participants (Committee):** The base composition of the committee includes representatives from: Digital Transformation (TD), the Demanding Department (Business) and IT Management.

The standard committee session invites all representatives defined in the base composition (TD, Business and IT), and their participation is expected to enrich the deliberation.

However, for the decisions of the session to be valid and not cancelled due to lack of attendance, the following base quorum requirement must be met:

- The Chairman of the (Digital Transformation) Committee.
- At least one (1) additional Digital Transformation (DT) expert.

The Committee Chair may require additional representatives (e.g. Business, IT, External Consultants) to be present if the nature of the project warrants.

- **Mandatory Presenters:** The session requires the presence of the **Responsible Project Manager** (from the Requesting Department) and a representative **from IT Management** to make executive presentations. If any of the mandatory presenters do not attend, the project evaluation must be rescheduled.
- 5. Executive Presentation:** The Responsible Project Manager jointly presents the requirement and the feasibility report.
  - 6. Validation of Completeness by the Committee (Re-evaluation of the Veto 1):** Immediately following the presentation, the Committee Chair will consult with the members as to whether they consider the documentation submitted is sufficient to proceed with a substantive evaluation. If the consensus of the committee is that the report is materially incomplete, the session for that project will end and the following will apply  
Veto 1, resulting in a rejection.
  - 7. Deliberation and Consensus:** If the previous step is passed, the committee deliberates on each criterion (based on the Rubric in Annex A) to reach a consensus assessment (☐ Meets, ☒ Partial or ☐ Does Not Meet).
  - 8. Critical Failure Veto Application (Veto 2):** Checks whether the consensus has been ☐ Not Met for any of the critical criteria (Business Justification, Technical Plan for v3, or **Investment Estimate (CAPEX)**). If one of these criteria is not met, the project is rejected.
  - 9. Verdict Determination:**
    - If the project is objected to by Veto 2, the verdict is Rejected.

# Instructions for the Evaluation of Feasibility Reports

## Committee of Experts

- If not vetoed, the final score is calculated. The verdict will be **Approved** (score  $\geq 80$ ) or **Rejected** (score  $< 80$ ).

## Phase III: Formalization and Communication

- 10. Issuance of the Decision Report:** The Coordinator drafts the "Expert Committee Decision Report" (PE.CGEDx.PE.REG.006.2024-FO.06), reflecting the final status (Approved or Rejected) and the rationale for the decision.
- 11. Validation and Distribution:** The report is validated and signed by the participants and distributed to the Respondent Department. A verdict of "Rejected" is accompanied by observations that act as an action plan so that the project can be corrected and resubmitted.

### 6.3. Basic Principles

The detailed calculation methodology, including the weighting formula and approval thresholds, is formalized in Annex 24: Scoring Methodology of this document.

## 7. Records and data. Formats applicable

The following table will be included with the records and data derived from the activities defined in the document (Forms, template formats, etc.). If there are no associated formats, complete with "Not applicable".

Record	Responsible issuer	File support/place of filing	Format	Responsible for archiving	Retention time
Decision Report	Coordinator (TD)	SharePoint Digital Transformation	PE.CGEDx.PE.REG.006.2024-FO.06	Coordinator (TD)	5 Years
Individual Evaluation Form	Committee Member	SharePoint Digital Transformation	PE.CGEDx.PE.REG.006.2024-FO.07	Coordinator (TD)	5 Years

## 8. Relation of Annexes

- **Annex 00:** Revision History
- **Annex 01:** Consolidated Rubric of Evaluation by Level
- **Annex 02:** Score Calculation Methodology

# Instructions for the Evaluation of Feasibility Reports

## Committee of Experts

### Annex 00: Revision History

It is advisable, in addition to recording the changes in the document file in the Regulations Document Manager, to also identify them in an annex to the document, from the first edition, especially if the document replaces or cancels another one.

Edition	Date	Reasons for the edition and/or summary of changes
1	06/11/2025	Initial edition of the document.

# Instructions for the Evaluation of Feasibility Reports

## Committee of Experts

### Annex01: Consolidated Assessment Rubric by Level

This rubric unifies the evaluation criteria for the three levels of feasibility reports (v1, v2 and v3), allowing a direct comparison of expectations at each stage of the process.

#### Dimension 1: Justification and Benefits (The Idea)

The objective is to validate whether the project solves a real problem and has a clear purpose.

Verdict	Report v1 (Initial Idea)	Report v2 (Detailed Justification)	Report v3 (Construction Plan)
<input type="checkbox"/> Passed (2 pts).	The problem is understood and the solution is coherent. Objectives are clear.	The need is justified with evidence and data (e.g. usage metrics). The objectives are quantifiable.	Justification remains sound and aligned with a detailed implementation plan.
<input type="checkbox"/> Requires More Information (1 pt)	Justification of the problem is very weak, or the objectives are ambiguous.	Justification is qualitative ("it's slow") and lacks the required supporting data.	The business justification does not clearly align with the detailed technical and economic plan presented.
<input type="checkbox"/> Rejected (0 pts).	Key sections such as "Benefits" or "Investment Estimate" are missing. The solution does not logically align with the problem.	"Need Analysis" section or objectives are omitted.	Detailed implementation plan does not demonstrate how the promised benefits will be achieved, or justification is missing.

#### Dimension 2: Technical Solution

The objective is to validate whether the proposed solution is coherent, complete and technically feasible for its maturity level.

Verdict	Report v1 (Initial Idea)	Report v2 (Detailed Justification)	Report v3 (Construction Plan)
<input type="checkbox"/> Approved (2 pts).	e describes at a high level what is to be purchased or built (Content and Plan).	Technical requirements are detailed. If continued, CPU/memory usage graphs are presented.	A complete technical plan is presented, including architecture, security plan and disaster recovery (DR) plan.
<input type="checkbox"/> Requires More Information (1 pt)	Equipment list is too generic or implementation plan is not understood.	The requirements are ambiguous. Mandatory load data is missing to justify the need for new hardware.	The technical plan is sound, but omits important details. For example, the OPEX projection is only one year out and does not analyze scenarios.



# Instructions for the Evaluation of Feasibility Reports

## - Committee of Experts

<input type="checkbox"/> <b>Rejected (0 pts).</b>	The "Content and Plan" section is incomplete or empty.	The "Current System Status" section is completely missing in a continuation project,	No security or disaster recovery (DR) plan is defined, representing a critical failure.
---	--	--	---

# Instructions for the Evaluation of Feasibility Reports

## Committee of Experts

		making the evaluation impossible.	
--	--	-----------------------------------	--

### Dimension 3: Economic Analysis

The objective is to validate whether the cost estimate is transparent, justified and complete for the stage of the project

Verdict	Report v1 (Initial Idea)	Report v2 (Detailed Detailed Justification)	Report v3 (Construction Plan)
<input type="checkbox"/> Approved (2 pts).	A CAPEX estimate is presented and explains where the numbers came from (e.g., "based on market inquiries"). An initial initial OPEX projection (if applicable) is included.	The CAPEX estimate is detailed (e.g. HW/SW breakdown). OPEX estimate (if applicable) is supported by a baseline calculation.	Detailed CAPEX cost breakdown tables are presented and quotations are attached. OPEX projection (if applicable) analyzes 3-year usage scenarios.
<input type="checkbox"/> More Information Required (1 point)	A total CAPEX number is presented without any explanation of its origin.	The OPEX calculation (if applicable) is unsubstantiated or incomplete.	The cost breakdown (CAPEX) is correct, but no quotation or support for prices is attached. quotation or support for the prices.
<input type="checkbox"/> Rejected (0 pts).	The "Capital Expenditure Estimate" (CAPEX) is completely missing.	No CAPEX breakdown or missing OPEX analysis (giving wrong view of total cost). (giving an erroneous view of the total cost).	<b>(Veto 2)</b> Cost breakdown tables (CAPEX) are empty or incomplete, preventing the incomplete, preventing approval of the budget.

# Instructions for the Evaluation of Feasibility Reports

## Committee of Experts

### Annex 02: Score Calculation Methodology

The final project score is obtained if, and only if, the project has not been rejected by a Veto (Veto 1 or Veto 2). If the project passes the vetoes, the score is calculated as follows:

#### 1. Weighting of Dimensions

The final score is calculated based on 100 points, distributed in three dimensions with the following weighting:

- **Dimension 1 (Justification and Benefits):** 35%.
- **Dimension 2 (Technical Solution):** 40%.
- **Dimension 3 (Economic Analysis):** 25%.

#### 2. Criteria Scoring Scale

The consensus evaluation of each criterion (see Annex 01 and 03) is translated into points:

- ☐ **Meets:** 2 points.
- ☒ **Partial / Requires More Information:** 1 point
- ☐ **Does Not Meet:** 0 points
- **N/A (Not Applicable):** The criterion is excluded from the calculation. It does not add up in the points obtained or in the maximum possible points of its dimension (Applies to criteria 2.3 and 3.2).

#### 3. Calculation Formula

##### • Step A: Calculate the Percentage of Achievement per Dimension

First, the % achievement is calculated for each of the three dimensions independently.

Maximum Points Dimension = (No. of criteria of the dimension that are NOT N/A) × 2  
 Points Achieved Dimension = Sum of points (2, 1 or 0) of the criteria of that dimension.  
**Dimension Achievement % = (Dimension Points Earned / Dimension Maximum Points) × 100**

##### • Step B: Calculate the Final Weighted Score

The final score is then obtained by adding the weighted scores for each dimension.

**Final Score =**  
 (% Achievement Dimension 1 × 0.35) + (% Achievement Dimension 2 × 0.40) + (% Achievement Dimension 3 × 0.25)

#### • 4. Decision Threshold

The final verdict is determined by the score (provided a Veto has not been applied):

- **APPROVED:** Final Score ≥ 80
- **REJECTED:** Final Score < 80