TECHNICAL EVALUATION REPORT ASSESSMENT

COMPREHENSIVE PEER-REVIEWED ANALYSIS

Procurement of: Cathlab Equipment (4 Lots - Single Plane and Biplane)

RFB No: ID-PMU SIHREN-395529-GO-RFB

Project: Indonesia Health Systems Strengthening Project (IBRD 9626-ID)

Purchaser: Directorate General of Health Services, Ministry of Health, Republic of Indonesia

Country: Indonesia

Evaluation Report Date: September 17, 2024

Executive Summary

Overall Assessment: REQUIRES MAJOR REVISION

The Technical Evaluation Report contains 8 Critical Issues, 10 Major Issues, and 5 Minor Issues that must be addressed before Bank No-Objection can be granted. While the evaluation demonstrates structured methodology and comprehensive documentation in certain areas, there are fundamental procedural deficiencies, inconsistent application of qualification criteria, inadequate justification for rejections, missing mandatory documentation, and potential violations of World Bank procurement principles that compromise the integrity of this evaluation.

Most Serious Concern: The evaluation appears to apply an undocumented technical score threshold to exclude technically qualified bidders from financial evaluation, which violates the combined 70%/30% evaluation methodology specified in the bidding documents and contradicts World Bank procurement regulations.

CRITICAL ISSUES (Must Fix Before Approval)

CRITICAL ISSUE 1: Application of Undocumented Minimum Technical Score Threshold

Pages: 16-23 (Forms 2 & 3 across all lots)

Description: The evaluation systematically excludes bidders from financial evaluation based on technical scores despite those bidders being marked

"Substantially Responsive" and passing all qualification criteria. This violates the specified combined evaluation methodology.

Specific Examples with Page References:

LOT 1 (Page 16-20):

- PT Rajawali Nusindo: Score 89/127, "Substantially Responsive," QUALIFIED on Form 11A (Pages 67-90) → **Excluded from financial evaluation**
- Justification: "Not to be invited for the opening of financial part of the bid because not meet in the technical and qualification evaluation"

LOT 2 (Pages 17-28):

- PT Surgika Alkesindo JV Neusoft: Score 110/126 → Status unclear, appears excluded despite high score
- Consortium of Siemens: Score 61/126 → Invited to financial evaluation

LOT 3 (Page 20-21):

- Beijing PRD International: Score 100/126, "Substantially Responsive," QUALIFIED (Pages 82-86) → Status unclear

LOT 4 (Page 22-23):

- PT Tawada Healthcare: Score 68/132, "Substantially Responsive," QUALIFIED → Excluded
- Canon Medical Systems: Score 75/132, "Substantially Responsive," QUALIFIED → Excluded
- PT Fokus Diagnostic Indonesia: Score 65/132 → Excluded
- Yet Consortium of Siemens with score 61/126 in LOT 1 **was invited** to financial evaluation

Rules Violated:

- **PR2025 Section V Para 5.50 & Annex X Para 3.1:** When Rated Criteria methodology used, all qualified and responsive bidders proceed to combined technical/financial evaluation
- **PR2025 Annex X Para 2.2a:** "Evaluation criteria and methodology must be specified in detail in Request for Bids documents"
- **PR2025 Annex X Para 2.2c:** "Only evaluation criteria indicated in procurement documents shall be applied"
- **Cathlab Rules C46 (page 60 of bidding documents):** Evaluated Bid Score formula requires BOTH technical AND financial scores: **B = (Clow/C × 0.70 × 100) + (T/Tmax × 0.30 × 100)**

Critical Analysis: The bidding documents specify a combined evaluation methodology with 70% weight for financial and 30% weight for technical. This means a bidder with lower technical score but competitive financial offer could rank as Most Advantageous Bid. By excluding bidders before financial evaluation, the committee is:

1. Preventing lower technical scorers from competing on price
2. Applying an evaluation methodology NOT specified in bidding documents
3. Potentially eliminating the actual "Most Advantageous Bid"

Required Actions:

1. Provide exact citation from Section III of bidding documents specifying minimum technical score threshold (if it exists)
2. If NO minimum threshold was specified, ALL technically qualified and responsive bidders MUST proceed to financial evaluation
3. Apply the full combined evaluation formula: B = (Clow/C × 0.70 × 100) + (T/Tmax × 0.30 × 100) to determine Most Advantageous Bid
4. Reconsider LOT 4 particularly: excluding bidders with scores of 65, 68, and 75 when their financial competitiveness is unknown violates competitive principles
5. Document the legal/procedural basis for any exclusion before financial evaluation

CRITICAL ISSUE 2: Inconsistent and Inadequate Rejection Justifications - "Manufacturing Experience"

Pages: 24-39 (Form 3 - Summary of Bids/Proposals Rejected across all lots)

Description: Multiple bidders across three lots rejected for allegedly not meeting manufacturing experience qualification based on interpretation that "Mobile C produced is not a Cathlab," yet this interpretation lacks:

- Citation to exact requirement specification from bidding documents
- Evidence of clarification process
- Consistent application across all bidders

Affected Bidders and Page References:

LOT 1 (Pages 24-31):

- **Shanghai United Imaging Healthcare (Page 24-25, items 1-3):**
    - Reason 2: "Not Meet Qualification, manufacturing experience is not in accordance with the requirements (Mobile C produced is not a Cathlab)"
    - Reason listed but unclear if this alone would disqualify
- **PT Rajawali Nusindo & EUROCOLUMBUS S.R.L (Page 31):**
    - Reason 1: "Not Meet Qualification, manufacturing experience is not in accordance with the requirements, but mobile c-arm is not a Cathlab"

LOT 2 (Pages 28-30):

- Similar pattern - multiple bidders rejected with same reasoning

LOT 3 (Pages 33-35):

- **Shanghai United Imaging Healthcare (Page 33-34):**
    - Reason 2: "Not Meet Qualification, manufacturing experience is not in accordance with the requirements (Mobile C produced is not a Cathlab)"

- **PT Rajawali Nusindo & Allengers Medical Systems Ltd. (Page 34-35):**
    - Reason 1: "Not Meet Qualification, manufacturing experience is not in accordance with the requirements (Mobile C is not a Cathlab)"

Rules Violated:

- **PR2025 Annex X Para 2.2e:** "Evaluation criteria must be applied consistently to all Bids"
- **PR2025 Section V Para 5.42-5.44:** Clarification must be sought before rejecting on ambiguous criteria
- **Cathlab Rules A6 (Section III page 53):** Requirement states "manufactured cathlab equipment for at least four (4) years" - Does NOT explicitly exclude manufacturers of related medical imaging equipment
- **EVAL2024 Form 3 Requirements:** Must provide clear "Requirement not met" with detailed "Justification"

Critical Analysis: The Form 11A qualification evaluations (Pages 67-160) show bidders who PASSED this same criterion. For example:

- Page 67-80: Multiple bidders show "Complies QUALIFIED" for manufacturing experience
- Yet Form 3 shows others rejected for same criterion

Questions Requiring Answers:

1. Where in Section III does it explicitly state that Mobile C-arm equipment manufacturing does NOT qualify as cathlab manufacturing experience?
2. Were clarifications issued to bidders asking them to explain how their manufacturing experience relates to cathlab equipment?
3. Why were some bidders with similar equipment manufacturing backgrounds accepted while others rejected?
4. Does the equipment specification define "cathlab" narrowly enough to exclude angiography C-arms?

Required Actions:

1. Provide exact text from Section III, page 53-54 defining "cathlab equipment" manufacturing requirement
2. Document clarification requests sent to affected bidders asking for explanation of manufacturing experience relevance
3. Show bidder responses to clarifications and evaluation committee's assessment
4. Demonstrate consistent application: if one bidder's Mobile C-arm experience was accepted, explain why others' was rejected
5. If criteria was ambiguous in bidding documents, rejection without clarification violates WB procedures

CRITICAL ISSUE 3: Rejection Based on Missing "Year of Installation" Data Not Clearly Required

Pages: 24-25, 33-34 (Form 3 rejection justifications)

Description: Multiple bids rejected because "bidder has offered the latest model with production year 2024 but does not give the year of installation" (Row 459), yet:

- Unclear if "year of installation" was mandatory requirement vs. "year of 1st production"
- Applied inconsistently across bidders
- Should have triggered clarification request, not outright rejection

Specific Examples:

LOT 1 (Page 24-25): Shanghai United Imaging Healthcare - Reason 3: "Not meet the Technical Specification. The bidder has offered technical specifications that do not meet the minimum requirement of mandatory criteria. Bidder has offered the latest model with production year 2024 but does not give the year of installation. row 459 no year of installation."

LOT 2 (Page 28-30): Similar rejection reasoning applied

LOT 3 (Page 33-34): Shanghai United Imaging Healthcare: "Bidder has offered the latest model with production year 2024 but does not give the year of installation. row 459 no year of installation"

Rules Violated:

- **PR2025 Section V Para 5.42:** "Borrower may ask for clarification... but shall not ask, offer, or permit changes in substance"
- **PR2025 Section V Para 5.40:** "Minor deviations... shall not be grounds for rejection"
- **Cathlab Rules B38:** Mandatory requirements marked in GREEN cells in Excel files; information requirements in WHITE cells

Critical Analysis: Technical Specification Excel files (referenced throughout Form 12, Pages 161+) use color coding:

- **Green cells** = Mandatory Pass/Fail requirements
- **Orange cells** = Rated criteria (scored competitively)
- **White cells** = Information only

Questions:

1. Is Row 459 "year of installation" marked as GREEN (mandatory) or WHITE (information)?
2. The requirement for equipment states "Year of 1st Production for Model Proposed" (Rows 8, 17 per Excel files) - is this the same as or different from "year of installation"?
3. Were all passing bidders verified to have provided "year of installation" in Row 459?
4. If information was unclear, why wasn't clarification sought per ITB 27?

Required Actions:

1. Provide screenshot/reference to Row 459 in technical specification Excel file showing cell color (mandatory green vs. information white)

2. Clarify definition: "year of 1st production" vs. "year of installation" - are these two different requirements?
3. Document whether this requirement was applied consistently - show Row 459 responses for ALL bidders who passed technical evaluation
4. If Row 459 was ambiguous, explain why clarification wasn't sought before rejection (required per PR2025 Section V Para 5.42)
5. If equipment was "latest model production year 2024," explain how "year of installation" could exist for brand new equipment

CRITICAL ISSUE 4: Preliminary Examination Results Conflict with Later Rejections

Pages: 56-62 (Form 10A - Preliminary Examination)

Description: Form 10A shows ALL bidders marked "Substantially Responsive" and "Accepted for detail evaluation," yet 11 bids were subsequently rejected for failing mandatory requirements. This indicates:

- Preliminary examination was not properly conducted
- Mandatory requirements were not checked at preliminary stage
- Evaluation sequence was not followed correctly

Evidence by Lot:

LOT 1 (Page 56-57): All 5 bidders marked:

- Authorization/Verification: Yes
- Eligibility: Yes
- Bid-Securing Declaration: Yes
- Completeness: Yes
- Substantially Responsive: Yes
- Accepted for detail evaluation: Yes

Yet Form 3 (Pages 24-31) shows 2 of these 5 were rejected for:

- Not meeting qualification criteria (manufacturing experience)
- Failing mandatory technical specifications
- Not meeting minimum requirements

LOT 2 (Page 58-60): All 9 bidders marked "Substantially Responsive" and "Accepted for detail evaluation"

Yet Form 3 (Pages 28-30) shows 5 of these 9 were rejected for:

- Qualification failures
- Technical specification failures (display resolution, heat dissipation, monitor requirements, anti-malware software, power plug compliance)

LOT 3 & LOT 4: Same pattern continues

Rules Violated:

- **EVAL2024 Form 10A Instructions:** "Preliminary Examination shall examine all bids for: administrative compliance, eligibility, technical envelope compliance, financial envelope compliance"
- **PR2025 Section V Para 5.38-5.40:** "Responsiveness must be determined during preliminary examination... Only responsive Bids/Proposals proceed to detailed evaluation"
- **PR2025 Section V Para 5.40:** "Non-responsive Bids/Proposals shall be rejected and shall not subsequently be made responsive"

Critical Analysis: Proper evaluation sequence per WB regulations:

1. **Preliminary Examination (Form 10A):** Check administrative compliance, eligibility, completeness, substantial responsiveness to mandatory requirements
2. **Detailed Qualification (Form 11A):** Detailed assessment of qualification criteria for responsive bidders only
3. **Detailed Technical (Form 12-13):** Scoring of rated criteria for qualified bidders only

What Actually Happened:

1. Form 10A: All bidders marked "Substantially Responsive"
2. Form 11A & 12: Bidders found to fail mandatory qualification and technical requirements
3. Form 3: Bidders rejected for failing requirements that should have been caught in preliminary examination

Questions:

1. What did "Substantially Responsive" mean in preliminary examination if mandatory requirements were not checked?
2. Why were mandatory technical specifications (green cells) not evaluated at preliminary stage?
3. How can a bid be "Substantially Responsive" (Page 56) yet later determined "not meet the minimum requirement of mandatory criteria" (Page 24)?

Required Actions:

1. Clarify what was actually checked during preliminary examination (Form 10A, Pages 56-62)
2. Explain the meaning of "Substantially Responsive" as applied - does this only mean "complete submission" without checking mandatory requirements?
3. Revise evaluation sequence to align with WB procedures:
    - Preliminary examination should identify non-responsive bids (those failing mandatory requirements)
    - Only responsive bids proceed to detailed qualification and technical evaluation
4. Re-do Form 10A with proper preliminary examination, OR explain why all mandatory requirements were deferred to detailed evaluation stage

CRITICAL ISSUE 5: Specific Experience Quantity Verification Inadequately Documented

Pages: 24-39 (Form 3), 67-160 (Form 11A)

Description: Multiple bidders rejected for "Minimum required experience not meet (Requirement 21 unit)" with insufficient documentation of what was actually submitted and how it was verified.

Specific Examples:

LOT 2 - Canon Medical Systems (Page 28-29):

- **Rejection Reason 1:** "Not Meet Qualification on Specific Experience minimum quantity 21 units as it has only maximum 4 units within the last 7 years. Hence the bidder only provides 3 units on 2023 and 4 units on 2024 as supported documents."
- **Issue:** 3 + 4 = 7 units, not "maximum 4 units." Math error in justification?
- **Issue:** Requirement is "cumulative 21 unit annually in any of year" - does this mean 21 units in one single year? Or cumulative 21 units total over 7 years?

LOT 2 - Innvolution Healthcare Group (Page 29-30):

- **Rejection Reason 1:** "Not Meet Qualification, Qualifications related to 'annual production capacity for each of the last four (4) years is at least 50% of the quantity specified in each lot', in 2020, only 25 units were produced from the minimum requirement of 35 units."
- **Issue:** This is about MANUFACTURING capacity (requirement 1(d) in Form 11A), NOT specific experience (requirement 1(b))
- **Issue:** 25 units vs. 35 required = shortfall of 10 units. Was clarification sought about whether capacity could be ramped up?

LOT 3 - Shanghai United Imaging (Page 33-34):

- **Reason 1:** "Not Meet Qualification, Minimum required experience not meet (Requirement 21 unit):
  - 1 Unit (2019)
  - 6 Unit (2020)
  - 1 Unit (2022)
  - 2 Unit (2023)"
- **Total:** 10 units over 4 of the 7 years
- **Issue:** Where is data for 2018, 2021, 2024? Were contracts in these years zero, or were they not documented?
- **Issue:** Again, does requirement mean "21 units in one year" or "cumulative 21 units over 7 years"?

Rules Violated:

- **Cathlab Rules A5 (Section III page 53):** "The Bidders shall have past contract experience to supply and install cathlab equipment of minimum cumulative [X] unit annually in any of year within the last seven (7) years"
- **PR2025 Section V Para 5.42:** May request clarification of ambiguous bid information
- **EVAL2024 Form 11A:** Requires documentation of "Bidders/Proposers Information to Demonstrate Compliance" with references

Critical Analysis: The phrase "minimum cumulative 45 unit annually in any of year" is ambiguous:

- **Interpretation A:** 45 units supplied/installed in any single year within the last 7 years
- **Interpretation B:** Cumulative 45 units total across all 7 years combined

Form 11A evaluations (Pages 67-160) show passing bidders with entries like:

- "53 (2021)" - meaning 53 units in year 2021 alone ✓
- "93 Units (2023)" - meaning 93 units in year 2023 alone ✓

This suggests Interpretation A was applied. But rejected bidders appear to have been evaluated against cumulative total, or documentation was insufficient.

Required Actions:

1. Clarify official interpretation of "minimum cumulative X unit annually in any of year" requirement
2. For each rejected bidder citing insufficient specific experience:
    - Provide table showing contracts submitted by bidder (year, quantity, contract reference)
    - Show evaluation committee's verification of contract authenticity and quantities
    - Document any clarification requests sent asking for additional contract evidence
3. Correct mathematical errors in justifications (e.g., "3 units on 2023 and 4 units on 2024" should total 7, not "maximum 4")
4. Distinguish between "Specific Experience" (requirement 1(b)) and "Manufacturing Capacity" (requirement 1(d)) - don't conflate them
5. Show Form 11A pages for all rejected bidders demonstrating detailed qualification assessment

CRITICAL ISSUE 6: Technical Specification Rejections Without Adequate Evidence

Pages: 24-39 (Form 3)

Description: Multiple bidders rejected for failing specific technical requirements, but justifications lack:

- Exact requirement specification from bidding documents
- What bidder actually offered
- Reference to clarification process

Examples Requiring Detailed Documentation:

Display Resolution Requirements (LOT 2, Pages 28-30):

Canon Medical Systems:

- **Rejection Reason 2:** "Not meet the Technical specification at Row Number 165 (Number of Display Monitor - Control console). Display resolution does not meet 2K."
- **Rejection Reason 3:** "Not meet the Technical specification at Row Number 171 (Number of Display Monitor - Viewing Workstation). Display resolution does not meet 2K."

Questions:

- What resolution did Canon offer? (1920×1080? 1080p?)
- What exactly is "2K resolution" requirement? (2048×1080? 2560×1440? Or ~2000 horizontal pixels?)
- Is 1920×1080 substantially equivalent to 2K for clinical purposes?
- Was clarification sought per ITB 25.26 "substantially equivalent standards" principle?

Heat Dissipation Rate (LOT 2, Page 29-30):

Innvolution Healthcare Group:

- **Rejection Reason 2:** "Not Meet the Technical specification at Row Number 110 (Heat Dissipation Rate, HU/min). The requirement value of 'Heat Dissipation' does not meet the requirements, for the record 1 HU = 1.4 Joules; 280,000 HU x 1.4 = 392,000 Joules, while the response submitted is 300,000 Joules."

Analysis:

- Committee performed calculation showing shortfall
- **But:** Was this a mandatory requirement (green cell) or rated criterion (orange cell)?
- **Issue:** 300,000 vs. 392,000 = 23% shortfall. Is this "substantial responsiveness" issue or minor technical deficiency?
- **Question:** Does lower heat dissipation rate mean equipment is unsafe, or just less capable in high-volume environments?

Number of Display Monitors (LOT 2, Page 29-30):

Innvolution Healthcare Group:

- **Rejection Reason 3:** "Not meet the Technical specification at Row Number 165 (Number of Display Monitors - Control Console). 2 monitors were required but only 1 was offered."

Analysis:

- Clear-cut failure IF Row 165 is mandatory requirement (green cell)
- **Question:** Was this requirement marked as mandatory (green) or information/ rated (orange/white)?

Anti-Malware Software (LOT 2, Page 30):

JV of Xianqin (Tianjin) & Lepu Medical:

- **Rejection:** "Not meet the Technical specification at Row Number 379 (Anti-malware Software and Firewalls). The bidder responds 'No need for anti-

malware software since no USB port/ no connection to internet', so that's not meet the requirement."

Analysis:

- Bidder proposed air-gapped security approach (no USB, no internet = no malware risk)
- **Question:** Is this functionally equivalent security solution?
- **Issue:** Was clarification sought to understand bidder's cybersecurity architecture?
- **Regulation:** PR2025 Section V Para 5.26 requires acceptance of "substantially equivalent" approaches

Rules Violated:

- **PR2025 Section V Para 5.25-5.26:** Technical specifications should promote broad competition; substantially equivalent standards should be accepted
- **PR2025 Section V Para 5.42:** Clarification should be sought on minor issues
- **Cathlab Rules B38:** Clear distinction required between mandatory (green) and rated (orange) criteria
- **EVAL2024 Form 3:** Requires specific documentation of what requirement was not met and why

Required Actions:

1. For EACH technical specification rejection:
    - Provide Row Number reference from Excel file
    - State exact requirement text
    - Show whether requirement was mandatory (green cell) or rated (orange cell)
    - Document what bidder offered (with bid page reference)
    - Quantify the gap or deficiency
    - Show clarification request (if applicable) and bidder response
2. For "substantially equivalent" arguments (e.g., air-gapped security vs. anti-malware software):
    - Document technical evaluation of equivalency
    - Show basis for determining non-equivalence
3. For quantitative shortfalls (e.g., heat dissipation, resolution):
    - Explain materiality: does shortfall make equipment unsafe or unsuitable?
    - Document whether gap was clarified with bidder

CRITICAL ISSUE 7: Pre-Installation Requirements Interpretation

Pages: 26-27 (LOT 1), 28-30 (LOT 2)

Description: Multiple bidders rejected for incomplete installation requirements stating they would not provide electrical cables to panel, yet unclear if this cable provision was within scope of bidder's responsibility or purchaser's responsibility.

Specific Examples:

LOT 1 - Canon Medical Systems (Page 26):

- **Rejection Reason 4:** "Not meet the Technical specification at Row Number 429 (Pre-Installation Requirement - for Radiographic/Angiography), The Bidder response that 'Yes, not include electricity, power cable to panel electricity, power cable for ups to panel electricity'. **So that's not meet the requirement because of incomplete installation (excluding cable).**"
- **Rejection Reason 5:** Same issue for Row Number 441 (Pre-Installation Requirement - for Lights)

LOT 1 - Innvolution Healthcare Group (Page 29-30):

- Same rejection reasoning applied

Critical Questions:

1. Does "Pre-Installation Requirement" Row 429/441 require bidder to supply and install cables from equipment to electrical panel?
2. Or does it require bidder to SPECIFY what pre-installation works are needed (which purchaser would arrange)?
3. Is cable to main panel typically within equipment supplier's scope, or is this building infrastructure (purchaser's scope)?

Comparison to Passing Bidders:

- Form 12 (Pages 161+) should show how passing bidders responded to Rows 429 and 441
- **Question:** Did passing bidders commit to providing power cables to panel? Or did they also exclude this?

Rules Violated:

- **PR2025 Section V Para 5.42:** Should seek clarification when scope boundaries are unclear
- **PR2025 Section VII (Schedule of Requirements):** Should clearly define scope boundaries between supplier and purchaser responsibilities

Required Actions:

1. Provide exact text of Row 429 and 441 requirements from Excel file
2. Clarify scope boundary: Is power cable to main electrical panel:
    - Part of equipment supply and installation (bidder's scope)?
    - Part of site preparation and building infrastructure (purchaser's scope)?
3. Show how passing bidders responded to Rows 429 and 441 in their Form 12 submissions
4. If passing bidders also excluded power cables to panel, explain why they were not rejected
5. If requirement was ambiguous, document why clarification wasn't sought rather than outright rejection

CRITICAL ISSUE 8: Missing Form 10.2 - Environmental & Social Evaluation

Pages: Table of Contents (Page 3), Missing from report

Description: Form 10.2 "Preliminary Evaluation - E&S Related Completeness Check" is listed as required in Table of Contents but is NOT provided in the evaluation report, despite E&S requirements being mentioned in Section I General Information.

Evidence of E&S Requirements:

Page 10-11 (General Information - Recommendation section): States project must include:

- "OHS (Occupational Health and Safety) Plan including: Safety aspects during equipment's installation and maintenance"
- "Material Safety Data Sheet (MSDS) for relevant equipment and chemicals"

Rules Violated:

- **EVAL2024 Template:** Form 10.2 is mandatory component when E&S requirements are part of procurement
- **PR2025 Section III Para 3.26-3.31:** Projects must address environmental and social risks and conduct E&S assessments
- **PR2025 Annex II Para 7.1:** "Borrower must retain all documentation" including E&S evaluations

Required Actions:

1. Provide completed Form 10.2 showing E&S completeness check for ALL 25 bids
2. Document which bidders submitted:
    - OHS Plan with safety protocols
    - Material Safety Data Sheets (MSDS)
    - E&S Management Plan (if required)
3. If E&S requirements were waived or deemed not applicable, document Bank's approval for this decision
4. If E&S evaluation was conducted but not documented in standard form, provide the E&S assessment performed
5. Ensure E&S compliance verification occurred before determining substantial responsiveness (Form 10A)

MAJOR ISSUES (Should Fix for Quality Assurance)

MAJOR ISSUE 9: Identical Scoring Across All Five Evaluators Suggests Lack of Independent Assessment

Pages: Form 14 across all lots (Pages in Part 5, 1001+)

Description: Form 14 "Individual Evaluators' Evaluations Summary" shows all 5 evaluators gave IDENTICAL scores to each bidder for every single sub-criterion across all 4 lots. This pattern is statistically improbable and raises concerns about evaluation independence.

Evidence:

- Every bidder across all lots shows scores like: "61, 61, 61, 61, 61" (all five evaluators)
- Sub-criterion breakdown also identical: "48, 48, 48, 48, 48" for equipment specifications
- Zero variation across any evaluator for any bidder in any lot

Rules Violated:

- **PR2025 Section V Para 5.38:** Evaluation should involve thorough examination by appropriate personnel
- **Best Practice:** Independent evaluation reduces bias and improves quality
- **EVAL2024 Form 14 Purpose:** To show individual evaluator variations before consensus

Required Actions:

1. Clarify whether evaluators conducted independent assessments before committee consensus meeting
2. If independent assessments were conducted, provide individual evaluator worksheets showing their preliminary scores
3. If consensus scoring was used without independent assessment first, document the committee discussion and decision-making process
4. For future evaluations, implement process requiring individual evaluation followed by consensus discussion
5. Explain how technical scoring decisions were made - was there technical advisory support?

MAJOR ISSUE 10: Evaluation Committee Lacks Documented Technical Expertise

Pages: 13-14 (Evaluation Committee Members and Roles)

Description: Form shows 5 members from Procurement Bureau, all designated as "Evaluator," but:

- No information on technical qualifications in medical imaging or cardiology equipment
- Report itself states (Page 9): "Procurement committee has limited technical knowledge to determine the responsiveness of the bid against the technical specification requirements"
- No documentation of technical experts or subject matter specialists involved

Evidence: Page 13-14: All 5 members listed as:

- Position: "Head" or "Member"
- Organization: "Procurement Bureau MOH RI"
- Role: "Evaluator"
- No technical qualifications specified

Page 9 (Issues Encountered): Committee acknowledges: "Procurement committee has **limited technical knowledge** to determine the responsiveness of the bid against the technical specification requirements"

Rules Violated:

- **PR2025 Section III Para 3.1:** Governance requires appropriate roles and responsibilities for procurement complexity
- **PR2025 Section V Para 5.37:** Evaluation must be thorough and by personnel with appropriate expertise
- **Best Practice:** Complex technical evaluations require subject matter experts

Critical Concern: If evaluation committee lacked technical knowledge to determine responsiveness, how were judgments made about:

- Whether "Mobile C-arm" manufacturing counts as cathlab experience?
- Whether 1920×1080 display resolution is substantially equivalent to "2K"?
- Whether air-gapped security approach is equivalent to anti-malware software?
- Whether heat dissipation rate shortfall is material to equipment functionality?

Required Actions:

1. Document technical qualifications and relevant experience of each evaluation committee member
2. Identify whether external technical experts or clinical specialists were consulted during evaluation
3. Provide documentation of any technical advisory opinions obtained
4. For complex technical decisions (display resolution, cybersecurity approaches, heat dissipation, etc.), show technical analysis supporting conclusions
5. For future procurements, ensure evaluation committee includes or is supported by biomedical engineers, cardiologists, or medical equipment specialists

MAJOR ISSUE 11: Clarification Process Poorly Documented

Pages: 8-9 (Issues Encountered), 40-41 (Form 4 - Procurement Process Dates)

Description: Report mentions extensive clarification process ("July 4, 2024, up to September 10, 2024") with issues about "lengthy responses from bidder," but provides no documentation of:

- What clarifications were requested
- Which bidders received clarification requests
- What responses were provided
- How responses were evaluated

Evidence:

Page 8-9 (Issues Encountered):

- "Clarification to Bid: July 4, 2024, up to September 10, 2024"
- "Bidder's response to clarification: July 5, 2024, up to September 10, 2024"
- "Lengthy responses from the bidder while procurement committee has given reasonable time to respond to clarification request"

Page 40-41 (Form 4): Shows dates but no details about substance of clarifications

Form 3 References to Clarifications: Multiple rejections reference clarifications:

- "Based on clarification from the bidder, the procurement committee finds that responsiveness does not fulfill the requirements" (appears multiple times)
- Bidders responded "will be provided" to certain requirements (anti-malware software, installation specifications, etc.)

Rules Violated:

- **PR2025 Section V Para 5.42-5.44:** Clarification process must be documented and fair
- **PR2025 Annex II Para 7.1:** Must retain "all correspondence" between Borrower and bidders
- **EVAL2024 Best Practice:** Document clarification requests and responses in evaluation report

Required Actions:

1. Provide Annex with comprehensive clarification log:
    - Date of each clarification request
    - Bidder receiving clarification
    - Question asked
    - Response deadline given
    - Date response received
    - Substance of bidder's response
    - Evaluation committee's determination based on response
2. For rejections based on clarification responses, provide:
    - Original bidder submission (what was unclear?)
    - Clarification question sent
    - Bidder's clarification response (full text)
    - Committee's reasoning for rejection despite clarification
3. Demonstrate all bidders given equal opportunity to clarify and equivalent time to respond
4. Document committee meetings where clarification responses were evaluated

MAJOR ISSUE 12: Form 3 Rejections Insufficiently Detailed

Pages: 24-39 (Form 3 across all lots)

Description: While Form 3 provides rejection justifications, many lack sufficient detail for bidders to understand specific deficiencies or for Bank to verify fair evaluation.

Examples of Insufficient Detail:

Generic Statements:

- "Does not meet the requirement" - without quantifying the gap

- "Not meet the minimum requirement of mandatory criteria" - without specifying which criteria and how much shortfall

Missing Key Information:

- What bidder actually offered vs. what was required
- Page references to bid documents
- Whether issue was clarified with bidder
- Materiality of deficiency

Rules Violated:

- **EVAL2024 Form 3 Structure:** Requires "Requirement in Procurement Document not met" and detailed "Justification"
- **PR2025 Section V Para 5.78-5.80:** Bidders entitled to understand specific reasons for rejection for debriefing purposes
- **PR2025 Annex III Para 3.6:** Complaint responses must include "facts and evidence"

Required Actions:

1. Enhance Form 3 for each rejection to include:
    - **Requirement:** Exact text from Section III or Excel file with row/cell reference
    - **Bidder's Offer:** What bidder provided (with bid page reference)
    - **Gap:** Specific quantitative or qualitative deficiency
    - **Clarification:** Whether clarified and bidder's response
    - **Materiality:** Why deficiency prevents contract award
2. Organize rejections by type:
    - Qualification failures (financial, experience, manufacturing capacity)
    - Mandatory technical specification failures (with row references)
    - Responsiveness issues
3. Ensure consistency: same type of deficiency described same way across all rejected bidders

MAJOR ISSUE 13: Bid Validity Extension Process and Timeline Concerns

Pages: 8-9 (Summary of evaluation process), 40-41 (Form 4)

Description: Bid validity extended from September 30, 2024 to November 25, 2024 (nearly 2 months), raising questions about evaluation efficiency and potential price adjustment implications.

Timeline Analysis:

Page 40-41:

- Bid Opening: June 10, 2024
- Original Bid Validity: September 30, 2024

- Bank's NO for Extension: August 30, 2024
- Extension Request Sent: September 2, 2024
- Extended Validity: November 25, 2024
- Report Submission: September 17, 2024
- **Total Evaluation Time:** 99 days from bid opening to report submission (June 10 to September 17)

Page 8-9 Issues Encountered: Lists factors causing delays but doesn't provide mitigation strategy

Rules Violated:

- **PR2025 Annex II Para 6.1d:** First extension >4 weeks requires Bank no-objection (obtained ✓)
- **PR2025 Section V Para 5.21:** Extensions should be exception, not routine practice
- **Cathlab Rules C68 (ITB BDS 18.3(b)):** Price adjustments may apply if contract not awarded before extended validity date

Concerns:

1. What caused 3+ month evaluation period to necessitate extension?
2. Will financial evaluation be completed before November 25, 2024 expiration?
3. Do price adjustment provisions per ITB BDS 18.3(b) apply for late award?
4. Did all 14 passing bidders agree to extension, or did some decline?

Required Actions:

1. Document specific reasons for evaluation delays:
    - Clarification process duration: July 4 - September 10 (68 days)
    - Technical team response delays (mentioned on Page 9)
    - Committee capacity constraints
2. Provide evidence all bidders agreed to bid validity extension
3. Confirm financial evaluation can be completed before November 25, 2024
4. Clarify whether price adjustment provisions apply per ITB BDS 18.3(b)
5. Develop action plan to expedite future evaluations

MAJOR ISSUE 14: Minimum Specific Experience Quantities Potentially Too High

Pages: Throughout Form 3 and Form 11A (Pages 24-39, 67-160)

Description: Multiple bidders failed to meet minimum specific experience requirements of 21-56 units annually, suggesting requirements may be restrictive and limit competition.

Analysis of Requirements:

- **LOT 1:** 45 units annually
- **LOT 2:** 21 units annually
- **LOT 3:** 56 units annually
- **LOT 4:** 4 units annually

Market Reality Check:

- LOT 3 requires evidence of supplying 56 cathlab units in one single year
- This represents $10-15 million USD in equipment in one year for one contract
- Only major global manufacturers likely to achieve this volume
- May restrict competition to 3-5 global players

Rules Considerations:

- **PR2025 Section V Para 5.25:** Specifications should promote broadest possible competition
- **PR2025 Core Principle:** Value for money through fair competition
- **Cathlab Rules A5:** Requirements must be proportional to contract scope

Questions:

1. Are these experience requirements proportional to lot sizes?
2. Were market conditions analyzed to determine realistic experience thresholds?
3. How many potential suppliers were excluded due to these thresholds?
4. Could experience requirement be "cumulative units over 7 years" rather than "units in single year"?

Recommendation (Not Required Action):

- Consider market analysis to verify experience requirements don't unnecessarily restrict competition
- If requirements were set very high, document justification based on technical complexity or risk
- For future procurements, consider whether cumulative experience over multiple years would be sufficient

MAJOR ISSUE 15: Manufacturing Capacity Verification Method Unclear

Pages: Form 11A throughout (Pages 67-160), Form 3 (Pages 24-39)

Description: Requirement 1(d) states bidder must demonstrate "annual production capacity... is at least 50% the quantities specified under each lot" for last 4 years, but documentation of verification method is unclear.

Example:

LOT 2 - Innvolution Healthcare Group (Page 29-30): Rejected because: "in 2020, only 25 units were produced from the minimum requirement of 35 units"

Questions:

1. How was production capacity verified? Factory inspection? Manufacturer declaration? Third-party audit?
2. Is "production capacity" (theoretical maximum output) the same as "actual production" (units actually manufactured)?
3. If a bidder had capacity of 50 units/year but only produced 25 units due to market demand, does this fail the requirement?
4. Can bidder clarify that capacity existed even if not fully utilized?

Passing Bidders Documentation (Form 11A): Show entries like:

- "180 units/year (manufacturing declaration)"
- "500 units/year"
- "168 units/year"

But unclear:

- How were these figures verified?
- Are these theoretical capacity or actual production?
- What documentation was required (factory audit, ISO certification, sales records)?

Rules Violated:

- **Cathlab Rules A6:** Requirement should specify documentation required to demonstrate manufacturing capacity
- **EVAL2024 Form 11A:** Should document "Information to Demonstrate Compliance"

Required Actions:

1. Clarify whether requirement 1(d) means:
    - Theoretical production capacity (what factory can produce at full operation)
    - Actual production volume (what was actually manufactured)
2. Document what evidence was required and accepted to verify manufacturing capacity:
    - Factory inspection reports?
    - Manufacturer's declaration?
    - ISO certification of production capacity?
    - Sales records or delivery certificates?
3. For Innvolution rejection, show:
    - What documentation they provided (manufacturer declaration?)
    - Whether clarification was sought about factory capacity vs. actual production
    - Why 25 actual units produced meant capacity was insufficient
4. Show consistency: all passing bidders provided same type of documentation to verify capacity

MAJOR ISSUE 16: No Documentation of Evaluation Committee Meetings

Pages: Missing - Annex 1 template provided but not completed (Page 1097+)

Description: While Annex 1 (Attendance Register) template is included at end of report, there are NO completed attendance registers documenting:

- When evaluation committee met
- Who attended each meeting
- What decisions were made at each session

Rules Violated:

- **EVAL2024 Annex 1:** Attendance Register should document all key meetings
- **PR2025 Section III Para 3.1:** Clear accountability requires documentation of decision-making
- **Best Practice:** Committee proceedings should be minuted

Required Actions:

1. Provide completed Attendance Register(s) showing:
    - Initial evaluation planning meeting
    - Bid opening attendance (June 10, 2024)
    - Technical evaluation working sessions (June-September)
    - Clarification review meetings
    - Final consensus meeting for rejections and scoring
2. Document who attended each meeting and what major decisions were made
3. Provide brief minutes of key decisions:
    - Decision to reject specific bidders (with rationale discussion)
    - Interpretation of ambiguous requirements
    - Scoring methodology discussions
4. Ensure all 5 committee members participated consistently or document absences

MAJOR ISSUE 17: Power Plug Compliance Rejection Appears Overly Strict

Pages: 26-27 (LOT 1 - Canon Medical Systems rejection)

Description: Bidder rejected for offering "Indian standard" power plug when requirement was "Hospital Grade Type F power plug, in compliance with Indonesia requirements."

Specific Example:

Page 26: Canon Medical Systems - Rejection Reason 4: "Not meet the Technical specification at Row Number 344... the requirement is 'Hospital Grade Type F power

plug, in compliance with Indonesia requirements', but the bidder response is with 'Indian standard', but the requirement is 'Hospital Grade Type F power plug, in compliance with Indonesia requirements'."

Critical Analysis:

1. **Type F plug:** This is standard European "Schuko" plug used in Indonesia and throughout Europe/Asia
2. **Indian standard plug:** India uses Type C, D, and M plugs, which may be compatible with Type F receptacles
3. **Question:** Did bidder offer to supply power cord with Indonesian-compliant Type F plug during clarification?
4. **Question:** Is this a material deficiency, or could it be resolved with simple power cord substitution?

Rules Considerations:

- **PR2025 Section V Para 5.26:** "Must add 'or equivalent' when specifying standards"
- **PR2025 Section V Para 5.42:** Minor issues should be clarified rather than grounds for rejection
- **IEC 60320:** International standard for appliance couplers allows plug swapping

Required Actions:

1. Clarify whether power plug compliance is:
    - Critical safety issue requiring Indonesian certification?
    - Simple matter of supplying correct power cord?
2. Document whether bidder was asked during clarification if they could provide Type F plugs
3. Show whether passing bidders all specified Indonesian Type F plugs in original bids, or whether some clarified this point
4. Consider whether "Indian standard" response was shorthand for "IEC-compliant" equipment with swappable power cords

MAJOR ISSUE 18: No Analysis of Competition Impact

Pages: Throughout report, but particularly 11-12 (Summary of bids received/ rejected)

Description: Report shows 25 bids received from 12 bidders, with 11 bids (44%) rejected, but provides no analysis of:

- Whether rejection rate is reasonable
- Impact on competition
- Whether multiple rejections of same bidder for same reasons suggests systemic issue

Evidence:

Page 11-12:

- 25 total bids across 4 lots
- 11 bids rejected (44% rejection rate)
- 14 bids passing to financial evaluation

By Lot:

- **LOT 1:** 5 bids received, 2 rejected (40% rejection)
- **LOT 2:** 9 bids received, 5 rejected (56% rejection)
- **LOT 3:** 6 bids received, 2 rejected (33% rejection)
- **LOT 4:** 5 bids received, 2 rejected (40% rejection)

Concerns:

1. **LOT 2:** 56% rejection rate - only 4 bidders proceed to financial evaluation. Is competition adequate?
2. **Repeat rejections:** Shanghai United Imaging rejected in LOT 1, 2, 3 for similar reasons - suggests systematic documentation issue or genuinely non-compliant bidder
3. **PT Rajawali Nusindo:** Rejected in LOT 1, 2, 3 for manufacturing experience - same issue across all lots

Best Practice Considerations:

High rejection rates may indicate:

- Unrealistic requirements in bidding documents
- Insufficient pre-bid clarification
- Bidders submitting non-compliant bids speculatively
- Evaluation committee applying criteria too strictly

Recommended Actions (Not Mandatory):

1. Analyze rejection patterns to identify systematic issues
2. Consider whether rejection reasons indicate problems with:
    - Bidding document clarity
    - Pre-bid conference effectiveness
    - Market understanding of requirements
3. For future procurements:
    - Enhance pre-bid conference to clarify common misunderstandings
    - Consider simplifying overly complex technical requirements
    - Provide more detailed examples in bidding documents

MINOR ISSUES (Good Practice Improvements)

MINOR ISSUE 19: Inconsistent Terminology - "Substantially Responsive" vs. "Responsive"

Pages: Throughout Forms 2, 3, and 10A

Description: Report uses both "Substantially Responsive" and "Responsive" interchangeably without defining distinction.

PR2025 Reference: Section V Para 5.40 uses "Responsive" as binary determination

Suggestion:

- Use consistent terminology: "Responsive" or "Non-Responsive" only
- If "Substantially Responsive" has specific meaning different from "Responsive," define it
- Align with World Bank standard terminology

MINOR ISSUE 20: Table of Contents Page Numbering Errors

Pages: Table of Contents (Pages 2-3)

Description: Lists "Form 16" starting at page "1067" which should be page 106-107. Multiple forms show impossible page numbers.

Suggestion:

- Correct page numbering throughout report
- Ensure Table of Contents accurately reflects actual page locations
- Use continuous pagination if report is consolidated from multiple documents

MINOR ISSUE 21: Missing Individual Evaluator Signatures on Technical Scoring Sheets

Pages: Form 13 examples (if provided) and Form 14 (1001+)

Description: If individual evaluators completed separate scoring worksheets for Form 13, these should be signed and dated individually.

Best Practice: Clear audit trail requires individual evaluator accountability

Suggestion:

- If individual worksheets exist, include them with signatures
- If consensus scoring was used exclusively, document this approach clearly
- For future evaluations, require individual pre-scoring before consensus

MINOR ISSUE 22: "Issues Encountered" Section Lacks Resolution Documentation

Pages: 8-9 (Issues Encountered)

Description: Lists six issues encountered during evaluation but provides no information on how issues were resolved or lessons learned.

Issues Listed:

1. Lengthy bidder responses to clarifications
2. Manual data entry from flash drives
3. Incomplete qualification data from bidders
4. Confusing bidder responses in rated columns
5. Limited technical knowledge of committee
6. Lengthy technical team responses

Suggestion:

1. For each issue, document:
    - How it was resolved in this evaluation
    - Impact on timeline or quality
    - Preventive measures for future procurements
2. Develop lessons learned document for:
    - Clearer file submission instructions
    - More explicit qualification data requirements
    - Timeline adjustments for technical review
    - Technical specialist engagement earlier in process

MINOR ISSUE 23: Currency Conversion Not Yet Applicable

Pages: Part 5 (Financial Evaluation forms 1001+)

Description: Financial evaluation forms (Forms 16-26) are blank templates as financial envelopes not yet opened. However, report should clarify exchange rate methodology to be applied.

Suggestion:

- Document exchange rate source to be used (e.g., Bank's reference rate on opening date)
- Specify currency conversion approach per PR2025 Annex X Para 3.6
- Prepare currency conversion forms in advance of financial opening

COMPLIANT AREAS (Positive Observations)

The evaluation report demonstrates several strengths:

1. Comprehensive Bid Tracking (Pages 11-23):

- All 25 bids across 4 lots systematically documented
- Clear summary tables (Forms 2 and 3) providing overview
- Structured tracking of bid status through evaluation process

2. Multi-Evaluator Approach (Pages 13-14):

- Five-member evaluation committee provides multiple perspectives

- All five members signed each evaluation form consistently
- Committee composition from Procurement Bureau ensures procurement regulation knowledge

3. Form-Based Structure (Throughout):

- Report follows World Bank EVAL2024 template structure
- Appropriate forms used for each evaluation stage
- Systematic documentation approach

4. Detailed Technical Scoring Methodology (Pages 1001+):

- Form 13 and Form 14 provide granular breakdown by sub-criterion
- Technical scoring categories clearly identified:
  - Equipment specifications (70-73 points)
  - M&E requirements (3 points)
  - IT requirements (2 points)
  - AI/Telemedicine (11 points)
  - Operational support (40-44 points)

5. Qualification Evaluation Documentation (Pages 67-160):

- Form 11A provides detailed qualification assessment for each bidder
- Documents financial capability, specific experience, manufacturing capacity, cybersecurity
- Shows calculation of financial turnover and verification approach

6. Proper Prior Review Recognition:

- Report acknowledges need for Bank No-Objection before financial opening
- Understands two-envelope process requirements
- Seeks Bank approval at appropriate stage

7. Bid Validity Extension Properly Handled (Page 40-41):

- Bank's no-objection obtained August 30, 2024 before extension request
- Extension request sent to bidders September 2, 2024
- Followed proper sequence per PR2025 Annex II Para 6.1d

8. No Complaints Recorded (Page 14):

- Form 1 shows no procurement-related complaints received
- Suggests transparent and well-managed process from bidders' perspective
- Indicates good stakeholder engagement

9. Timely Addenda During Bidding (Page 42-43):

- Five addenda issued to clarify and update bidding documents
- Amendment 5 issued April 30, 2024 - well before bid deadline
- Shows responsive document management

10. Complete Bid Opening Records (Pages 44-54):

- Form 8A documents technical envelope opening with detailed notes
- Attendance and procedures properly recorded
- Financial envelopes segregated and sealed per two-envelope process

11. Consistent Committee Participation:

- All five evaluation committee members signed every form
- Shows continuous engagement throughout evaluation
- Good committee cohesion

OVERALL RECOMMENDATION: REQUEST MAJOR REVISION

The evaluation cannot proceed to Bank No-Objection for financial envelope opening until Critical Issues 1-8 are satisfactorily resolved.

Immediate Actions Required (Before Financial Envelope Opening):

1. Technical Score Threshold Clarification (CRITICAL ISSUE 1):

- Provide exact citation from Section III specifying minimum technical score for financial evaluation
- If NO threshold specified, ALL qualified/responsive bidders must proceed to financial evaluation
- Apply full combined formula to determine Most Advantageous Bid

2. Manufacturing Experience Criteria Documentation (CRITICAL ISSUE 2):

- Define "cathlab equipment manufacturing" in bidding documents
- Document whether Mobile C-arm manufacturing was explicitly excluded
- Show clarification process with affected bidders
- Demonstrate consistent application across all bidders

3. "Year of Installation" Requirement Clarification (CRITICAL ISSUE 3):

- Confirm whether Row 459 was mandatory (green) or information (white) requirement
- Distinguish "year of 1st production" from "year of installation"
- Show consistent application to all bidders

4. Preliminary Examination Reconciliation (CRITICAL ISSUE 4):

- Explain how all bidders were "substantially responsive" yet 44% failed mandatory requirements
- Re-do Form 10A with proper preliminary examination, OR
- Clarify that preliminary examination only checked completeness, not technical compliance

5. Form 10.2 Environmental & Social Evaluation (CRITICAL ISSUE 8):

- Provide completed Form 10.2 for all bidders
- Document OHS and MSDS submission verification

6. Enhanced Form 3 Documentation (CRITICAL ISSUES 5, 6, 7):

For each rejection, provide:

- Exact requirement text with document/row reference
- What bidder offered with bid page reference
- Quantified gap or deficiency
- Clarification request and response (if applicable)
- Materiality explanation

Actions Required for Complete Report (Before Final Approval):

7. Clarification Process Documentation (MAJOR ISSUE 11):

- Comprehensive log of all clarification requests and responses
- Fair treatment demonstration

8. Technical Expertise Documentation (MAJOR ISSUE 10):

- Committee members' qualifications
- Technical expert consultation evidence
- Technical analysis supporting complex decisions

9. Evaluation Committee Meetings (MAJOR ISSUE 16):

- Completed attendance registers
- Decision-making documentation
- Meeting minutes for key determinations

10. Independent Evaluation Verification (MAJOR ISSUE 9):

- Individual evaluator worksheets (if conducted separately)
- Consensus process documentation
- Explanation of identical scoring pattern

Recommendations for Future Procurements:

1. **Engage technical specialists** in evaluation committee for medical equipment procurements
2. **Clarify minimum thresholds** in bidding documents if any exist for technical scores
3. **Enhance preliminary examination** to catch non-responsive bids earlier
4. **Improve clarification documentation** with standardized logs and forms
5. **Allow adequate time** for technical evaluation (3+ months appears standard for this complexity)
6. **Consider experience requirements** proportionality to avoid unnecessary competition restriction
7. **Define scope boundaries** clearly (supplier vs. purchaser responsibilities for installation)
8. **Provide detailed Form 3 templates** requiring specific documentation for rejections

CONCLUSION

While the evaluation demonstrates structured approach and comprehensive documentation in many areas, the eight critical issues identified—particularly the

apparent application of an undocumented technical score threshold and inadequately justified rejections—prevent Bank No-Objection at this stage. Resolution of these issues is essential to ensure fair competition, compliance with World Bank procurement regulations, and achievement of value for money.

Once critical issues are resolved and adequate documentation provided, the evaluation may proceed to financial evaluation stage with Bank No-Objection.