



**INTERNATIONAL CIVIL AVIATION ORGANIZATION**  
**WESTERN AND CENTRAL AFRICA OFFICE**  
**Twenty Second Meeting of the AFI Satellite Network Management Committee (SNMC/22)**  
**(Lomé, Togo, 15-19 December 2014)**

---

**Agenda Item 3: Implementation of Special AFIRAN meeting recommendations 6/18**  
**(Presented by the Rapporteur)**  
**AFISNET Technical Evaluation and Re-engineering**

**SUMMARY**

The purpose of this paper is to analyze the status of implementation of AFI/RAN **Conclusion 6/18: AFISNET Technical Evaluation and re-engineering, that calls for AFISNET Evaluation and re-engineering;**

**Reference:**

Report of SP AFI RAN 8 Meeting

Reports of SNMC 16, 17, 18, 19, 20 and 21 meetings

Conclusions of the first meeting of the Joint Technical Evaluation and Re-engineering Team

**Action by the meeting in paragraph 3**

## **I- Introduction**

1.1 The AFI RAN meeting held in Durban, South Africa from 24 to 29 November 2008 formulated **Conclusion 6/18: AFISNET Technical Evaluation and re-engineering, that calls upon for AFISNET Evaluation and re-engineering** and reads as follows:

**Implementation of Conclusion 6/18: AFISNET Technical Evaluation and re-engineering:**

*That, as a matter of urgency, ICAO and States involved in AFISNET follow-up on*

**Conclusion 16/07 of Satellite Network Management Committee (SNMC/16).** *(Conclusion provided in appendix 1 to this document).*

1.2 Further to the evaluation of the list of technical experts proposed by ICAO for the conduct of the above mentioned audit, the SNMC at its 21<sup>st</sup> meeting decided (Ref. Decision 21/09) to retain a different approach i.e. that the interests of the AFISNET would be better served by appointing a consultancy firm with a high level of expertise in the telecommunications domain.

1.3 Following few exchanges of correspondences with the ICAO/TCB, a sealed tender was launched on the TCB website was issued on 10 September 2014, with the closing date on 2 October 2014, further extended till 31 October 2014 with the aim of contracting a consultancy firm for the performance of the audit. Upon the closing date, two bids were received, evaluated by ICAO and are hereby presented for your consideration.

1.4 Purpose of the evaluation process (Art. 7 of ICAO Procurement Code)

The objectives of the evaluation process are to:

- a) compare the bids received with the ICAO technical specifications and ensure that all intended functional and operational requirements of the equipment and/or services are met;
- b) assess the reasonableness of the price and compliance with ICAO's General Terms and Conditions;
- c) assess the financial integrity and standing of the recommended supplier and/or the capacity to deliver the goods and/or services as tendered.

## **2. Discussion**

2.1 Presentation of the ICAO Tendering process and general principles (for services).

2.2 The tender issued by TCB generated a significant interest given the number (close to 20) of companies that downloaded the tender documentation. Several questions/clarifications were asked during the process pertaining to the current condition of the equipment and these were addressed by ICAO directly as the answers were available within the tendering documentation.

2.3 Bids were received and evaluated (as per the evaluation methodology described in appendix 2) for the two following companies: ADPI and ISDEFE.

#### 2.4 Technical evaluation

##### 2.4.1 ADPI

###### *a. Formal criteria*

ADPI met all the Formal Criteria. The tenderer provided all the specified documentation as per ICAO's requirements. In addition, ADPI met all the Corporate Eligibility Criterion. The tenderer has an excellent corporate experience, good capability and is in good financial standing.

Overall, ADPI is a strong corporation and meets all the necessary formal and corporate ICAO requirements.

###### *b. Technical criteria*

ADPI has all the skills required to perform the AFISNET Network audit. It has a thorough knowledge of the network based on the technical evaluation submitted and in particular its staffing plan. The key and support personnel performing the work has an impressive background and required skill-set needed to perform a detailed evaluation/audit of the existing system. They will be able to provide ICAO with the recommended changes or technology gaps that will drive the future changes of this network.

ADPI had a realistic 5.5 month schedule and plan to carry out this task. Although they did mention concerns about the existing health issues in Africa, they still plan to send their experience personnel to perform the required survey. Furthermore, the company has a quality system in place and is ISO-9001 certified.

##### 2.4.2 ISDEFE

###### *a. Formal criteria*

Also, ISDEFE met all the Formal Criteria. The tenderer provided all the specified documentation per ICAO's requirements. In addition, ISDEFE met all the Corporate Eligibility Criterion. The tenderer has excellent corporate experience and capability and is in good financial standing.

Overall, ISDEFE is a strong corporation and meets all the necessary formal and corporate ICAO requirements.

###### *b. Technical criteria*

ISDEFE has a good plan for conducting the survey; however, they do not plan to use the identified experts to carry out the plan. ISDEFE plans to use an on-site partner, Oasis Networks, for all but one site visit. Technical Proposal Annex B was provided as back-up material to describe the partner, but no viable information concerning the partner was given, specifically as to Oasis' technical capabilities.

ISDEFE mentions that the AFISNET network is a "very complex network". One wonders why it would not send its most experienced engineers to perform the required survey. Experienced experts will identify issues and concerns that others will miss. In addition, ISDEFE (on page 44 of their Technical Proposal) believes that their workload estimates are optimistic and informs ICAO that additional costs will likely occur or the scope of the work will have to be adjusted (reduced).

Furthermore, when discussing their schedule, ISDEFE has concerns about the current situation in Africa and state that the schedule is a planning schedule versus a project schedule. It is an indication that ISDEFE cannot meet the 6 month requirement.

##### 2.4.3. Summary

After review of the formal criteria and technical criteria, both suppliers will be commercially evaluated. From a technical point of view, ADPI's offer is more technically sound.

#### 2.5. Commercial evaluation (Art. 7.2 b) of ICAO Procurement Code)

The following table summarizes the prices proposed by the companies selected for commercial evaluation:

<b>Company name</b>	<b>Price (USD)</b>	<b>Score</b>
ADPI	\$265,000	400
ISDEFE	\$300,000	353

## 2.6 Recommendation

For ICAO:

- 1) There are no identified concerns with ADPI.
- 2) There are concerns with ISDEFE on:
  - Unidentified experts to carry out the plan proposed by ISDEFE
  - ISFEDE plans to use an on-site partner without indicating a viable information concerning this partner
  - Indication that ISFEDE may not meet the 6 months requirements
  - ISDEFE believes that their workload estimates are optimistic and informs ICAO that additional costs will likely occur or the scope of the work will have to be adjusted (reduced).

After commercial evaluation, ADPI has been deemed the company with the best scoring (technical + commercial) and is therefore recommended for the award of the contract for the technical evaluation and re-engineering of the AFISNET.

<b>Company name</b>	<b>Technical Score</b>	<b>Commercial Score</b>	<b>Total Score</b>
ADPI	559	400	959
ISDEFE	547	353	900

## 3. Actions by the meeting

The meeting is kindly invited to:

- a) Take note of the information provided
- b) Approve the recommendation for the supplier;
- c) Agree on a schedule to convene of the inception meeting in January 2015.

-----

**Conclusion 16/07: AFISNET technical evaluation and re-engineering project**

*That AFISNET member Administrations and Organizations undertake to implement a joint technical evaluation of the network in view of its re-engineering, in accordance with SNMC Conclusion 15/06. In this connection:*

*1) AFISNET member Administrations and Organizations should implement a joint technical evaluation of the network. In so doing, they should establish a team of qualified experts to:*

*a) conduct a comprehensive assessment of the network potential for current and future requirements and applications;*

*b) identify technical and operational deficiencies of the current network and propose short term solutions for their mitigation;*

*c) develop user requirements and basic specifications for the re-engineering of the network, to be submitted for formal approval by members;*

*d) participate in the request for proposals (RFP) process referred to in 2) hereunder; and*

*e) prepare a report for consideration by the next SNMC meeting;*

*2) a request for proposal (RFP) for upgrading/re-engineering of AFISNET, including technical, operational, financial and institutional aspects should be developed on the basis of a comprehensive assessment of current and future requirements and applications to be supported by the network; and*

*3) the ICAO Regional Office propose the timescales for the RFP process and related steps based on 1) above for consideration by the next SNMC meeting*

**APPENDIX 2****EVALUATION METHODOLOGY (ICAO Procurement Code)****1 Main evaluation factors**

The bases for the evaluation of the services are:

- Compliance with the technical requirements submitted by the end-user and with ICAO instruction to tenderers and Terms and Conditions.
- Best value for money.

The bids are evaluated with the evaluation criteria as defined at the time of the tender and as included in Attachment I.

**2 Formal evaluation**

Formal criteria will be evaluated on a PASS/FAIL basis. Suppliers have to pass all formal criteria to be eligible for evaluation of technical criteria. Formal criteria include:

- Attachment II "Terms of Reference";
- Commercial Offer submitted;
- Detailed Technical proposal;
- Schedule of implementation;
- Financial information;
- Three (3) References
- Proposal submitted before the closing date
- Offer meets Validity period
- Supplier Eligibility Declaration signed

**3 Technical & Commercial evaluation**

Technical criteria will focus on the following three main areas:

1. Corporate experience and capability
2. Proposed work plan and approach
3. Skill and experience of Personnel

Up to 600 points will be attributed to the technical merits. Tenderers have to reach a minimum of 70% (i.e. minimum 420 points) in the technical evaluation to be eligible for commercial consideration.

Price of companies who have reached 70 % of technical merits will be reviewed and received up to 400 points. For the calculation of the price score, the following formula will be used:  $P = y (\mu/z)$  where

P = points for the financial proposal being evaluated

y = maximum number of points for the financial proposal (i.e. 400)

$\mu$  = price of the lowest priced proposal having reached 70 % in technical merits

z = price of the proposal being evaluated

In this methodology (Cumulative Analysis), the maximum number of points assigned to the financial proposal is allocated to the lowest price/technically compliant proposal. All other price proposals receive points in inverse proportion.

#### **4 Vetting of the supplier**

Before being recommended for order award, vetting of the recommended company will be undertaken with review of references and review of the financial information.