



MINISTRY OF FINANCE AND THE PUBLIC SERVICE

OFFICE OF PUBLIC PROCUREMENT POLICY

Procurement Committee Bid Submission Checklist

44

45

46

47

Government of Jamaica

Procurement Committee Bid Submission Checklist

Disclaimer: Procuring entities shall adopt this template for their respective entities.

Section 21 of the Act mandates the head of a procuring entity to establish a procurement committee to review procurement proceedings for that procuring entity, and the operations of such committees must accord with administrative guidance issued by the Office of Public Procurement Policy.

Section 22 of the Act provides that the functions of the procurement committee are to:

- (a) Review and make recommendations to the head of the procuring entity (HPE) with respect to the award of procurement contracts that the head of the procuring entity requires the procurement committee to review;
- (b) Review evaluation reports on bids with respect to each award of procurement contracts referred to in paragraph (a); and
- (c) Maintain proper records of the proceedings of the committee, including records of the recommendations of the committee and the reasons for those recommendations.

In the event you do not recommend this submission, proceed to submit to the Head of Procuring Entity (HPE) without delay for their determination/decision.

DECISION	
Recommended <input type="checkbox"/> Not recommended <input type="checkbox"/>	
Name of recommend bidder _____ Bid price \$ _____	
Reasons for not recommending: <i>Detail reason(s) for not recommending</i>	
Disclaimer: I agree with the above mentioned information and understand to the best of my knowledge all the information enclosed.	
<i>All members are required to sign this document before submitting to the Head of Entity.</i>	
Chairperson: [Name] _____ [Signature] _____	
Members	
[Name] _____	[Signature] _____
[Name] _____	[Signature] _____
[Name] _____	[Signature] _____
[Name] _____	[Signature] _____
[Name] _____	[Signature] _____
[Name] _____	[Signature] _____
FOR HEAD OF ENTITY USE ONLY	
<input type="checkbox"/> Approved <input type="checkbox"/> Not Approved	
Date:	
HPE Name: _____	
HPE Signature: _____	

Procurement Committee Bid Submission Checklist

1 TITLE OF PROCUREMENT:

Procurement Reference #:

REVIEW ANY RESTRICTION OF COMPETITION

If Open Competition was used (whether National or International Competition, this Section does not apply, and you should move on to the following sections).

1. The procurement method utilized was:

- | | | | |
|------------------------|--------------------------|---|-------------------------------------|
| Restricted Bidding | <input type="checkbox"/> | Request for Proposals without Negotiation (Restricted) | <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> |
| Request for Quotations | <input type="checkbox"/> | Request for Proposals with Consecutive Negotiation (Restricted) | <input type="checkbox"/> |
| Single Source | <input type="checkbox"/> | | |

2. Was the restriction of competition justifiable?

The Committee must satisfy itself that the restriction of competition was logical, cogent, and defensible.

2a. The Committee should enquire into: Information from market research. <i>Review the market research findings</i>	Whether the acquisition conforms to the entity's standardization policy. <i>This reason cannot be accepted if the entity does not have an approved standardization policy</i>
Whether the procurement value threshold was followed.	Whether there was a genuine emergency or situation of extreme urgency <i>Consider the requirements stated in Regulation 7</i>
Whether the contemplated contract to be awarded to a previous supplier of the same subject matter is limited in size and no reasonable alternative exists	

COMMENTS

Detail concerns if any regarding these reasons in Section 2a above.

2 REVIEW KEY PROCEDURES

In this section, the Committee should examine any deviations from procedural requirements that may result in the unfair treatment of a bidder/supplier.

1. The Committee should enquire into whether:

PUBLICATION	PROCUREMENT PROCESSES	EVALUATION
The opportunity was sufficiently advertised to attract the attention of suppliers	All requests for clarification submitted by suppliers were addressed within the time specified in the bidding documents	Any evaluator had a conflict of interest
The period of prior notification conformed with the requirements of the regulations or were otherwise adequate.	All addenda were issued to all suppliers at the same time	Evaluator(s) faithfully followed the evaluation criteria that were disclosed in the bidding document. - <i>Ensure that scores are allocated correctly.</i> - <i>Ensure that bids are not unfairly rejected.</i> - <i>Ensure a bid that should be rejected is not accepted</i>
	The tender opening result was issued contemporaneously with the opening of tenders	

2. Did the procuring entity provide for a standstill period?

Yes No

3. Where a standstill period was not provided for, is the entity's justification acceptable pursuant to Section 44(4) (c) of the Act?

Yes No

4. Is there evidence of splintering as defined in Section 25G of the Act?

Yes No

To answer the question asked in Section 2 part 4 the committee must request from the procurement department:

- i. A list of all contracts awarded to the recommended bidder in the twelve months prior to the date of review of the submission.
- ii. A list of all contracts awarded **for the procurement subject matter** in the twelve months prior to the date of the review of the submission.

If there is evidence of splintering, the Committee should allow the procurement department to explain the contract bundling approaches and document any concerns for consideration by the Head of the Procuring Entity.

3 REVIEW BIDDING DOCUMENTS

In this section the Committee should focus its review on the formulation of the evaluation criteria and other selected sections of the bidding document to ensure that these are free from ambiguity, vagueness, and incompleteness.

1. The Committee should examine the evaluation criteria for the following issues.

Eligibility	Qualification	Contract Award
<p>Were suppliers clearly informed of the requirement for Public Procurement Commission (PPC) registration whether as a condition for participation or for contract award? Yes <input type="checkbox"/> No <input type="checkbox"/> Not applicable <input type="checkbox"/></p> <p><i>The Committee should review the Registration and Classification Regulations if necessary.</i></p>	<p>The qualification criteria were clearly stated. Yes <input type="checkbox"/> No <input type="checkbox"/></p> <p>Having reviewed the qualification criteria, you were able to:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Identify what bidder/supplier attributes the procuring entity is looking for. 	<p>Was the contract award criterion clearly stated? <i>Either lowest price OR most advantageous bid</i> Yes <input type="checkbox"/> No <input type="checkbox"/></p>
<p>Was the most appropriate PPC category chosen? Yes <input type="checkbox"/> No <input type="checkbox"/> Not applicable <input type="checkbox"/></p> <p>Was an appropriate grade selected? Yes <input type="checkbox"/> No <input type="checkbox"/> Not applicable <input type="checkbox"/></p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Identify the documents a bidder should submit to prove its qualification. - Understand how the procuring entity would allocate points for a range of attributes. 	<p>If most advantageous bid was chosen, were the evaluation criteria for the non-price factors (NPF) stated? Yes <input type="checkbox"/> No <input type="checkbox"/></p>
<p>Were suppliers clearly informed of the requirement for tax compliance in Jamaica whether as a condition for participation or for contract award? Yes <input type="checkbox"/> No <input type="checkbox"/> Not applicable <input type="checkbox"/></p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Identify a link between qualification criteria chosen and the subject matter of the procurement. <i>If the criteria appear biased, further explanation must be sought from the procurement department and/or requestor</i> 	<p>Having reviewed the evaluation criteria for the NPF, you were able to:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Identify what NPFs the procuring entity is looking for. - Understand how the procuring entity would allocate points for each NPF.

2. The Committee should further examine the following:

- Cross referencing errors likely to result in confusion to bidders/suppliers.
- Inconsistent dates and timelines for actions to be taken by bidders (Example deadlines for submission of bids were represented in different ways at different parts of the bidding document.
- Any other matter related to the drafting of the bidding document that is/was likely to disadvantage bidders/suppliers.

3. The Committee should further examine the specifications/scope of work/scope of services/terms of reference to identify if any aspect is biased, discriminatory, or otherwise objectively unjustifiable. Examples of these are:

- Inclusion of a brand name without justification.
- Requirements that are otherwise unduly specific (for example: are there max or min tolerances?)
The procurement office/department and/or requestor should be given an opportunity to explain the inclusion of any such specification that appears biased etc.

COMMENTS

Detail concerns if any regarding your review of the bidding documents.

4 REVIEW EVALUATION REPORT

The Committee should ensure that the evaluation report accounts for all actions, decisions etc. that have been taken in relation to the procurement. The evaluation report must not be deficient in any respect. *If the answer to any of the below is “no” return report for corrections.*

- 1. The procurement process from initiation to completion of evaluation is comprehensively documented.
Yes No

- 2. Reasons for rejection of bids are clearly stated.
Yes No

- 3. Where scores are allocated for any criterion/criteria, the scores are detailed (There should be a break-down together with qualitative explanations where necessary).
Yes No

- 4. Was the procurement office’s/department’s explanation for the acceptance of an abnormally low/high bid clearly stated?
Yes No

COMMENTS

Detail concerns if any regarding your review of the evaluation report.

5 OVERALL COMMENTS

To be completed by the Chairman.

Use this section to highlight any concerns not accounted for in the preceding sections. These will be considered by the Head of the Procuring Entity.