

GUIDELINES FOR TECHNICAL EVALUATION

Standard No.53 Apr. 4, 2007
Amended by Standard No.91 Dec. 11, 2008
Amended by Standard No.113 Jul. 24, 2009
Amended by Standard No.123 Mar. 11, 2010
Amended by Standard No.139 Sep. 14, 2010
Amended by Standard No.142 Oct. 15, 2010
Wholly Amended by Standard No.187 Apr. 25, 2012
Amended by Standard No.194 May 14, 2012
Amended by Standard No.232 May 27, 2013
Amended by Standard No.259 Dec. 31, 2013
Wholly Amended by Standard No.272 Jul. 29, 2014
Wholly Amended by Standard No.344 Oct. 31, 2017
Amended by Standard No.382 Jul. 13, 2018
Wholly/Title Amended by Guideline No.271 Feb. 22, 2019
Amended by Guideline No.274 May 3, 2019
Amended by Guideline No.310 Apr. 29, 2020
Amended by Guideline No.349 Apr. 8, 2021

CHAPTER 1. GENERAL PROVISIONS

Article 1 (Purpose) The purpose of these Guidelines shall be to determine the necessary details when the Korea International Cooperation Agency (hereinafter referred to as “KOICA”) evaluates a proposal in executing projects with important technical elements according to Article 39 (7) of the Detailed Enforcement Rules of the Regulations for Procurement and Contract in Grant Aid Projects.

Article 2 (Definition of Terms) The definitions of terms used in these Guidelines shall be as follows:

1. The term “Technical evaluation” (hereinafter referred to as “evaluation”) means where the evaluation commissioner comprehensively evaluates the technical capabilities

offered in the submitted proposal pursuant to the evaluation criteria, and shall be performed by convocation or written evaluation;

2. The term “Technical evaluation committee” (hereinafter referred to as “committee”) means a group of evaluation commissioners appointed under these Guidelines to evaluate the technical capabilities offered in individual proposals;
3. The term “Technical evaluation commissioner” (hereinafter referred to as “evaluation commissioner”) means a member appointed under these Guidelines for evaluating technical capabilities for providing services and/or goods, and shall be comprised of standing and non-standing members;
4. The term “Standing member of a committee” means an evaluation commissioner who performs technical evaluation among executive officers and employees of KOICA according to these Guidelines;
5. The term “Non-standing member of a committee” means an evaluation commissioner who performs the technology evaluation among those other than executive officers and employees of KOICA according to these Guidelines;
6. The term “Technical evaluation commissioners pool” means a pool of personnel separately managed by the evaluation department to form a committee;
7. The term “Electronic technical evaluation system” means a program and system for operating and managing the entire technical evaluation process through computerization, including committee planning, liaison between evaluation commissioners, implementing evaluation, and reporting results;
8. The term “Request for proposal” means a document issued to request submission of a proposal to a person who intends to participate in a project promoted by KOICA and where the technical elements are important;
9. The term “Proposal” means all documents related to technical proposals that a person who intends to participate in a project shall complete and submit in accordance with the request for proposal presented by KOICA;
10. The term “Convocation evaluation” means that the evaluation commissioner gathers at a place designated by the evaluation department to evaluate the proposal. The

evaluation may include the sessions for bidders' presentations and Q&A on the proposals subject to technical evaluation;

11. The term "Written evaluation" means evaluation of the proposal documentation, without any presentation of the proposal by the bidder and without any Q&A session; <Amended on Apr. 29, 2020>
12. The term "Preliminary review of proposal" means a procedure in which the evaluation commissioner reviews a proposal before the evaluation starts when the committee evaluates by convocation;
13. The term "Evaluation Department" means a department that directly performs the evaluation of a proposal;
14. The term "Department that commissioned the evaluation" means a department that commissioned the evaluation of a proposal;
15. The term "Project general manager (including Project Manager (PM), Team Leader (TL), Construction Manager (CM))" means the general manager suggested by the participant in the proposal for the project requested by KOICA;
16. The term "Contracting consortium" means an entity that has at least two members and is formed temporarily to jointly perform the service, project, and/or the relevant contract requested by KOICA.

Article 3 (Preparing and Submitting Proposals) (1) Bidding participants shall submit to KOICA at the location and date specified in the notice, proposals prepared according to the request for proposals and the tender notice. The table of contents of the proposal shall apply the guidelines for drafting proposals in the request for proposal. However, the guidelines in the tender notice shall be set based upon the characteristics of the relevant bid.

(2) When bidding participants wish to conduct a project with the cooperation of a person not affiliated with them, this shall be specified in the proposal.

(3) When bidding participants form a contracting consortium and wish to conduct a project, the purpose and each share ratio (joint implementation) or shared matters (shared implementation) shall be accurately specified in the proposal.

(4) Bidding participants may additionally describe in the proposal if there are improvements in the content of the request for proposal, plans for additional input by the proposer, quality improvement plan for project outputs, and plans to realize social values. <Amended on Apr. 29, 2020>

(5) Bidding participants shall complete and submit [Form 1], [Form 1-2], [Form 2], and [Form 2-2] along with documentary evidence (diploma, career certificate, performance certificate, employment certificate, qualification, and employment verification document (certificate of enrollment in the four major insurances such as National Pension, Employment Insurance, and Medical Insurance, etc)) for all matters for which KOICA requires evidence, such as all performance and technology holdings described in the proposal, and essential qualification requirements for key personnel. <Amended on Apr. 29, 2020>

(6) Proposals (including documentary evidence) shall be submitted in PDF file format. However, for projects deemed necessary considering the characteristics of the project, a proposal shall be submitted in paper form. In this case, bidding participants shall submit a proposal paper form by the method specified in the tender notice. <Newly Inserted on Apr. 29, 2020>

Article 4 (Receiving Proposals) KOICA shall accept bidding participants' proposals only when they reach the place by the date specified in the tender notice.

CHAPTER 2. COMPOSITION OF COMMITTEE

Article 5 (Composition of Committee) (1) KOICA shall organize and operate a committee to evaluate proposals.

(2) The committee shall appoint a chairman according to the criteria in [Table 1].

(3) Evaluation commissioners of the committee shall be standing and non-standing members

according to the criteria in [Table 1].

(4) The committee shall have an assistant administrator to conduct work and quantitative evaluation of the committee. The assistant administrator shall be the staff of the evaluation department.

(5) A quorum for committee meetings shall be at least 2/3 of the enrolled members.

(6) Notwithstanding Paragraph (2), if the chairman of the technical evaluation committee for the relevant service is unable to perform a task due to unavoidable circumstances, the vice president of the evaluation department may delegate the task to the director general, and the director general may subdelegate it to the director. If the vice president, director general, and director of the evaluation department are each unable to perform the chairman's duties due to unavoidable circumstances, one of the evaluation commissioners shall be appointed as chairman by sortition. The appointed commissioner shall act on behalf of the chairman and participate in the evaluation. <Newly Inserted on Apr. 29, 2020>

Article 6 (Qualification of Evaluation Commissioners) The qualification requirements for the evaluation commissioners shall be professional experience in performing tasks related to the subject-matter of evaluation, or those with specialized knowledge, as follows:

1. When persons employed by State agencies, local governments, or public institutions pursuant to the Act on Management of Public Institutions; and experienced in the relevant field fall under any of the following items;
 - a. A grade-6 or higher public official (the job grade of the State official is applied mutatis mutandis to the captain or higher in a case of military personnel; a professional public official; or a public institution employee);
 - b. A person who holds a qualification as a technical engineer pursuant to the National Technical Qualifications Act in the relevant field;
 - c. A person who has at least three years (five years) experience in the relevant field and has a doctorate (master's) degree in the field;
 - d. A person in charge of a technical position with at least an engineer license and at

least 13 years' work experience in the relevant field.

2. An assistant professor, associate professor, or professor who works in a college or university and has more than three years' experience as at least an assistant professor in the relevant field (excluding honorary professors). <Amended on Apr. 29, 2020>
3. Other persons deemed necessary by the president in consideration of the simplicity, urgency, and specificity of the project being evaluated.

Article 6-2 (Composition of Technical Evaluation Commissioners Pool) The evaluation department shall form an evaluation commissioners pool by publicly recruiting evaluation commissioners that meet the qualification requirements of Article 6, or by recommending suitable people through government departments, related organizations, and academia. In such cases, evaluation commissioners that meet the qualification requirements of Article 6 shall be included in the evaluation commissioners pool without a separate commissioning procedure.

[This Article Newly Inserted on Apr. 29, 2020]

Article 7 (Appointing and Liasing with Evaluation Commissioners)

- (1) To appoint an evaluation commissioner, a candidate shall be appointed by three to five times the number of evaluation commissioners among those included in the evaluation commissioners pool. The order for commencing liaison shall be determined through the electronic technical evaluation system. <Amended on Apr. 29, 2020>
- (2) Liaisons for appointing evaluation commissioners shall be conducted in at least two rounds according to the defined liaison order to confirm their availability to participate. The liaisons shall conclude when the number of required commissioners is reached. Each commissioner shall be confirmed by the day before the particular evaluation, except in emergency or special cases.
- (3) Where liaisons have not been conducted regarding the list of appointed candidates, a list of additional candidates shall be prepared, of within three times the required number of evaluation commissioners. Liaisons shall proceed according to the procedures of

Paragraphs (1) and (2), above. <Amended on Apr. 29, 2020>

(4) New evaluation commissioners recruited pursuant to Article 6-2 shall submit completed [Form 7] or a resume, and completed [Form 4]. <Amended on Apr. 29, 2020>

(5) <Deleted. Apr. 29, 2020>

(6) The authority of an appointed evaluation commissioner shall not be delegated to others.

(7) The evaluation department may dismiss an evaluation commissioner if the commissioner falls under any of the following:

1. When three times reports related to the commissioner's misconduct or corruption are received;
2. When corruption or equivalent misconduct falling under any subparagraph of Article 16 (5) is found in relation to an evaluation;
3. When he/she falls under any subparagraph of Article 33 of the State Public Officials Act;
4. When his/her demerit points under Article 24 (3) reach 100 points;
5. When the integrity of evaluation is violated by not abstaining from evaluation despite falling under any of the subparagraphs of Article 9 (1);
6. When ceasing to meet qualification requirements under Article 6;
7. When a physical or mental abnormality affects work performance;
8. When the evaluation commissioner resigns voluntarily;
9. Other cases where the head of the evaluation department deems that the commissioner is unsuited due to a reason such as poor participation in an evaluation.

<Newly Inserted on Apr. 29, 2020>

⑧ If an evaluation commissioner is dismissed pursuant to Paragraph (7), the evaluation department shall not be re-commissioned or registered as a member. <Newly Inserted on Apr. 29, 2020>

Article 8 (Duty of Committee) (1) The chairman shall supervise the committee.

(2) The chairman and evaluation commissioners shall perform an evaluation by the following allocation. However, if necessary, evaluation criteria for standing members and

non-standing members shall be configured differently according to the characteristics of the subject-matter of evaluation:

1. Chairman: Operation and general management of the committee;
 2. Evaluation commissioners: Qualitative evaluation of a proposal based on evaluation criteria such as general elements of the proposal, project management, and technology.
- (3) Members of the committee shall not disclose any confidential information acquired during the evaluation process. When a standing or non-standing member is commissioned, a Pledge, Personal Information Collection and Use Agreement, and Confirmation (report) of Prior Contact, in [Form 3], [Form 4] and [Form 5], shall be submitted. <Amended on Apr. 29, 2020>
- (4) The assistant administrator shall be in charge of quantitative evaluation of the proposal, and shall submit the results of evaluation to the committee, if necessary.

Article 9 (Compliance of Evaluation Commissioners) (1) The evaluation department shall notify the evaluation commissioners of any reasons for their abstaining and being excluded based upon the following cases, before starting to evaluate the proposal. If applicable, an evaluation commissioner shall immediately notify the chairman and assistant administrator and voluntarily abstain from evaluating the proposal: <Amended on Apr. 29, 2020>

1. If an evaluation commissioner performs services, consultation, and/or research in relation to the proposal for the company subject to evaluation;
2. If an evaluation commissioner conducts services, consultation, and/or research, including subcontracting at the request of the company subject to evaluation between January 1 of the previous year and the present; <Amended on Apr. 29, 2020>
3. If the evaluation commissioner has experience working in the company subject to evaluation within the three years preceding the evaluation date;
4. If the sponsorship funds received by the evaluation commissioner or the organization to which the commissioner belongs, from the company subject to evaluation is directly related to the agenda item;
5. Other cases falling under subparagraphs 1 through 4, in which it is determined that a

fair screening cannot be performed. <Amended on Apr. 29, 2020>

(2) If an evaluation commissioner violates Paragraph (1) (including if discovered after evaluation), the chairman shall take action according to Article 24. <Amended on Apr. 29, 2020>

CHAPTER 3. COMMITTEE MEETINGS AND EVALUATIONS

Article 10 (Evaluation Criteria and Evaluation Requests) (1) The technical elements of a proposal shall be evaluated according to the evaluation criteria table in [Table 3] through [Table 3-5]. However, the evaluation criteria may be set differently in the request for proposal, based upon the characteristics of the project. <Amended on Apr. 29, 2020>

(2) The department that commissioned the evaluation shall pre-consult with the evaluation department before establishing a bidding plan, and shall request the evaluation through a bid request.

(3) When evaluation of technical factors is required or determined necessary in the process of appointing a project operator, other than through bidding in an open competition, etc., the department that commissioned the evaluation shall request evaluation based on prior consultation with the evaluation department.

Article 11 (Establishing Evaluation Plans) (1) The evaluation department shall pre-establish an evaluation plan, including all matters related to evaluating a proposal, such as the composition of a committee and the date and place for the committee to evaluate the proposal by bidding participants. <Amended on Apr. 29, 2020>

(2) In cases of local bidding organized by overseas offices, the technical evaluation guidelines shall be applied mutatis mutandis, but evaluation shall be performed pursuant to a separate plan established based upon the local circumstances.

Article 12 (Methods of Evaluation) (1) Committee meetings shall be held at the time and place pre-announced by the evaluation department.

(2) In principle, the proposal shall be reviewed by the committee on the day of evaluation. However, if necessary, proposals shall be previewed considering the size, importance, and the number of proposals of the project.

(3) Notwithstanding Paragraph (2), evaluation may be conducted in writing if it falls under any of the following subparagraphs. In this case, the composition of the committee applies the standards in [Table 1]:

1. In cases where the reason for urgently holding evaluation is due to the project execution schedule;
2. In cases of a project with an order value of less than KRW 100 million (KRW 500 million for negotiated contracts);
3. When the subject-matter of evaluation is technically simple;
4. When it is impracticable to evaluate by convocation due to a natural disaster or other unavoidable circumstance. <Newly Inserted on Apr. 29, 2020>

(4) A proposal review time shall be 60 minutes initially, but if there are more than four proposals to be evaluated, at least five minutes shall be added for each proposal.

(5) Notwithstanding Paragraph (4), the chairman may shorten or extend the time for preliminary review of a proposal as follows:

1. If deemed necessary, when a proposal has been previewed pursuant to the provisions of Paragraph (2).
2. If it is deemed necessary considering the number of companies that submitted the proposal; the impracticability of the content to be evaluated; and the characteristics of the project.

(6) If necessary, KOICA may stipulate in a tender notice that the general manager of a project or one of the key personnel deems necessary to give a presentation regarding the proposal. KOICA may assign a score one level below the original evaluation grade to the evaluation criterion related to the general manager of the project or key personnel in any of the following cases:

1. If the general manager of the project or key personnel does not meet each of the requirements specified in the request for proposal;

2. If the proposal does not specify the general manager of the project or key personnel;
3. If an agent announces as a proposal anything aside from those specified as the subject-matter of the proposal presentation in the request for proposal;
4. No one participates in the proposal presentation.

<Amended on Apr. 29, 2020>

(7) If the representative of the contracting consortium is bankrupt, sanctioned as an unethical businessperson, subject to business suspension, or engages in invalid bidding, the consortium shall be disqualified on such ground. Proposals may be evaluated in cases of bankruptcy, sanctions against unethical businessperson, business suspension, or invalid bidding among members of the consortium other than the representative. In such cases, the investment ratio or the shareholding ratio shall be determined and submitted by the day before the deadline for submitting the bid, and the investment ratio or the share ratio of members with reasons for disqualification shall not be distributed to the remaining members.

(8) Where evaluating a contracting consortium pursuant to Paragraph (7), the investment ratio or shareholding ratio of disqualified members shall be converted to the ratio of the entire project. Then the score corresponding to the conversion rate (calculated by rounding to the fifth decimal place) shall be deducted from the evaluation score.

(9) When submitted documents are written in fraudulent or false information, they shall be handled as follows:

1. Prior to concluding the contract, the person who is eligible for negotiation shall be excluded or notification that the successful bidder has been decided shall be canceled;
2. If the contract is concluded, it shall be reviewed for cancellation or termination.

(10) If any of the contents of the proposal (including documentary evidence) submitted by the bidder falls under any of the following subparagraphs, as an exception, Paragraph (9) need not be applied.

1. If it is impracticable to attribute the submission of false documents to the bidder;
2. If it is evident that the severity of the falsehood is insignificant and does not affect the bidding result;

3. Other cases according to the reasons under Subparagraphs 1 and 2.

(11) KOICA shall disqualify the bidding participants if the participants have not completed or submitted [Form 2] or [Form 2-2]. <Newly Inserted on Apr. 29, 2020>

(12) Experts who participated in the project formation stage, such as preliminary and planning investigation of the service subject to evaluation after appointed by the method of Article 5 (1) 2 through 4 of the Guidelines on the Work Process of Professional Personnel, shall not participate as a general manager of the project in bidding for such services. If the expert violates this provision, the lowest grade shall be awarded to the evaluation criteria related to the general manager of the project or key personnel. <Newly Inserted on Apr. 29, 2020>

Article 12-2 (Presenting Proposal) (1) The order of presentation shall be determined by sortition on the day of evaluation.

(2) In principle, presentations shall be made by the general manager of a project. Up to three key personnel and project participants including the general manager may attend a the evaluation committee and answer the inquiries of evaluation commissioner. However, if deemed necessary based on the nature of the services, the number of persons present may be adjusted, and the number of persons shall be specified in the tender notice.

(3) In principle, presentations shall be concluded within 10 minutes using the presentation materials. However, if necessary, the presentation time may be adjusted depending on the nature of the service.

(4) A presentation shall be prepared based on contents of the proposal. If the contents differ from the proposal, the evaluation commissioner shall penalize the evaluation.

[This Article Newly Inserted on Apr. 29, 2020]

Article 13 (Evaluation Criteria and Allocation Limit of Proposal) (1) The evaluation criteria and allocation limits of proposals are as follows:

1. General services: [Table 3];
2. Architectural Design services: [Table 3-2];

3. Establishment of an informatization strategy (consulting), Services for developing software (operation), etc.: [Table 3-3];

4. Services for computer supervision: [Table 3-4]; <Amended on Apr. 29, 2020>

5. Services for supply goods: [Table 3-5]. <Amended on Apr. 29, 2020>

(2) If the department that commissioned the evaluation deems necessary when preparing a request for proposal, the allocation limit for each evaluation item shall be increased or reduced by up to 10 points considering the characteristics, purpose, and contents of the project, upon discussing it with the evaluation department. Evaluation criteria shall be added or removed.

(3) When evaluating a proposal, if points are added or deducted according to factors other than the reasons specified in the evaluation criteria table in [Table 3] to [Table 3-5], points may be added or deducted based upon [Table 4]. <Amended on Apr. 29, 2020>

(4) According to [Table 5-2], “win-win cooperation” shall be included in the quantitative evaluation criteria for a software business that orders at least KRW 2 billion worth of software based on the project budget (including VAT) that mid-sized software business operators can participate in. At least five points shall be allocated. However, in cases of competition between SMEs, the item “win-win cooperation” shall be excluded. <Amended on Apr.8, 2021>

(5) When the department that commissioned the evaluation by determining the number of points for the qualitative criteria in the evaluation criteria table, the evaluation shall be conducted accordingly. However, the criteria in each of the following subparagraphs shall be quantitatively evaluated according to Article 14. However, the total number of points in Subparagraphs 1 through 3 shall not exceed ten: <Amended on Apr. 29, 2020>

1. The credential status of a company;
2. The performance of similar projects by a company;
3. Win-win cooperation (can be included in software-related services).

Article 14 (Quantitative Evaluation) (1) For the quantitative evaluation of the proposal, the evaluation department shall conduct the evaluation in writing or on the electronic technical

evaluation system according to the request for proposal. The detailed criteria shall be handled according to the following criteria:

1. The difference between the highest score and the lowest score in the scoring interval for each quantitative evaluation item shall not exceed 30% of the scoring limit;
2. The evaluation of the business status base on its credit rating and the performance of similar projects shall be evaluated according to [Table 5]. However, if the project budget (execution limit) is less than the amount (subject to the release of goods or services under the WTO's Government Procurement Agreement) determined and notified by the Minister of Economy and Finance pursuant to provisions of Article 4 (1) of the Act on Contracts to Which the State is a Party, the performance of similar projects need not be evaluated;
3. Where adding "win-win cooperation" as a quantitative evaluation item pursuant to Article 13 (4), the number of points allocated for evaluating the business status and performance of similar projects shall be adjusted. <Amended on Apr. 8, 2021>

Article 15 (Conducting Evaluation) (1) In principle, the proposal shall be evaluated within seven (working) days from the date the proposal is received.

(2) The assistant administrator shall pre-notify bidding participants of the date and place for the committee meeting and preparations for it.

(3) The assistant administrator shall provide documents such as proposals and technical evaluation tables submitted by bidding participants to the evaluation commissioner on the day of evaluation. The assistant administrator shall conduct preliminary training for the commissioner to help understand the project and evaluation thereof. However, in order to help the commissioner understand the project and evaluation thereof, related documents such as the proposal, request for proposal, and evaluation table may be distributed in advance. <Amended on Apr. 29, 2020>

(4) The person in charge from the department that commissioned the evaluation shall explain the project characteristics to the commissioner at the time, date, and place designated by the chairman during the review of the proposal.

- (5) Notwithstanding Paragraph (4), if the department that commissioned the evaluation cannot provide a project description due to unavoidable circumstances, the department shall submit an explanation of such circumstances and the project description to the evaluation department by the day before the evaluation date. The document may be distributed in lieu of the project description.
- (6) For the fairness of the prior explanation, the chairman shall restrain any biased remarks of the department that commissioned the evaluation.
- (7) The assistant administrator shall maintain security and order in the venue where proposals are evaluated during evaluation.
- (8) Bidding participants shall enter the venue where proposals are evaluated only with the permission of the chairman.
- (9) Upon completing evaluation, the evaluation commissioner shall submit the technical evaluation table and evaluation form to the chairman via the electronic technical evaluation system or in writing.
- (10) The assistant administrator shall check whether each evaluation commissioner has submitted a technical evaluation table and evaluation form and shall report such status to the chairman. If no abnormality exists, the chairman shall finalize the evaluation of the proposal.

Article 16 (Security and Integrity) (1) No one may broadcast, film, record, or transcribe the process of evaluating a proposal without the chairman's agreement. <Amended on Apr. 29, 2020>

- (2) During evaluation, the use of information and communications devices (such as mobile phones and instant messaging services) shall be prohibited.
- (3) KOICA should strive to prevent misconduct and corruption, and to promulgate a culture of integrity for fair evaluation.
- (4) When bidding participants participate in an evaluation, they shall adhere to the following principles to prevent misconduct and corruption, and shall promulgate a culture of integrity:

1. Contacting the evaluation commissioner shall is prohibited between the tender notice date and the evaluation date. (contact refers to a bidding participant intentionally approaching through by phone or visit, to the extent the evaluation commissioner recognizes him/her);
2. The contents of the bidding should not be explained individually to the evaluation commissioner;
3. Successful bidders shall not request service, research, or advice from a member who has participated in the evaluation without prior notification within one year.

<Newly Inserted on Apr. 29, 2020>

(5) Each evaluation commissioner shall adhere to the following principles of evaluation:

1. The commissioner shall maintain dignity, fairness, objectivity, integrity, and professionalism as an evaluation commissioner;
2. The commissioner shall not disclose facts learned during the evaluation and the results or details of his/her evaluation;
3. The commissioners shall not accept any money, gifts, or entertainment from anyone participating in a bid;
4. The commissioner shall not be influenced by any unjust solicitation or evaluation fee from the person who requested the evaluation;
5. The commissioner shall not engage in unreasonable solicitation, propaganda, advertising, or misleading behavior;
6. The commissioner shall not engage in inappropriate contact with any interested party other than as a legitimate activity;
7. The commissioner shall not exaggeratedly advertise or misrepresent his expertise and abilities in order to obtain an evaluation role;
8. The commissioner shall not engage in any other conduct that would compromise fair evaluation.

<Newly Inserted on Apr. 29, 2020>

Article 17 (Calculating Evaluation Scores) (1) The chairman shall aggregate the qualitative

results of evaluation conducted by the standing and the non-standing members of a committee; set the ranking by arithmetic average; and submit it to the committee. Where the results of evaluation are aggregated, if the total number of standing and non-standing members of a committee is at least six, the scores, excluding the highest and lowest points based on the total evaluation score of the proposal, shall be counted and averaged arithmetically. However, if there are at least two highest or lowest points, only one of the same shall be excluded. If the number of evaluation commissioners is less than five, the highest and lowest points shall be included. Any number after the decimal point after calculation shall be rounded to the third decimal place.

(2) An evaluation score shall be calculated by summing each of the results from the quantitative and qualitative evaluations. Those with an evaluation score of at least 85 shall be deemed eligible.

(3) Upon converting an evaluation score according to the technical evaluation weight for the summation of technical evaluation and price evaluation scores, any number after the decimal point shall be rounded to the third decimal place.

(4) The evaluation commissioner shall evaluate the proposal according to the criteria in [Table 3-6] for assigning evaluation grades. <Newly Inserted on Apr. 29, 2020>

Article 18 (Evaluating Proposals for Negotiated Contracts) (1) Where the grounds for executing a negotiated contract are met pursuant to the relevant regulations and procedures; and is necessary to verify the objective project performance capability of the counterparty, the evaluation department may conduct evaluation based on a written request from the department that commissioned the evaluation. In such cases, evaluation may be performed in writing according to Article 12 (3).

(2) If evaluation is required pursuant to Paragraph (1), the department that commissioned the evaluation shall submit the evaluation criteria and the proposal submitted by the counterparty to the evaluation department. However, where the ground for pursuing a negotiated contract is due to the bid being invalidated, the request for proposal included in the final tender notice and the proposal submitted by the single bidder shall be submitted

to the evaluation department.

(3) If an evaluation score is less than 85 points, the department that commissioned the evaluation shall request a re-examination after supplementing the proposal.

(4) If an evaluation score is less than 85 even after a proposal is re-evaluated twice, it shall not proceed to a negotiated contract.

Article 19 (Evaluating Proposals for Supply of Goods) (1) A proposal for supply of goods shall be evaluated technically when the order value is at least KRW 3 billion; or when special equipment is included and it involves evaluation of manufacturing, installation, and operational training capabilities, rather than simple supply of goods.

(2) Where conducting an evaluation according to Paragraph (1), in principle the evaluation shall be in writing. However, any of the following cases, evaluation may be conducted by a committee meeting. In such cases, a committee is formed according to the criteria in [Table 1]:

1. When the value of the order is at least KRW 5 billion;
2. When the specificity and importance of the project necessitates evaluation by a committee.

CHAPTER 4. COMMITTEE FOLLOW-UP MANAGEMENT, ETC.

Article 20 (Reflecting the Details of Technical Evaluation) During the priority negotiation process, the department that commissioned the evaluation shall reflect the evaluation forms proposed by the committee. If any contents of the proposal are amended or added by reflecting such opinions, the amendment shall be provided to the contracting department.

Article 21 (Storing Related Documents) KOICA shall store evaluation-related documents such as proposals, evaluation tables, and evaluation forms submitted by bidding participants, as electronic documents after evaluation is completed. The storage period shall coincide with the period for retaining electronic documents. <Amended on Apr. 29, 2020>

Article 22 (Disclosing Evaluation Results) (1) Upon legitimate request from the bidder or if deemed necessary, KOICA may disclose the results of a proposal evaluation but redact all personal information, trade secrets, and other legally-restricted information. In this case, the disclosure method shall allow the bidder to inspect the results of evaluation in the presence of the person in charge from the evaluation department. <Amended on Apr. 29, 2020>

(2) KOICA shall disclose the total evaluation score of the bidding participants and the evaluation opinions of each evaluation commissioner on the electronic procurement system, but shall not disclose the name of any commissioner. <Amended on Apr. 29, 2020>

Article 23 (Paying Evaluation Allowances) The evaluation department shall pay an allowance to an evaluation commissioner according to [Table 6].

Article 24 (Managing Evaluation Commissioners) (1) After completing committee proceedings, the assistant administrator shall evaluate the results of the commissioner's activity in the electronic technical evaluation system or in writing according to the criteria in [Table 7].

(2) The assistant administrator shall take the following measures where a commissioner violates any matter specified in [Table 2] or [Table 8]:

1. Where violating any of the evaluation elements in [Table 8], demerit points shall be recorded in the electronic technical evaluation system or in writing after obtaining approval from the head of the evaluation department.
2. Where the commissioner violates any of the precautions in [Table 2], he/she may be requested to rectify it immediately. <Amended on Apr. 29, 2020>
3. The assistant administrator or chairman may request the commissioner to leave the evaluation site if: (a) the commissioner fails to comply with a request to rectify pursuant to Subparagraph 2; and/or (b) there is a risk of compromising the integrity of evaluation.

(3) The assistant administrator shall dismiss an evaluation commissioner when his/her

cumulative demerit points reach 100 due to any violation of Paragraph (2). <Amended on Apr. 29, 2020>

Article 25 (Others) For matters not specified in these Guidelines, KOICA may apply related regulations such as the Guidelines for Signing Negotiated Contracts. KOICA shall separately reflect in a tender notice and requests for proposals, matters deemed to make it impracticable to apply these Guidelines, depending on the nature of the service.

[This Article Newly Inserted on Apr. 29, 2020]

ADDENDA <Apr. 4, 2007>

Article 1 (Enforcement Date) These Standards shall enter into force from the date of approval by the governor.

ADDENDA <Dec. 11, 2008>

Article 1 (Enforcement Date) These Standards shall enter into force from the date of approval by the governor.

ADDENDA <Jul. 24, 2009>

Article 1 (Enforcement Date) These Standards shall enter into force from July 1 after an approval by the president.

ADDENDA <Mar. 11, 2010>

Article 1 (Enforcement Date) These Standards shall enter into force from the date of approval by the president.

ADDENDA <Sep. 14, 2010>

Article 1 (Enforcement Date) These Standards shall enter into force from the date of approval by the president but shall begin to apply from the first plan to appoint a project executor after the date these Guidelines enter into force.

ADDENDA <Oct. 15, 2010>

Article 1 (Enforcement Date) These Standards shall enter into force from the date of approval by the president.

ADDENDA <Apr. 25, 2012>

Article 1 (Enforcement Date) These Standards shall enter into force from the date of approval by the president but shall begin to apply from the first plan to appoint a project executor after the date these Guidelines enter into force.

ADDENDA <May 14, 2012>

Article 1 (Enforcement Date) These Standards shall enter into force from the date of approval by the president.

ADDENDA <May 27, 2013>

Article 1 (Enforcement Date) These Standards shall enter into force from the date of approval by the president.

ADDENDA <Dec. 31, 2013>

Article 1 (Enforcement Date) These Standards shall enter into force from January 1, 2014.

ADDENDA <Jul. 29, 2014>

Article 1 (Enforcement Date) These Standards shall enter into force from August 4, 2014 but shall begin to apply from the first plan to appoint a project executor after the date these Guidelines enter into force.

ADDENDA <Oct. 31, 2017>

Article 1 (Enforcement Date) These Standards shall enter into force from October 31, 2017 but shall begin to apply from the first plan to appoint a project executor after the date these Guidelines enter into force.

ADDENDA <Jul. 13, 2018>

Article 1 (Enforcement Date) These Standards shall enter into force from July 13, 2018.

ADDENDA <Feb. 22, 2019>

Article 1 (Enforcement Date) These Standards shall enter into force from February 22, 2019 but shall begin to apply from the first plan to appoint a project executor after the date these Guidelines enter into force.

ADDENDA <May 3, 2019>

Article 1 (Enforcement Date) These Guidelines shall enter into force from May 3, 2019 but shall apply from tender notice after the date these Guidelines enter into force.

ADDENDA <Apr. 29, 2020>

Article 1 (Enforcement Date) These Guidelines shall enter into force from April 29, 2020 but shall begin to apply from the first plan to appoint a project executor after the date these Guidelines enter into force.

ADDENDA <Apr. 8, 2021>

Article 1 (Enforcement Date) These Guidelines shall enter into force from April 8, 2021 but shall begin to apply from the first tender notice issued after the date these Guidelines enter into force.

[Table 1] Comprising Technical Evaluation Committee and Holding Committee Meetings

<Amended on Apr. 29, 2020>

Comprising Technical Evaluation Committee and Holding Committee Meetings

Category		Type of Meeting	Committee Chairman	Number of Commissioners
Services	Urgent or simple services; or order value less than KRW 100 million (500 million for a negotiated contract)	Written evaluation (if necessary, convocation evaluation)	Director of evaluation department	Two standing/ Three non-standing
	Order value less than KRW 1 billion	Convocation evaluation	Director of evaluation department	Two standing/ Five non-standing
	Order value between KRW 1 billion and KRW 2.5 billion	Convocation evaluation	Director of evaluation department	Three standing/ Five non-standing
	Order value between KRW 2.5 billion and KRW 5 billion	Convocation evaluation	Director General of evaluation department	Three standing/ Five non-standing
	Order value at least KRW 5 billion	Convocation evaluation	Vice President of evaluation department	Four standing/ Six non-standing
Supply of Goods	Basic principles	Written evaluation	Director of evaluation department	Two standing/ Three non-standing
	Order value at least KRW 5 billion; or when necessary to consider specificity and importance	Convocation evaluation	Director General of evaluation department	Two standing/ Five non-standing

[Note] Notwithstanding Paragraph (2), if the chairman of the technical evaluation committee for the relevant service is unable to perform a task due to unavoidable circumstances, the vice president of the evaluation department may delegate the task to the director-general. If necessary, the director-general may subdelegate the task to the director. If the vice president, director-general, and director of the evaluation department are each unable to perform the chairman's duties due to unavoidable circumstances, one of the evaluation commissioners shall be appointed as chairman by drawing lots. The appointed commissioner shall act on behalf of the chairman and participate in the evaluation.

[Table 2] Points for Evaluation Commissioner to Note

<Amended on Apr. 8, 2021>

Precautions for Evaluation Commissioners

Understanding and Readiness	① Do arrive at the venue before the evaluation commences.
	② Do perform a technical evaluation based on objective evidence such as expertise and materials, independent from any interference of affiliated institutions or related organization.
Attitude and Cooperation	③ Do refrain from personal affairs until the end of the evaluation.
	④ Do faithfully complete an evaluation form.
	⑤ Do not express tendencies for and against, or as to rightfulness or wrongfulness of a matter, with facial expressions, words, and/or gestures.
	⑥ Do not indicate the incorrect part(s) of the proposal with evaluation scores and opinions, not point out or correct it
	⑦ Do consider the contents of the preliminary review and presentation and ask questions that match the purpose of the evaluation when inquiring.
	⑧ Do not try to convey or flaunt knowledge.
	⑨ Do not reduce or enlarge factors by guessing or extrapolating without checking.
	⑩ Do not induce correct or incorrect answers.
	⑪ Do not rebuke or humiliate the company subject to evaluation.
	⑫ Do not say anything that may cause sexual shame.
	⑬ Do refrain from speaking and acting with bias .
	⑭ Do not consult or negotiate with other Commissioners.
	⑮ Do not try to dominate the atmosphere of the evaluation venue.

[Table 3] Evaluation Criteria for a Proposal of General Services

<Amended on Apr. 29, 2020>

Evaluation Criteria for a Proposal of General Services

Category	Area	Item	Points
Quantitative Evaluation (10 points)	Management Status	Credit rating	4
	Performance of Similar Projects	The ratio of similar projects domestically and overseas	6
Qualitative Evaluation (90 points)	Proposer	General status, history, organizational and personnel status, details of major projects, etc.	5
	Technology	Understanding of the project - Characteristics and differentiation of the proposal - Analysis of target area - Task goals, performance, and outputs	10
		Detailed implementation plan for tasks - Basic direction setting - Detailed action plan	25
	Project Management	Current status and management plan for personnel - Current status of personnel - Personnel management plan	20
		Project management plan - Performance management - Schedule management - Risk management - Follow-up management - Monitoring and quality control for output - Publicizing domestic and overseas projects	20
		Strategies to localize tasks and plans in each field to implement the project - Task execution strategy based upon local characteristics - Plans in each field to implement the project	
	Additional Proposal	Improvements in the content of the request for proposal, plans for additional input by the proposer, quality improvement plan for project outputs, and plans to realize social values	5
	Capability of Key Personnel (PM, TL, or CM)	Project execution capability of key personnel (PM, TL, or CM)	5

[Note]

1. For qualitative evaluation, a standing member or a non-standing member awards an evaluation score out of a maximum score of 90 points and calculates the score by arithmetic average (related to

Article 17).

2. Considering the content and characteristics of the project, it is possible to amend details such as the above evaluation criteria and the scoring criteria for each item if necessary (however, the allocation for each item cannot exceed the 30-point limit).

[Table 3-2] Evaluation Criteria for a Proposal of Architectural Design Services

<Amended on Apr. 29, 2020>

Evaluation Criteria for a Proposal of Architectural Design Services

<Where unifying the evaluation criteria for standing/non-standing members>

Category	Area	Item	Points
Quantitative Evaluation (10 points)	Credential Status	Credit rating	4
	Performance of Similar Projects	The ratio of similar projects domestically and overseas	6
Qualitative Evaluation (90 points)	Proposer	General status, history, organizational and personnel status, details of major projects, etc.	5
	Technology	Understanding of the project - Characteristics and differentiation of the proposal - Analysis of target area - Task goals, performance, and outputs	10
		Detailed implementation plan for tasks - Main point of tasks - Overview of tasks - Local investigation and material review plan - Preparing a construction plan - Proposing eco-friendly technology and various systems - Building structure and construction	25
	Project Management	Current status and management plan for personnel - Current status of personnel - Personnel management plan	20
		Project management plan - Integrated management - Schedule management - Risk management - Construction cost management - Cooperation with project stakeholders and management of decision making - The role of the designer in the execution stage	20
		Strategies to localize tasks and plans in each field to implement the project - Task execution strategy based upon local characteristics - Plans in each field to implement the project	
	Additional Proposal	Improvements in the content of the request for proposal, plans for additional input by the proposer, quality improvement plan for project outputs, and plans to realize social values	5
	Capability of Key Personnel (PM, TL, or CM)	Project execution capability of key personnel (PM, TL, or CM)	5

<Where classifying the evaluation criteria for standing/non-standing members>

Category		Area	Item	Points
Quantitative Evaluation (10 points)		Credential Status	Credit rating	4
		Performance of Similar Projects	The ratio of similar projects domestically and overseas	6
Qualitative Evaluation (90 points)	Standing Member	Proposer	General status, history, organizational and personnel status, details of major projects, etc.	5
		Technology	Understanding of the project - Characteristics and differentiation of the proposal - Analysis of target area - Task goals, performance, and outputs	10
			Detailed implementation plan for tasks - Main point of tasks - Overview of tasks - Local investigation and material review plan - Preparing a construction plan	25
		Project Management	Current status and management plan for personnel - Current status of personnel - Personnel management plan	20
			Project management plan - Integrated management - Schedule management - Risk management - Monitoring and reporting	20
			Strategies to localize tasks and plans in each field to implement the project - Task execution strategy based upon local characteristics	
		Additional Proposal	Improvements in the content of the request for proposal, plans for additional input by the proposer, quality improvement plan for project outputs, and plans to realize social values	5
		Capability of Key Personnel (PM or TL)	Project execution capability of key personnel (PM, TL, or CM)	5
	Non-standing Member	Proposer	General status, history, organizational and personnel status, details of major projects, etc.	5
		Technology	Understanding of the project - Characteristics and differentiation of the proposal - Analysis of target area - Task goals, performance, and outputs	10
			Detailed implementation plan for tasks - Main point of tasks - Overview of tasks - Local investigation and material review plan	25

			- Preparing a construction plan - Proposal for eco-friendly technology - Proposing a system for each field (various) - Building structure and construction	
		Project Management	Current status and management plan for personnel - Current status of personnel - Personnel management plan	20
			Project management plan - Integrated management - Schedule management - Risk management - Construction cost management plan - Cooperation with project stakeholders and management of decision making - The role of the designer in the execution stage	20
			Strategies to localize tasks and plans in each field to implement the project - Task execution strategy based upon local characteristics	
		Additional Proposal	Improvements in the content of the request for proposal, plans for additional input by the proposer, quality improvement plan for project outputs, and plans to realize social values	5
		Capability of Key Personnel (PM, TL, or CM)	Project execution capability of key personnel (PM, TL, or CM)	5

[Note]

1. For qualitative evaluation, a standing member or a non-standing member awards an evaluation score out of a maximum score of 90 points and calculates the score by arithmetic average (related to Article 17).
2. Considering the content and characteristics of the project, it is possible to amend details such as the above evaluation items and the scoring criteria for each item if necessary (however, the allocation for each item cannot exceed the 30-point limit).

[Table 3-3] Evaluation Criteria for a Proposal of Establishing an Informatization Strategy (consulting) and Services for Developing Software (Operation)

<Amended on Apr. 8, 2021>

Evaluation Criteria for a Proposal of Establishing an Informatization Strategy (consulting) and Services for Developing Software

<Where unifying the evaluation criteria for standing/non-standing members>

Category	Area	Item	Points
Quantitative Evaluation (10 points)	Credential Status	Credit rating <i>* When evaluating 'win-win cooperation', the number of points allocated in the Credential Status area is adjusted to 2 points.</i>	4 (2)
	Performance of Similar Projects	The ratio of similar projects domestically and overseas <i>* When evaluating 'win-win cooperation', the number of points allocated in the Performance of Similar Projects area is adjusted to 3 points.</i>	6 (3)
	Win-Win Cooperation	Share ratio (investment share rate) of small and medium-sized businesses	5
Qualitative Evaluation (90 points)	Proposer	General status, history, organizational and personnel status, details of major projects, etc.	5
	Strategy and Methodology	- Understanding of the project - Execution strategy - Performance management - Applied technology - Standard framework application plan - Development methodology	10
	Technology and Function	- System requirements - Functional requirements - Security requirements - Data requirements - System operation requirements - Restrictions	15 (Excluding subcontract 20)
	Performance and Quality	- Performance requirements - Quality requirements - Interface requirements	15
	Project Management	- Management methodology - Experience and capabilities of personnel - Schedule plan - Development equipment - Risk management - Follow-up management - Monitoring and reporting - Publicizing domestic and overseas projects	15
	Project Support	- Quality assurance	15

		- Test operation - Education and training - Maintenance - Defect repair plan - Confidential security - Emergency measures	
	Additional Proposal	Improvements in the content of the request for proposal, plans for additional input by the proposer, quality improvement plan for project outputs, and plans to realize social values.	5
	Capability of Key Personnel (PM, TL, or CM)	Project execution capability of key personnel (PM, TL, or CM)	5
	(If applicable) Subcontract	Appropriateness of subcontracting plan	5

<Where classifying the evaluation criteria for standing/non-standing members>

Category		Area	Item	Points
Quantitative Evaluation (10 points)		Credential Status	Credit rating <i>* When evaluating 'win-win cooperation', the number of points allocated in the Credential Status area is adjusted to 2 points.</i>	4 (2)
		Performance of Similar Projects	The ratio of similar projects domestically and overseas <i>* When evaluating 'win-win cooperation', the number of points allocated in the Performance of Similar Projects area is adjusted to 3 points.</i>	6 (3)
		Win-win Cooperation	Share ratio (investment share rate) of small and medium-sized businesses	5
Qualitative Evaluation (90 points)	Standing Member	Proposer	General status, history, organizational and personnel status, details of major projects, etc.	5
		Technology	Understanding of the project - Characteristics and differentiation of the proposal - Analysis of target area - Task goals, performance, and outputs	10
			Detailed implementation plan for tasks - Basic direction setting - Establishment of informatization strategy (consulting) - Software development (operation) - Expert dispatch - Fellowship Program - Advise on an order for equipment	25

		Project Management	Current status and management plan for personnel - Current status of personnel - Personnel management plan	20
			Project management plan - Integrated management - Schedule management - Risk management - Follow-up management - Monitoring and reporting - Publicizing domestic and overseas projects	20
			Strategies to localize tasks and plans in each field to implement the project - Task execution strategy based upon local characteristics - plans in each field to implement the project	
		Additional Proposal	Improvements in the content of the request for proposal, plans for additional input by the proposer, quality improvement plan for project outputs, and plans to realize social values.	5
		Capability of Key Personnel (PM, TL, or CM)	Project execution capability of key personnel (PM, TL, or CM)	5
Qualitative Evaluation (90 points)	Non-standing Member	Proposer	General status, history, organizational and personnel status, details of major projects, etc.	5
		Strategy and Methodology	- Understanding of the project - Execution strategy - Performance management - Applied technology - Standard framework application plan - Development methodology	15
		Technology and Function	- System requirements - Functional requirements - Security requirements - Data requirements - System operation requirements - Restrictions	20 (Excluding subcontract 25)
		Performance and Quality	- Performance requirements - Quality requirements - Interface requirements	15
		Project Management	- Management methodology - Experience and ability of personnel - Schedule plan - Development equipment	15

		Project Support	- Quality assurance - Test operation - Education and training - Maintenance - Defect repair plan - Confidential security - Emergency measures	15
		(If applicable) Subtract	Appropriateness of subcontracting plan	5

[Note]

1. For qualitative evaluation, a standing member or a non-standing member awards an evaluation score out of a maximum score of 90 points and calculates the score by arithmetic average (related to Article 17).
2. Considering the content and characteristics of the project, it is possible to amend details such as the above evaluation items and the scoring criteria for each item if necessary (however, the allocation for each item cannot exceed the 30-point limit)
3. According to [Table 5-2], “win-win cooperation” shall be included in the quantitative evaluation items for a software business that orders at least KRW 2 billion worth of software based on the project budget (including VAT) that mid-sized software business operators can participate in. At least five shall be awarded. However, in cases of competition between SMEs, the item “win-win cooperation” shall be excluded.
4. Where the software project subcontracting plan in [Form 6] submitted at the time of bidding (at the time of bidding) under the Software Promotion Act, the proportion of the amount to be subcontracted of those who participate in subcontracting is evaluated based upon the size, purpose, and characteristics of this project. However, where not subcontracting or where planning to use the standard form subcontract for the software project pursuant to Article 3-2 of the Fair Transactions in Subcontracting Act while the ratio of the amount to be subcontracted is less than 10/100, the highest grade is assigned.
 - “Subcontract amount ratio” refers to the ratio of the planned subcontracting amount to the software project amount excluding the purchase amount of goods (including commercial software).
 - (Exemption) In the case of competition with limited subcontracting, the “Subcontract” evaluation item is deleted, and the corresponding points are assigned to the Technology and Function item.

[Table 3-4] Evaluation Criteria for Services for Computer Supervision

<Amended on Apr. 29, 2020>

Evaluation Criteria for Services for Computer Supervision

<Where unifying the evaluation criteria for standing/non-standing members>

Category	Area	Item	Points
Quantitative Evaluation (10 points)	Credential Status	Credit rating	4
	Performance of Similar Projects	The ratio of similar projects domestically and overseas	6
Qualitative Evaluation (90 points)	Proposer	General status, history, organizational and personnel status, details of major projects, etc.	5
	Technology	Basic direction setting	5
		Details of examination	10
		Method of examination	10
		Schedule and procedure of supervision	5
	Project Management	Current status and management plan for personnel - Current status of personnel - Personnel management plan	15
		Project management plan - Project scope management - Risk management - Follow-up management - Monitoring and reporting	20
	Project Support	Other supports	10
	Additional Proposal	Improvements in the content of the request for proposal, additional input plans of the plants for additional input by the proposer, quality improvement plan for project outputs, and plans to realize social values.	5
	Capability of Key Personnel (PM, TL, or CM)	Project execution capability of key personnel (PM, TL, or CM)	5

<Where classifying the evaluation criteria for standing/non-standing members>

Category		Area	Item	Points
Quantitative Evaluation (10 points)		Credential Status	Credit rating	4
		Performance of Similar Projects	The ratio of similar projects domestically and overseas	6
Qualitative Evaluation (90 points)	Standing Member	Proposer	General status, history, organizational and personnel status, details of major projects, etc.	5
		Technology	Understanding of the project - Characteristics and differentiation of the proposal - Analysis of target area - Task goals, performance, and outputs	10
			Detailed implementation plan for tasks - Implementation plan - Details and method of examination - Schedule and procedure of supervision	20
		Project Management	Current status and management plan for personnel - Current status of personnel - Personnel management plan	25
			Project management plan - Project scope management - Risk management - Follow-up management - Monitoring and reporting	20
		Additional Proposal	Improvements in the content of the request for proposal, plans for additional input by the proposer, quality improvement plan for project outputs, and plans to realize social values	5
		Capability of Key Personnel (PM, TL, or CM)	Project execution capability of key personnel (PM, TL, or CM)	5
		Qualitative Evaluation (90 points)	Non-standing Member	Technology
Basic direction setting	5			
Details of examination	20			
Method of examination	10			
Project Management	Schedule and procedure of supervision			10
	Current status and management plan for personnel - Current status of personnel - Personnel management plan - Education, training, and quality management to improve supervision quality			25

		Additional Proposal	Improvements in the content of the request for proposal, additional input plans of the plants for additional input by the proposer, quality improvement plan for project outputs, and plans to realize social values.	5
		Capability of Key Personnel (PM, TL, or CM)	Project execution capability of key personnel (PM, TL, or CM)	5

[Note]

1. For qualitative evaluation, a standing member or a non-standing member awards an evaluation score out of a maximum score of 90 points and calculates the score by arithmetic average (related to Article 17).
2. Considering the content and characteristics of the project, it is possible to amend details such as the above evaluation items and the scoring criteria for each item, if necessary (however, allocation for each item cannot exceed the 30-point limit).

[Table 3-5] Evaluation Criteria for a Proposal of Services for Supply Goods

<Amended on Apr. 29, 2020>

Evaluation Criteria for a Proposal of Services for Supply Goods

<Where unifying the evaluation criteria for standing/non-standing members>

Category	Area	Item	Points
Quantitative Evaluation (10 points)	Credential Status	Credit rating	4
	Performance of Similar Projects	The ratio of similar projects domestically and overseas	6
Qualitative Evaluation (90 points)	Proposer	General status, history, organizational and personnel status, details of major projects, etc.	5
	Technology	Understanding of the project - Characteristics and differentiation of the proposal - Analysis of target area - Task goals, performance, and outputs	10
		Detailed implementation plan for tasks - Basic direction setting - Purchase of goods (specifications, manufacturers, performance, quality, warranty period, etc.) - System interface - Inspection, transportation, customs clearance, installation - Test requirements - User education, technology transfer - Manual preparation - Breakdown repair, parts acquisition, Follow-up management - A plan to utilize local companies and personnel when purchasing locally	25
	Project Management	Current status and management plan for personnel - Current status of personnel - Personnel management plan	20
		Project management plan - Integrated management - Schedule management - Risk management - Monitoring and reporting	20
	Additional Proposal	Improvements in the content of the request for proposal, additional input plans of the plants for additional input by the proposer, quality improvement plan for project outputs, and plans to realize social values.	5
	Capability of Key Personnel (PM, TL, or CM)	Project execution capability of key personnel (PM, TL, or CM)	5

<Where classifying the evaluation criteria for standing/non-standing members>

Category		Area	Item		Points
Quantitative Evaluation (10 points)		Credential Status	Credit rating		4
		Performance of Similar Projects	The ratio of similar projects domestically and overseas		6
Qualitative Evaluation (90 points)	Standing Member	Proposer	General status, history, organizational and personnel status, details of major projects, etc.		5
		Technology	Understanding of the project - Characteristics and differentiation of the proposal - Analysis of target area - Task goals, performance, and outputs		10
			Detailed implementation plan for tasks - Purchase of goods (specifications, manufacturers, performance, quality, warranty period, etc.) - Inspection, transportation, customs clearance, installation - User education, technology transfer - Manual preparation - Breakdown repair, parts acquisition, follow-up management - A plan to utilize local companies and personnel when purchasing locally		25
		Project Management	Current status and management plan for personnel - Current status of personnel - Personnel management plan		20
			Project management plan - Integrated management - Schedule management - Risk management - Monitoring and reporting		20
		Additional Proposal	Improvements in the content of the request for proposal , additional input plans of the plants for additional input by the proposer, quality improvement plan for project outputs, and plans to realize social values.		5
		Capability of Key Personnel (PM, TL, or CM)	Project execution capability of key personnel (PM, TL, or CM)		5
	Non-standing Member	Proposer	General status, history, organizational and personnel status, details of major projects, etc.		5
		Technology	Understanding of the project - Characteristics and differentiation of the proposal - Analysis of target area - Task goals, performance, and outputs		10
			Detailed Execution	- Specification of goods - Manufacturer of goods	30

			for Tasks	- Performance and quality of goods - Warranty period of goods	
				- Inspection, transportation, customs clearance, installation - User education, technology transfer - Manual preparation - Breakdown repair, parts acquisition, follow-up management - Plan to utilize local companies and personnel when purchasing locally	15
		Project Management	Current status and management plan for personnel - Current status of personnel - Personnel management plan		10
			Project management plan - Integrated management - Schedule management - Risk management - Monitoring and reporting		10
		Additional Proposal	Improvements in the content of the request for proposal, additional input plans of the plants for additional input by the proposer, quality improvement plan for project outputs, and plans to realize social values.		5
		Capability of Key Personnel (PM, TL, or CM)	Project execution capability of key personnel (PM, TL, or CM)		5

[Note]

1. For qualitative evaluation, a standing member or a non-standing member awards an evaluation score out of a maximum score of 90 points and calculates the score by arithmetic average (related to Article 17).
2. Considering the content and characteristics of the project, it is possible to amend details such as the above evaluation items and the scoring criteria for each item if necessary (however, allocation for each item cannot exceed the 50-point limit).

[Table 3-6] Criteria for Assigning Evaluation Grades

<Newly Inserted on Apr. 29, 2020>

Criteria for Assigning Evaluation Grades

Category	Criteria for Assigning Grades	Points
Excellent	○ If the proposal content is excellent and does not require any supplementation; or if the matters that need to be supplemented in terms of expression or editorial are very insignificant and do not affect the contents of the proposal. ○ If it is confirmed that performance, experience, manpower composition, and/or technical skills are the best available in Korea by field.	100% of the allocated points
Good	○ If the requirements in RFP are satisfied; or if it is possible to facilitate performing the task since the proposal is good but some modifications or supplements are needed to enhance the project effect. ○ If the performance, experience, manpower composition, and technical skills are above the required level for each field or above the level necessary to facilitate project execution.	85% of the allocated points
Suitable (Normal)	○ If the requirements in the RFP are generally satisfied, but the validity and fidelity of the project execution strategy and plan for each area are somewhat insufficient in the proposal. ○ If the minimum required level has been met but some items are insufficient in terms of performance, experience, manpower composition, and technical skills.	70% of the allocated points
Poor	○ If some requirements in RFP are not satisfied; and the validity and fidelity of the project execution strategy and plan for each area of the proposal is insufficient and impractical. ○ If some of the minimum requirements are not met or a significant portion is insufficient in terms of performance, experience, manpower composition, and technical skills.	55% of the allocated points
Very Poor	○ If some requirements in RFP are significantly not met. ○ If execution is impossible because the possibility of realization of the proposed contents absent. ○ When performance, experience, manpower composition, and technical skills are below the minimum required level, and replacement measures, etc. are necessary.	40% of the allocated points

[Table 4] Evaluation Table for Adding or Deducting Points

<Amended on Apr. 29, 2020>

Evaluation Table for Adding or Deducting Points

Category	Item and Ground	Points
Adding	A. Companies with no contracting track record with KOICA (if the investment share rate or share ratio is at least 20%)	0.5 (Maximum 0.5)
	B. Supporting medium, small, or micro-enterprises (if the investment share rate or share ratio is at least 20%)	
	(1) Companies that have been designated as an innovative (venture, technological innovation, management innovation, exceptional green business) small or medium-sized business by the Minister of SMEs and Startups (or delegate)	0.5
	(2) Others designated as medium, small, or micro-enterprises	0.25
	C. Supporting female-owned businesses and promoting gender equality in employment (if the investment share rate or share ratio is at least 20%)	
	(1) Female-owned businesses that have been defined in the Act on Support for Female-owned Businesses and the enforcement decree of the same Act and have been issued a confirmation letter by the Minister of SMEs and Startups (including a delegate)	0.2
	(2) Companies that have been designated as a company with exceptional gender equality in employment by the Minister of Employment and Labor	0.25
	D. Supporting enterprises owned or operated by a person with a disability and promoting employment of persons with a disability (if the investment share rate or share ratio is at least 20%).	
	(1) Companies that have been defined in the Act on the Employment Promotion and Vocational Rehabilitation of Persons with Disabilities and confirmed by the Minister of SMEs and Startups (including a delegate)	0.25
	(2) Companies with exceptional employment of persons with a disability	0.5
	(a) Owners of companies with exceptional employment of persons with a disability pursuant to the Act on Employment Promotion and Vocational Rehabilitation of Persons with Disabilities	
	E. In the case of any of the following items about policy support (if the investment share rate or share ratio is at least 20%)	
	(1) Companies certified as family-friendly enterprises from the Minister of Gender Equity and Family (or delegate)	0.5 per case (Maximum 1.5)
	(2) Companies certified as social enterprises by the Minister of Employment and Labor (or delegate)	
	(3) Companies selected as a youth-friendly small business by the Minister of Employment and Labor (or delegate)	
	F. For key personnel who have obtained a valid ODA Professional Certificate (ODA Professional Certificate (Level 3) or ODA General	0.5 per person (Maximum 1)

	Certificate) based on the date of tender notice, 0.5 points (maximum 1 point) will be awarded per person. However, the additional points for the ODA Professional Certificate (Level 3) and the ODA General Certificate shall not be duplicated.	
Deducting	G. Warning regarding unfaithful project execution or sanctions against unethical businesspersons (1) Where receiving warnings from KOICA relating to project execution (evaluated only when the sanction start date is within the 2 years from the tender notice date) (2) Where registered and confirmed in the Korea On-line E-Procurement System and a data processing unit after receiving sanctions for unethical businesspersons from the head of central office (including heads of state agencies, local governments, and public institutions) - It is evaluated based upon the total sanction period against an unethical businessperson when the end date of sanctions is included within the two years since the date of the tender notice. In this case, the entire period of sanctions against unethical businesspersons is aggregated. 1. Where the total sanction period is at least two years (-0.5) 2. Where the total sanction period is between one and two years (-0.4) 3. Where the total sanction period is between six months and one year (-0.3) 4. Where the total sanction period is between three and six months (-0.2) 5. Where the total sanction period is less than three months (-0.1)	0.5
	H. Any of the following proposal formats (1) Where the size, color, and cover each does not conform to the requested format (0.15 points for each case) (2) Exceeding the limit number of copies (0.2 points) (3) In cases of incomplete or non-submission of [Form 1] and [Form 1-2] each (0.2 points for each case)	Maximum 1.5

※ “Evaluation by Adding or Deducting Points” is based on the following evaluation criteria.

I. Supervising the evaluation by adding or deducting points

1. Adding or deducting points for each evaluation item can be duplicated and the duplicate evaluation according to the grade within the same item detailed evaluation criteria for each item.
2. Points cannot be aggregated to exceed the quantitative evaluation score (10 points).

II. Detailed evaluation criteria for each evaluation item for adding or deducting points

1. Evaluation on “A (Companies with no contracting track record with KOICA)”

- (a) Based upon the date of tender notice, regardless of the project type such as research service, evaluation service, fellowship program, public-private partnership program, only companies with no contracting track record are evaluated.
- (b) For a contracting consortium, it is evaluated only when the investment share rate (or share ratio) is at least 20%. A maximum of 0.5 points is awarded regardless of the number of members.

2. Evaluation on “B (Supporting medium, small, or micro-enterprises)”

- (a) Medium, small, or micro-enterprises that have been issued a confirmation letter by the Minister of SMEs and Startups (or delegate) are evaluated when all relevant documents are submitted. In this case, evaluation is limited to those falling within the validity period based on the date of public notice of the tender, but if the validity period is not determined, evaluation is limited to those received within the two years since the day before the date of public notice of the tender.
- (b) In the case of competition between owners of medium or small enterprises, additional points are not awarded for small and medium-sized businesses.
- (c) For a contracting consortium, the evaluation is conducted only for members with an investment share rate (or share ratio) of at least 20%.
- (d) Multiple detailed items under an evaluation item cannot be evaluated in tandem. Only the highest-graded detailed item is awarded a score.

3. Evaluation on “C (Supporting female-owned businesses and promoting gender equality in employment)”

- (a) Evaluation on female-owned businesses
 - 1) Female-owned businesses that have been issued a confirmation letter by the Minister of SMEs and Startups (including a delegate) are evaluated when all relevant documents are submitted. In this case, evaluation is limited to those falling within the validity period based on the date of public notice of the tender, but if the validity period is not determined, evaluation is limited to those received within the

two years since the day before the date of public notice of the tender.

(b) Evaluation on companies with exceptional gender equality in employment

1) Companies that have been submitted documents verified by the Minister of Employment and Labor (including a delegate) are evaluated. However, evaluation is limited to those falling within the validity period based on the date of public notice of the tender, but if the validity period is not determined, evaluation is limited to those received within the two years since the day before the date of public notice of the tender.

(c) For a contracting consortium, the evaluation is conducted only for members with an investment share rate (or share ratio) of at least 20%.

(d) Multiple detailed items under an evaluation item cannot be evaluated in tandem. Only the highest-graded detailed item is awarded a score.

4. Evaluation on “D (Supporting enterprises owned or operated by a person with a disability and promoting employment of persons with a disability)”

(a) Evaluation on enterprises owned or operated by a person with a disability

1) Enterprises owned or operated by a person with a disability that has been issued a confirmation letter by the Minister of SMEs and Startups (including a delegate) are evaluated when all relevant documents are submitted. In this case, evaluation is limited to those falling within the validity period based on the date of public notice of the tender, but if the validity period is not determined, evaluation is limited to those received within the two years since the day before the date of public notice of the tender.

(b) Evaluation on companies with exceptional employment of persons with a disability

1) Companies with exceptional employment of persons with a disability that has been issued a confirmation letter by the relevant ministry pursuant to Article 24 of the Act on the Employment Promotion and Vocational Rehabilitation of Persons with Disabilities. In this case, evaluation is limited to those falling within the validity period based on the date of public notice of the tender, but if the validity period is not determined, evaluation is limited to those received within the two years since the day before the date of public notice of the tender.

- (c) For a contracting consortium, the evaluation is conducted only for members with an investment share rate (or share ratio) of at least 20%.
- (d) Multiple detailed items under an evaluation item cannot be evaluated in tandem. Only the highest-graded detailed item is awarded a score.

5. Evaluation on “E (Policy support)”

- (a) Each enterprise that has been issued a confirmation letter by the head of the competent ministry (ministry, agency) specified in each of the following paragraphs. In this case, evaluation is limited to those falling within the validity period based on the date of public notice of the tender, but if the validity period is not determined, evaluation is limited to those received within the two years since the day before the date of public notice of the tender.

Detailed Item	Certified by	Documents for Verification
(1) Family-friendly Enterprises	The Minister of Gender Equity and Family	A certificate of family-friendly
(2) Social Enterprises	The Minister of Employment and Labor	A certificate of social enterprises
(3) Youth-friendly Small Business	The Minister of Employment and Labor	A certificate of youth-friendly small business

- (b) For a contracting consortium, the evaluation is conducted only for members with an investment share rate (or share ratio) of at least 20%.

[Table 5] Quantitative Evaluation Criteria Table

<Amended on Apr. 8, 2021>

Quantitative Evaluation Criteria Table

Item (Points)	Scoring Criteria			
○ Credential Status (4 points. 2 points when including “Win-win cooperation”)	Credit rating			Points
	Corporate Bonds	Corporate Bills	Corporate Credit Rating	
	AAA, AA+, AA0, AA-, A+, A0, A-, BBB+, BBB0	A1, A2+, A20, A2-, A3+, A30	AAA, AA+, AA0, AA-, A+, A0, A-, BBB+, BBB0	4.00
	BBB-, BB+, BB0, BB-	A3-, B+, B0	BBB-, BB+, BB0, BB-	3.80
	B+, B0, B-	B-	B+, B0, B-	3.60
	CCC+ or less	C or less	CCC+ or less	2.80
○ (Compared to the scale of the project) Performance ratio of the similar projects domestically and overseas* (6 points. 3 points when including “Win-win cooperation”) * Based on the completion	A. At least 100% : 6.0 points			
	B. Between 70% ~ 100% : 5.5 points			
	C. Between 40% ~ 70% : 5.0 points			
	D. Between 10% ~ 40% : 4.5 points			
	E. Less than 10% : 4.2 points			

※ Under Article 14 (1) 1 of the Guidelines for Technical Evaluation, the difference between the highest and lowest scores in the scoring interval for each quantitative evaluation item must not exceed 30% of the scoring limit.

※ Each quantitative evaluation applies the following criteria.

1. The method of evaluation by the field for a contracting consortium

(a) For contracting consortium (joint implementation, shared implementation), Credential Status and Performance of Similar Projects are evaluated by multiplying the

evaluation scores calculated for each consortium member by the investment share rate (share ratio) and summing them. Any number after the decimal point after calculation shall be rounded to the third decimal place.

2. The method for evaluating Credential Status

- (a) Before the date of public notice of the tender, credit information business owners performing the duties specified in Article 4 (1) 1 of the Credit Information Use and Protection Act or Article 9 (26) of the Financial Investment Services and Capital Markets Act evaluate based on corporate bonds, corporate bills, and most recent corporate credit ratings for bidding purposes. It is evaluated as valid even if the expiration date of the validity period is the public notice of the tender date.
- (b) If not submitted or credit rating confirmation is not received, it will be evaluated as the lowest grade.
- (c) The merged company shall be evaluated by the new credit rating after the merger. If there is no new credit rating after the merger, the credit rating of the company with the lowest credit rating among the merged companies is evaluated.

3. The method for evaluating the performance of a similar project

- (a) The 'corresponding project scale' is based on the project budget (execution limit), but the scale can be adjusted if necessary considering the content and characteristics of the project.
- (b) Performance of a similar project is evaluated only where the following evidence exists:
 - 1) Performance of a similar project is based on a certificate of performance that has been confirmed by relevant associations or public institutions. However, if there is a service provision track record of a private company that has not been reported to or managed by the relevant association, it is evaluated only on the performance certificate attached with documentary evidence such as tax invoices and contracts.
 - 2) When a domestic company has performed a similar project in a foreign country or a public institution or private company has provided a similar service that has not

been reported or managed by a company located in a foreign country, only evaluates the case of notarizing the documents for proving the performance of 1), above; or the performance certificate submitted after confirmation by the Chamber of Commerce of the relevant country or the Korean overseas diplomatic office residing in the relevant country.

<Required Documents Performance of Similar Project>				
Orderer		Performance Management Association*	Required Documents	Note
Location	Category			
Domestic	Public Institutions	Exists	① Service performance certificate issued by the orderer ② Performance certificate issued by performance management association	Choose between ① and ②
		None	① Service performance certificate issued by the orderer	
	Private ***	Exists	① Performance certificate issued by performance management association	
		None	① Service performance certificate issued by the orderer ② A contract or invoice	Submit both ① and ②
Overseas	Public Institutions	Exists	① Performance certificate issued by performance management association	
		None	① Service performance certificate issued by the orderer	Notarization or confirmation by overseas diplomatic office is mandatory**
	Private ***	Exists	① Performance certificate issued by performance management association	
		None	① Service performance certificate issued by the orderer ② A contract	Submit both ① and ② Notarization or confirmation by overseas diplomatic office is mandatory**

* Only when domestic **performance management associations** (such as associations related to construction technology, software, and engineering) under the applicable special law are systematically implementing performance verification.

** Notarization or confirmation by the Chamber of Commerce of the relevant country or the Korean overseas diplomatic office residing in the relevant country is mandatory.
(Notarization method: Submitting after receiving Apostille confirmation or consular confirmation of an official document in the host country. If the document is not in English, submit it with a notarizing Korean translation thereof).

*** The private sector includes international organizations.

[Table 5-2] Evaluation Criteria for Win-win Cooperation

<Amended on Apr. 8, 2021>

Evaluation Criteria for Win-win Cooperation

SMEs Participation Share	Evaluation Score	Rating
At least 50%	5.00	The method for rating is according to [Note]
Between 45% and 50%	4.00	
Between 40% and 45%	3.00	
Between 35% and 40%	2.00	
Less than 35%	1.00	

[Note]

1. For win-win cooperation, the software project division is evaluated by the contracting consortium participation rate (investment share rate) of a software business, a small or medium-sized business. However, in the case of a joint-implementation consortium, the investment share rate of the small businesses in the entire project is evaluated.
 - (a) (Applicability of shared implementation type) A software development and construction project consisting of 80% of the software development and 20% of the information and communication construction: When a contracting consortium is formed, a large company A shares 40% of a software project, a small or medium-sized business B shares 40% of a software project, and a small business C shares information and communication construction (20%), the participation rate of small and medium-sized software business operators is based on the participation rate of small or medium-sized business B (40%) out of the software development project ratio (80%). In this case, it is evaluated as 50% and the score is 5 points.
 - (b) (Applicability of joint implementation type) A software development and construction project consisting of 80% of the software development and 20% of the information and communication construction: For the software development project, when a contracting consortium is formed, a large company A shares 40% of a software project, a small or

medium-sized business B shares 40% of a software project, and a small or medium-sized business C shares 20% of a software project, the participation rate of small and medium-sized software business operators is based on the participation rate of small and medium-sized businesses B and C (60%) out of the software development and construction project ratio (100%). In this case, the score is 5 points.

2. If a small or medium-sized software business operator participates in the bidding alone, the highest rating is awarded and if there is no stake in the small or medium-sized software business operator, 0 points are awarded.
3. Confirmation and evaluation of small and medium-sized enterprises are as follows:
 - (a) In the case of a Small and Medium Business Certificate issued pursuant to Article 6 of the Small and Medium Business Scope and Verification Regulations and registered in the Small & Medium Business Public e-Procurement Information, the evaluation reference date is the day before the deadline for submitting the bid and must be within the validity period of the Certificate. In this case, documents issued up to the day before the evaluation date of the proposal are also included in the examination.
 - (b) Small and medium enterprises under Article 8-2 of the Act on Facilitation of Purchase of Small and Medium Enterprise-Manufactured Products and Support for Development of Their Markets as members (including representatives) of the contracting consortium are not eligible.
4. Where a project restricts the participation of large software enterprises pursuant to Articles 48 (2) and (4) of the Software Promotion Act, win-win cooperation will not be evaluated.

[Table 6] Criteria for Paying Allowance to Evaluation Commissioner

<Amended on Apr. 29, 2020>

Criteria for Paying Allowance to Evaluation Commissioners

1. Consultation fees

- (a) Consultation fees are paid to non-standing members of a committee who have completed evaluation according to the number of proposals, regardless of the number of evaluation days, as follows. However, if the person is subject to the Improper Solicitation and Graft Act, the amount may be reduced according to the payment standards of the affiliated institution.

Number of Proposals	Up to 3	4 ~ 6	At least 7
Amount	KRW 250,000	KRW 350,000	KRW 400,000

(2) Attendance allowance

- (a) The attendance allowance is 100,000 won (one time) for non-standing members of a committee. However, if the member works outside the metropolitan area (referring to Seoul, and Gyeonggi-do, and Incheon metropolitan cities around it), 100,000 won (one time) will be additionally paid.
- (b) In a convocation evaluation, if it is impracticable to participate in the evaluation because the evaluation commissioner is excluded or abstained, or if postponement of the committee is inevitable due to lack of quorum, the non-standing member of a committee receives only an attendance allowance.

3. Other allowances

- (a) In principle, technical evaluation should be conducted within a day, but further evaluation days may be added considering the number of proposals. In this case, if accommodation is required, additional accommodation and meal expenses may be paid according to the domestic business travel expense regulations.

<Amended on Apr. 8, 2021>

Item	Evaluation Factor	Grade	
Understanding and Readiness	① Did he/she arrive at the venue before the evaluation commenced? ② Did he/she perform a technical evaluation based on objective evidence such as expertise and materials?	Excellent	
		Good	
		Suitable	
		Poor	
		Very Poor	
Attitude and Cooperation	③ Did he/she refrain from personal affairs until the end of the evaluation? ④ Did he/she faithfully complete an evaluation form? ⑤ Did he/she refrain from expressing tendencies for and against, and as to the rightfulness or wrongfulness of matters with facial expressions, words, and/or gesture? ⑥ Did he/she refrain from indicating the incorrect part(s) of the proposal with evaluation scores and opinions, and refrain from pointing out or correcting it? ⑦ Did he/she consider the contents of the preliminary review and presentation and ask questions that matched the purpose of the evaluation when inquiring? ⑧ Did he/she refrain from trying to convey or flaunt knowledge? ⑩ Did he/she refrain from guessing or extrapolating factors without checking? ⑪ Did he/she refrain from inducing correct or incorrect answers? ⑫ Did he/she refrain from rebuking or humiliating the company subject to evaluation? ⑬ Did he/she refrain from saying anything that may cause sexual shame? ⑭ Did he/she refrain from speaking and acting with bias? ⑮ Did he/she refrain from consulting or negotiating with other commissioners? ⑯ Did he/she refrain from trying to dominate the atmosphere of the evaluation venue?	Excellent	
		Good	
			Suitable
			Poor
		Very Poor	

[Table 8] Demerit Points for Evaluation Commissioner by Evaluation Item

<Amended on Apr. 29, 2020>

Demerit Points for Evaluation Commissioner by Evaluation Item

Evaluation Factor	Demerit Points
- If a commissioner violates Article 9 (1) (grounds for evaluation commissioner's abstaining and being excluded) - If a commissioner violates Article 25 (3) (integrity) - If a commissioner fails to report prior contact from the company subject to evaluation	100
- If a commissioner awards a significantly (beyond 2nd grade) high/low to a specific company compared to the result of the qualitative evaluation of the proposal, without a valid reason, etc. - If a commissioner did not participate in the evaluation without informing the evaluation department prior to the evaluation of the proposal. - If a commissioner does not submit an evaluation form.	50
- If a commissioner pre-contacted the evaluation department notifying the ground for non-participation before the evaluation of the proposal and did not participate in the evaluation.	30
- If a commissioner violates any of the provisions of Table 2 (Points to Note for Evaluation Commissioner) (10 points for each violation)	10

[Form 1] Quantitative Evaluation Self-Screening Table

<Amended on Apr. 29, 2020>

Quantitative Evaluation Self-Screening Table

Item	Self-Screening		
	Summary of Evidence	Points	The Page of Relevant Evidence
○ Credential Status			
- Credit rating (Applicable grade)			
○ Performance of Similar Projects			
- The ratio of similar projects domestically and overseas			
○ Adding and Deducting			
- Adding (contents)			
- Deducting (contents)			
Total Score			

※ For a contracting consortium (shared implementation, joint implementation), the evaluation items such as Credential Status and Performance of Similar Projects should be summed by multiplying the evaluation score calculated for each member of the consortium by the participation share or share ratio.

※ Where documents are incomplete or not submitted according to Table 4 (Evaluation Table for Adding or Deducting Points) H.(3) of the Guidelines of Technical Evaluation, 0.2 points will be deducted.

Attachment. Relevant documentary evidence

mm. dd. yy.

Representative: (Seal)

[Form 1-2] Self-Screening Table to Check Qualification Requirements for Key Personnel

<Amended on Apr. 29, 2020>

Self-Screening Table to Check
Qualification Requirements for Key Personnel

Key Personnel	Requirements	Satisfying	List of Evidence
Key personnel 1	Necessary		
Key personnel 2	Necessary		
Key personnel 3	Necessary		

- ※ In cases falling under Article 12 (6) 1 through 4 of the Guidelines for Technical Evaluation, the evaluation item for the general manager of the project or key personnel is awarded a score one level lower than the original evaluation grade.
- ※ Qualification requirements must be verifiable through the documentary evidence (diploma, career certificate, performance certificate, employment certificate, qualification, and employment verification document (certificate of enrollment in the four major insurances such as National Pension, Employment Insurance, and Medical Insurance, etc.)) submitted as an appendix to the proposal. If verified, the requirements shall be deemed not met.
- ※ In the case of incompleteness or non-submission according to Table 4 (Evaluation Table for Adding or Deducting Points) H.(3) of the Guidelines of Technical Evaluation, 0.2 points will be deducted.

mm. dd. yy.

Representative: (Seal)

Original Factual Confirmation Letter

By submitting this confirmation, ____ Corporation, (contracting consortium) ____ Corporation confirms that all the contents and required documents are true and the same as the original, in submitting a proposal for tendering to select companies for ____ services. If any fact differs from the original, the corporation will be disqualified from participating in the bidding and assume all civil and criminal liabilities, including compensation for loss, and the contract will be terminated.

mm. dd. yy.

Corporate Name:

Representative: (인)

(Contracting consortium) Corporate Name:

Representative: (인)

To Korea International Cooperation Agency President

※ Points to note

- ① The representative of the company participating in the bidding prepares the above.
(When forming a contracting consortium, each representative prepares the above.)
- ② An incomplete or non-submitted 'Original Factual Confirmation Letter' pursuant to the Guidelines for Technical Evaluation Article 12 (11) will result in disqualification from technical evaluation.

Fair Competition Commitment

____ Corporation, (contracting consortium) ____ Corporation is committed to not engaging in any misconduct or corruption in participating in the tender to select companies for ____ services, and to not raise any objections to the results of the selection without recognized legitimate legal grounds.

mm. dd. yy.

Corporate Name:

Representative: (인)

(Contracting consortium) Corporate Name:

Representative: (인)

To Korea International Cooperation Agency President

※ Points to note

- ① The representative of the company participating in the bidding prepares the above. (When forming a contracting consortium, each representative prepares the above.)
- ② An incomplete or non-submitted 'Fair Competition Commitment' pursuant to the Guidelines for Technical Evaluation Article 12 (11) will result in disqualification from technical evaluation.

[Form 3] Pledge of Evaluation Commissioner

<Amended on Apr. 29, 2020>

Pledge of Evaluation Commissioner

As a technical evaluation commissioner evaluating proposals for selecting companies to perform ___ services ordered by the Korea International Cooperation Agency, I pledge to comply with each of the following matters:

- (a) I have checked the principles of integrity of the evaluation commissioner in Article 16 (5) of the Guidelines for Technical Evaluation and Table 2 (Points for Evaluation Commissioners to Note), and will strictly comply with it.
- (b) I will not object to any sanctions as well as punishment under all security-related laws and regulations where causing a significant problem by divulging externally any security matters or facts learned through evaluation.
- (c) As at the evaluation date, I am certain that I am currently working at the affiliated institution mentioned below, and if this is not true, I will not object to any sanctions.
- (d) I do not fall under any of the following grounds for abstaining and exclusion in Article 9 (1) of the Guidelines for Technical Evaluation:
 - 1. Where an evaluation commissioner performs services, consultation, and/or research about the item of the agenda for the company subject to evaluation;
 - 2. Where an evaluation commissioner has conducted services, consultation, and/or research, including subcontracting, at the request of the company subject to evaluation at any time between January 1 of the previous year and the present;
 - 3. Where the evaluation commissioner has experience working in the company subject to evaluation at any time within the three years preceding the evaluation date;
 - 4. Where the sponsorship funds received by the evaluation commissioner or the organization to which the commissioner belongs, from the company subject to evaluation is directly related to the agenda item;
 - 5. Other cases falling under subparagraphs 1 through 4, in which it is determined that a fair screening cannot be performed.
- (e) If I compromise violating fairness, integrity, expertise, and objectivity during the evaluation process, I will not object even if I am excluded from the technical evaluation commissioner pool.
- (f) I will not accept any money, gift, or entertainment from the company subject to evaluation. If accepted any such, I will be punished according to as a public official pursuant to Article 35 of the Act on Contracts to Which the State is a Party and Article 118 of the Enforcement Decree of the same Act, and will not object to any such sanctions.

mm. dd. yy.

Affiliation and Position

Name

(Signature)

To: Korea International Cooperation Agency President

[Form 4] Agreement on Collection/Use of Personal Information (for registering technical evaluation commissioners)

<Amended on Apr. 29, 2020>

**Agreement on Collection/Use of Personal Information
(for registering technical evaluation commissioners)**

The Korea International Cooperation Agency seeks your consent to collect, use, and provide your personal information under Articles 15 and 22 of the Personal Information Protection Act for registering and managing the technical evaluation commissioner pool. Please read the following carefully and decide whether to agree or not.

☐ **Collection and use of personal information (mandatory)**

Item	Purpose	Retention Period
Name, DOB, address (home, work), phone number (mobile, work), e-mail, specialty, academic background, career, qualifications, similar work experience	Technical evaluation commissioner registration and information update, etc.	5 years according to KOICA Records Management Standard

※ You have the right to refuse to consent to the collection and use of your personal information stated above.
However, refusal may limit your selection and activity as a technical evaluation commissioner.

☒ Do you agree to the collection and use of personal information as above?

☐ Agree

☐ Disagree

- If you agree to receive news such as holding meetings for evaluation commissioners, please check the method of reception.
- (☐ SMS ☐ E-MAIL)

mm/dd/yy

Name

(Signature or Seal)

To Korea International Cooperation Agency President

※ For details on the processing of personal information, please refer to the “Personal Information Processing Policy” published on the Korea International Cooperation Agency website.

(<http://www.koica.go.kr>).

[Form 4-2] Agreement on Collection/Use of Personal Information (for paying allowances to technical evaluation commissioners)

<Amended on Apr. 29, 2020>

Agreement on Collection/Use of Personal Information (for paying allowances to technical evaluation commissioners)

The Korea International Cooperation Agency seeks your consent to collect, use, and provide your personal information under Articles 15 and 22 of the Personal Information Protection Act, for paying an allowance(s) to you as a technical evaluation commissioner. Please read the following carefully and decide whether to agree or not.

☐ **Collection and use of personal information (mandatory)**

Item	Purpose	Retention Period
Name, affiliation, position, bank name, account number	Payment of allowances for participation in technical evaluation and tax reporting of other income	5 years according to KOICA Records Management Standard

※ You have the right to refuse to consent to the collection and use of personal information stated above.

However, refusal may limit payment of allowance to technical evaluation commissioners.

☞ Do you agree to the collection and use of personal information as above?

☐ Agree

☐ Disagree

- If you agree to receive news such as meetings for evaluation commissioners, please check the method of reception.

- (☐ SMS ☐ E-MAIL)

☐ **Personal Information (required items)**

Name	Affiliation/Position
Resident Registration Number	
Bank Name/Account Number	

<Other Notices>

Under Article 15 (1) 4, Article 24-2 (1) of the Personal Information Protection Act, personal information is collected and used without the consent of the data subject.

Reason for Processing	Personal Information	Grounds for Collection
Issuing tax withholding receipt	Resident Registration Number	Paragraph (3) of Article 68 (Handling of Sensitive Information and Personally Identifiable Information) of the Enforcement Decree of the Framework Act on National Taxes

mm/dd/yy

Name

(Signature or Seal)

To Korea International Cooperation Agency President

※ For details on the processing of personal information, please refer to the “Personal Information Processing Policy” published on the Korea International Cooperation Agency website.

(<http://www.koica.go.kr>).

Confirmation (Report) of Prior Contact

I confirm (report) whether there has been any prior contact with any of the bidding participants regarding the technical evaluation for the selection of ____ service companies by the Korea International Cooperation Agency as follows:

Corporate Name	Pre-contacted Person	Date and Time	Details

※ If not, please write “Not applicable” by hand.

mm/dd/yy

Affiliation and Position

Name (Signature)

To Korea International Cooperation Agency President

[Form 6] Software Project Subcontracting Plan (when tendering)

<Amended on Apr. 8, 2021>

Software Project Subcontracting Plan (when tendering)

Project Name		Period	months
Tenderer (Representative of contracting consortium)	Business Name	Representative	
	Corporate Registration Number	Location	
☐ Subcontracting Plan			
Tenderer	Subcontractor Business Name	Subcontract Name	Subcontract Amount Ratio
			%
Total			
1) Subcontract amount ratio is the ratio of the total amount of subcontracting to the total bid amount of the original contract. - Subcontract amount ratio = Expected subcontracting amount / (bid amount - expected amount of simple purchase of goods *) X 100 * Purchase amount for goods (hardware, commercial software, equipment, etc.) that the bidder wants to purchase directly - Reason for exceeding 50% of total subcontract amount ratio: _____ 2) Grounds for re-subcontracting: _____			
☐ Grounds for subcontracting ratio exceeding 10%			
☐ Whether the institution in demand requested the bidder to participate in a contracting consortium with a subcontractor when the subcontract amount ratio exceeds 10% in the request for proposal: (☐), (☐) ☐ Grounds for not participating in the contracting consortium even though the subcontract ratio exceeds 10%: _____			
☐ Whether using standard form subcontract			
☐ Using standard contracts pursuant to Article 38 (4) of the Software Promotion Act - Whether using standard form subcontract: (☐), (☐) - Grounds for not using standard contracts: _____ ☐ Use the software project standard form subcontract pursuant to Article 3-2 of the Fair Transactions in Subcontracting Act - Whether using standard form subcontract: (☐), (☐) - Grounds for not using standard form subcontract: _____			
I hereby submit software project subcontracting plan, and when subcontracting, the contract is signed with prior approval from the ordering agency under Article 20 of the Guidelines on Software Project Contracts and Management Supervision. I affirm that I will not object even if I suffer any disadvantages if I do not implement the plan without any justifiable ground. mm/dd/yy Representative of Contracting Consortium Business Name: _____ Representative: _____ (Signature or Seal) To Korea International Cooperation Agency President			
※ Points to note - The ratio of the total subcontracted amount to the bid amount cannot exceed 50% of the bid amount pursuant to Article 51 (1) of the Software Promotion Act. However, this shall not apply if it falls under any of the subparagraphs of Paragraph 2 of the same article. In this case, the reason for the exception shall be stated. - Re-subcontracting is prohibited pursuant to Article 51 (3) of the Software Promotion Act. However, this is not the case if it falls under any of the subparagraphs of Paragraph 3 of the same article. In this case, specify the name of the subcontractor and the reason for the exception in the "Bidder" field. - Pursuant to Article 51 (6) of the Software Promotion Act and Article 48 (5) of the Enforcement Decree of the same Act, the head of a state agency requested that a bidder participates as a member of the contracting consortium for cases where the subcontract amount ratio to the bid amount exceeds 10/100. If no specific reason exists, the bidder must comply accordingly.			

◁Newly Inserted on Apr. 8, 2021▷

Software Project Subcontracting Plan (when signing a contract)						
Project Name						
Contract Amount (C)	KRW		Period	mm/dd/yy ~ mm/dd/yy		
Contractor (Representative of contracting consortium)	Business Name			Representative		
	Corporate Registration Number			Location		
Plan to be subcontracted						
No.	Contractor	Subcontractor Name	Subcontract Name	Contract Period	Planned Subcontracting Amount (A)	Ratio of Estimated Subcontracting Amount to Contract Amount
1				. . . ~ . . .	KRW	%
2				. . . ~ . . .	KRW	%
Total				. . . ~ . . .	KRW	%
Plan to purchase goods directly						
No.	Category (HW, Facility, Commercial SW)	Name of Goods	Manufacturer (Developer)	Quantity	Proposed Purchase Date	Estimated Purchase Amount (B)
1						KRW
2						KRW
Total						KRW
- If the contractor is a contracting consortium, specify the plan for subcontracting of the consortium members (including the representative). - Simple purchase of goods, installation services, new technology, or specialized technology included in subcontracting - Direct goods purchase plans are limited to items purchased directly by the contractor (<u>contract partner</u>) - Grounds for exception if the aggregate ratio of the planned subcontracting amount exceeds 50%: _____ - Contract Amount (C) = Estimated Subcontracting Amount (A) + Estimated Purchase Amount (B) + contractor Self-Performance Amount - Ratio of estimated subcontracting amount to contract amount = Estimated Subcontracting Amount(A)/(Contract Amount(C)-Estimated Purchase Amount(B)) X 100						
I hereby submit a Software Project Subcontracting Plan according to Article 19 of the Guidelines on Software Project Contract and Supervision.						
						mm/dd/yy
Contracting Consortium		Business Name of the Representative:				
		Representative: (Signature or Seal)				
Contracting Consortium		Business Name of a Member:				
		Representative: (Signature or Seal)				
Contracting Consortium		Business Name of a Member:				
		Representative: (Signature or Seal)				
Korea International Cooperation Agency President						
Documents	- Subcontracting Project Execution Plan (including calculation statement on subcontracting amount and project execution schedule) 1 copy of each - 1 copy of each Goods Supply Agreement					

※ Points to note

- The ratio of the estimated subcontracting amount to contract amount cannot exceed 50% of the total contract amount under Article 51 (1) of the Software Promotion Act. However, this shall not apply the case if it falls under any of the subparagraphs of Paragraph 2 of the same Article. In this case, the reason for the exception shall be stated.

- The contractor shall submit to the head of a state agency, etc., a copy of each goods supply commitment, etc., that can prove the matters specified in the plan to purchase the goods directly. If the submitted documents are incomplete, the head of a state agency may request supplementation. If such documents are not submitted, or a direct purchase is not made after reviewing the submitted documents, the amount will be incorporated into calculating the subcontract limit ratio.

- If there are many plans to be subcontracted and there is insufficient space, a separate form can be attached.

[Form 7] Application for Registration of Technical Evaluation Commissioner

<Newly Inserted on Apr. 29, 2020>

Application for Registration of Technical Evaluation Commissioner

Photo (optional)	Name		(Korean) (English) (Chinese Character)	DOB		Login ID
				<i>Resident registration number First 6 digits</i>		<i>Including 7-20 alphanumeric characters</i>
	Contact		(Mobile) (Office)	E-mail		
	Address		(Home) <i>Road-name address is recommended</i> (Office)			
Field of Expertise	<i>Choose from among "Education", "Health", "Public Administration", "Agriculture, Forestry and Fisheries", "Industrial Energy", "Emergency Relief", and "Others"</i>					
Detailed Field	<i>Complete by referring to the attached "Field Classification Table", but if there is no suitable name, state directly (multiple possible)</i>					
Work Experience	Working Place	Department	Position	Year and Month Entered	Year and Month Resigned	Duty (Responsibilities)
Education	Degree	School Name	Major	Year and Month Admitted	Year and Month Graduated	Degree Status
	Bachelor					<i>Graduation/ Completion/ Attendance</i>
	Master					
	Doctor					
Qualifications	Foreign Language	Test Year and Month		Qualification Name (Language)		Score/Grade
	Certificate	Year and Month Obtained		Certificate Name		Publisher
Similar Project Experience	Start Year and Month	End Year and Month	Business name	Country	Responsibilities	