TECHNICAL & FINANCIAL BID EVALUATION STATUS:

Four Consultants had shown their interest and filed their bid for this project; all the bids were initially accepted and evaluated as per the Evaluation Criteria mentioned in RFP. The firms who had shown their interest for this project are listed below;

1. A. F. Ferguson & Co.
2. BDO Ebrahim & Co.
3. Ernst & Young Ford Rhodes Sidat Hyder
4. MAZARS Consulting Pakistan

Out of the above mentioned applicants, only two of the applicants scored above then the technical threshold set by the NBP; Those two applicants are;

1. A. F. Ferguson & Co.
2. Ernst & Young Ford Rhodes Sidat Hyder

We would like to record our appreciation for your participation in the bidding process. The weighting of your documentation was an educative experience for us; we also acknowledge the professionalism and conduct of your firm throughout this process as being appropriate.
JUSTIFICATION FOR DISQUALIFICATION OF BID – MAZARS CONSULTING PAKISTAN

- **SECTION-1 “Quality & Experience of Staff (Dedicated to NBP)”**
  - Experience in the majority of the dedicated team in BPR related projects in local banks was not available.
  - Experience in the majority of the dedicated team in COSO related projects in local banks was not available.
  - Availability of the dedicated team was also not in accordance with the definition of dedicated team given by NBP in its RFP.
  - No local experience of the dedicated team in implementing COSO projects.

- **SECTION-2 “Experience of firm / Consortium of Firms”**
  - Details of the BPR projects provided in the technical proposals were in the international banks however NBP required the domestic experience of the applicant.
  - Details of the COSO projects (Implementation / review) completed in international banks, however NBP required the domestic experience of the applicant.
  - No local experience in implementing various stages of COSO
  - No local experience in conducting the ICFR exercise.

- **SECTION-3 “Approach / Methodology”**
  - No detailed approach and methodology against the end-results of the project were provided against the sub-section of section 3 in the technical proposal
  - No detailed similar projects conducted/examples/proposed structures were provided against the sub-section of section 3 in the technical proposal

- **SECTION-4 “Coverage of the Scope of the work as defined in RFP”**
  - No details of the detailed process inventory, to-be prototypes, benchmarking methodology and detailed remediation planning templates provided against the phase-wise implementation road map of the project in the sub-section of section 4 in the technical proposal.

**CONCLUSION:**

Your technical bid attained a low score and did not meet the minimum technical threshold set by NBP in the technical evaluation and thus considered as “Technically Non-Responsive” for the project “BPR & COSO Implementation Project at NBP”.

Please note that no conditions or qualifications have been considered by the BPR & COSO Implementation Committee in the evaluation of the bids received by NBP.