

RECEIVED  
RECEIVED

2003 AUG 29 A 10:13  
2003 AUG 29 A 10:13

PURCHASE OF TRANSPORTATION  
PURCHASE OF TRANSPORTATION

United Nations  Nations Unies

INTEROFFICE MEMORANDUM

004007

MEMORANDUM INTERIEUR

2003 AUG 29 A 10:13

004109

UNITED NATIONS Date: 27 August 2003  
PURCHASE OF TRANSPORTATION Reference: 2003-UNHQ-006964

TO: Mr. Christian Saunders, Chief  
A: Procurement Division  
OCSS/DM

THROUGH: Clemens Adams, Chief  
S/C DE: Specialist Support Services  
LSD/OMS/DPKO

FROM: Vevine Stamp, OIC  
DE: Services Unit/SSS/LSD

SUBJECT: Technical Evaluation of Rations EOI Questionnaire Responses  
OBJET:

1. In response to a request from the Logistics Support Division of DPKO, PD issued an EOI for the provision of rations and associated services for UN troops in Liberia, UNMEE and MONUC. PD subsequently sent out technical questionnaires to vendors that indicated their interest, to ascertain their ability to adequately meet the requirements of UN rations contracts. The responses were forwarded to LSD on August 18, 2003.
2. The questionnaire contained eighteen technical questions. These questions sought answers that demonstrate the vendors' willingness, experience, and ability to provide the full complement of rations services under contracts of the size and scope of the UN's requirement, i.e. requiring the company to source, procure, transport, warehouse and deliver a minimum of 400 fresh, dry and frozen food items from all food groups monthly to at least 5,000 persons at various overseas location. From this point of view the questions covered experience (questions 1, 2, 16, 17, and 18), worldwide storage & delivery network (questions 2, 9, & 10), financial responsibility (questions 4 & 13), and technical ability (questions 5, 6, 11). The responses were reviewed on whether affirmative answers and supporting documentation or details were provided to demonstrate this capability.
3. PD forwarded twelve (12) responses to the Supply Section. Of these, five responses were deemed to be sufficient to indicate the ability of the companies to meet the UN requirements. These five are from Economat, ES-KO, Eurest, PAE,

and Supreme Sales. These companies have significant experience with UN missions, NATO, and Defence Departments/Ministries of national governments and with the exception of PAE each has provided food to more than 5,000 troops. In addition, their annual revenues confirmed that they could afford the potentially large investment required to mobilize and maintain operations for the provision of rations to the UN. Each of these companies is also experienced in establishing operations in Africa which is the location of the next three rations requirements. For PAE it should be noted that the company has major contracts (up to \$280m value) with USA armed forces for provision of logistics services, engineering and other support to troops. It has UN contracts for airfield services in UNMISSET and MONUC. Although food supply does not seem to be its major operation, in its response it did provide examples of food services operations to troops in international locations.

4. The other responses were analysed has not meeting the basic UN requirements. The following is a summary of the reasons for the failure of the responses to demonstrate the vendor's ability to meet UN requirements:

ALMA: This company specified limited catering experience for up to only 2,000 persons. There is no evidence of the ability to source and deliver food supplies to UN destinations and provide in-country distribution. It did not respond on its ability to fund the mobilization of resources for the contract. It is experienced in Central Africa but did not indicate if it had any experience with troops (governmental or for international organizations). PD should consider if the company's stated annual revenue of \$10m is adequate to demonstrate its ability to be financially responsible for high value rations contracts.

Cavalier: Cavalier stated that its list of food contracts was "unavailable". Thus it provided no information on which to judge its experience. It stated that it had no quality control programme, no governmental experience servicing troops, and had no experience in Central Africa.

Danish Camp: While the company has significant experience providing services for military camps, its experience is limited to Europe for a maximum of 3,000 troops. In addition, the vendor has stated that it is not able to provide in-country distribution of rations, an important component of the UN rations requirements.

Dewina: This company provided information on ration packs. It did not provide any information on its experience in providing rations services, but it does supply ration packs within Africa. The company did not respond on whether it had experience with governments or international organizations.

Layam: This company has no experience in Africa and its primary experience is supplying food for cruise vessels worldwide. Its UN experience was

in UNTSO and UNDOF for small local contracts to provide a limited range of food items. It does not have a quality control programme but relies on its suppliers for this. PD should consider if the vendor's stated annual revenue of \$4m is adequate to demonstrate its ability to be financially responsible for high value rations contracts.

PKL Group: In its cover letter to PD this company indicated that it does not supply food rations. Therefore in responding to the questionnaire it indicated its inability to establish an international delivery network, to source food conforming with the food specifications, and to provide and deliver food to 5,000 troops.

TeknoFoods: In its response this company indicated that it does not have an international storage and delivery network, it could not deliver food to 5,000 troops, and had no international food experience. Its stated annual revenue is only \$1m.

5. Summary

Based on the responses to the BOI questionnaire received from potential vendors, LSD recommends that the companies that demonstrated their ability to submit technically meaningful proposals able to meet the requirements of a UN rations RFP are Economat, ES-KO, Eurest, PAE, and Supreme Sales. LSD plans to submit SOWs for Liberia (UNMIL) and UNMEE next week, and the SOW for MONUC within a few weeks.

cc: Mr. Alex Yakovlev

## **Attachment to Rations Technical Evaluation (RFPS-550 for UNMIL)**

### **1. Requirement**

The RFP specifically requested proposals for the provision of rations and associated services for UN troops in UNMIL, and included a chart showing anticipated troops strengths and delivery locations which were based on estimates at the time of its issuance. It also included a sliding scale pricing option to reflect the possibility of changes in the troop strength in the Mission. The SOW also included a request for optional items such as drinking water, catering, lease/purchase of containers, and equipment. In addition, due to the damaged state of the infrastructure in Liberia and the possibility that there would not be immediate access by surface transportation to certain locations in Liberia, the SOW requested that the proposals address the delivery of the rations to Sector and Contingent locations by various means including air delivery, in case this mode of transportation was required of the contractor.

### **2. Specific Tasks**

The specific tasks required included the following:

- To deliver fresh, frozen, dry and canned rations to the Mission in accordance with the United Nations Ration Scale and food and packaging specifications;
- To provide cost effective and reliable logistics arrangements taking into account the geography, topography, climate, and required delivery cycles;
- To manage the complete supply chain from procurement of the rations, to delivery to the designated delivery points, and the submission of necessary documentation for payment

### **3. Evaluation Criteria**

Prior to the closing of the RFP, LSD provided PD with the detailed evaluation criteria. The scoring of the proposals was based on these evaluation criteria, which are: corporate capability, mobilization schedules, quality control, supply chain management & logistics, work plan – staffing, risk management, reporting, optional requirements, and proposal presentation, which covered comprehensiveness, whether proposal is clear and logical and demonstrates understanding of requirements.

### **4. Proposals**

These companies are well-established large providers of the full spectrum of rations services. In general their proposals demonstrated a good understanding of the requirements, provided adequate plans, and showed flexibility and satisfactory attention to risk management

issues. The break-down of the scores according to evaluation criteria for the three vendor proposals are set forth in the table below:

**Consolidated Matrix -**

	<b>ESS</b>	<b>ESKO</b>	<b>Supreme</b>
<b>Corporate Capability – experience etc. (150 points)</b>	<b>136.67</b>	<b>150.00</b>	<b>130.00</b>
<b>Mobilization &amp; Delivery Schedules (250 points)</b>	<b>235.00</b>	<b>233.33</b>	<b>230.00</b>
<b>Work Plan – Quality Control, Other – (Supply Chain Management, logistics, et.) (250 points)</b>	<b>245.00</b>	<b>243.33</b>	<b>212.50</b>
<b>Work Plan – Other: staffing, performance, options &amp; reporting (250 points)</b>	<b>243.67</b>	<b>222.33</b>	<b>192.50</b>
<b>Proposal Presentation – comprehensiveness, clarity, etc. (100 points)</b>	<b>92.67</b>	<b>95.00</b>	<b>82.50</b>
<b>TOTAL (max. 1,000)</b>	<b>953.00</b>	<b>944.00</b>	<b>848.00</b>

5. Evaluation Issues

Although all bidders are technically acceptable, LSD has included the following points about certain aspects of the offers that should be considered by PD to the extent that they may impact the commercial evaluation.

Routine Delivery

Because of the poor condition of roads in Liberia especially outside of the capital, all vendors offered delivery to contingent locations by road and by air. In addition, Eurest offered an option for delivery by sea to certain coastal delivery points, not offered by the other contractors. This offer of a sea alternative seems to provide additional flexibility for the requirement.

Air Delivery Option

For air delivery of rations, the UN responsibilities are normally limited (conditionally) to granting a UN Call Sign, and at the UN's option, providing fuel for the aircraft. In addition, the UN may provide assistance in unloading the rations from the aircraft. The contractor however is to be responsible to maintain operational control, load the aircraft,

provide an aircraft which carries tow bars, push back, paying all air navigation fees, handling the cargo, and paying civil aviation costs. These are normal carrier responsibilities in the industry. In ESKO's proposal for air delivery it was stated that costs specifically NOT included are royalties, landing fees, navigation fees, parking fees, short-term licence fees, and overflight fees. It should be noted that the UN deems those fees to be carrier fees that are the responsibility of the carrier or contractor and not the UN.

Other ES-KO requests are for permit to park in UN segregated area, and UN subcontractor badge – acceptance will depend on the ability of the Mission to provide these items.

The other two vendors ESS and Supreme, did not mention who had responsibility for fees and specific services in their technical proposal. Thus PD should consider whether the issue of fees and services relating to air delivery impacts a viable comparison of prices in PD's commercial evaluation.

PD should also include a term in any resulting contract that air delivery if required shall be conducted in accordance with UN policy.