

ANNEX VIII c

STANDARD FORMATS AND TEMPLATES

STANDARD PROPOSAL EVALUATION FORMAT

FOR

THE PROCUREMENT OF CONSULTING SERVICES (FIRMS)

for

Quality Cost-Based Selection (QCBS)

Quality-Based Selection (QBS)

Fixed Budget Selection (FBS)

Least-Cost Selection (LCS)

Selection Based on Consultants' Qualifications (SBCQ)

Preface

1. This standard tender evaluation format for the Selection of Consultants has been prepared for use by Procuring Entities in the application of the evaluation criteria in the Request for Proposals (RFP) process, under the open or selective tendering procedures. The processes and practices they convey have been developed through international best practice.

2. The document sets out the format of a sample evaluation report. It is mandatory for Procuring Entities to use in order to facilitate the evaluation of consultants' proposals and the subsequent review of these proposals by the relevant Tender Evaluation Committee. The evaluation must be in accordance with the criteria spelled out in the Request for Proposals and carried out by qualified evaluators. Procuring Entities are obligated to submit certain reports to the Tenders Committee during the selection process:

- a) a technical evaluation report subject to prior review by the Tenders Committee, such as the Tenders Committee's approval prior to opening the financial proposals; or
- b) the combined technical/financial evaluation report;

3. The evaluation must be in accordance with the criteria spelled out in the Request for Proposals and carried out by qualified evaluators. The evaluation report includes five sections:

- Section I. A Short Report Summarising the Findings of the Technical Evaluation;
- Section II. Technical Evaluation Report - Forms;
- Section III. A Short Report Summarising the Findings of the Financial Evaluation;
- Section IV. Financial Evaluation Report - Forms;
- Section V. Annexes:
 - Annex I. Individual Evaluations;
 - Annex II. Information Data Monitoring;
 - Annex III. Minutes of the Public Opening of the Financial Proposals;
 - Annex IV. Copy of the Request for Proposals;
 - Annex V. Miscellaneous Annexes— Ad Hoc.
 - Annex VI. Proposal Evaluation Checklist
 - Annex VII. Statement on Ethical Conduct, Fraud and Corruption

4. The report can be used for all methods of selection. Though it mainly addresses Quality and Cost-Based Selection, each section contains a note indicating the data and forms that are to be provided for the other methods of selection. Guidance is given in italic text into brackets [].

BID EVALUATION REPORT
AND
RECOMMENDATION FOR AWARD OF CONTRACT

Selection of Consultants (Firms)

Procuring Entity Name: _____

Title of Consulting Services: _____

Contract Number: _____

Date of Submission: _____

Table of Contents

Section I. Technical Evaluation Report—Text	3
Section II. Technical Evaluation Report—Forms	4
Form IIA. Technical Evaluation - Basic Data	5
Form IIB. Evaluation Summary.....	8
Form IIC. Individual Evaluations—Comparison.....	9
Section III. Financial Evaluation Report—Award Recommendation—Text.....	10
Section IV. Financial Evaluation Report—Award Recommendation—Forms.....	9
Form IVA. Financial Evaluation—Basic Data	10
Form IVB. Adjustments—Currency Conversion—Evaluated Prices	12
Form IVC. QCBS—Combined Technical/Financial Evaluation—Award Recommendation	13
Form IVD. Fixed-Budget and Least-Cost Selection—Award Recommendation	14
Section V. Annexes	15
Annex I (i). Individual Evaluations	16
Annex I(ii) Individual Evaluations—Key Personnel.....	17
Annex II. Minutes of Public Opening of Financial Proposals.....	18
Annex III. Request for Proposals.....	19
Annex IV. Miscellaneous Annexes—Ad Hoc	20
Annex V. Proposal Evaluation Checklist.....	21
Annex VI. Statement on Ethical Conduct and Fraud and Corruption.....	23

Section I. Technical Evaluation Report–Text¹

1. Background/Executive Summary

[Include a brief description, context, scope, and objectives of the services. Use about a page.]

2. The Selection Process (Prior to Technical Evaluation)

[Elaborate on information provided in Form IIA.

Describe briefly the selection process, beginning with the advertising (if required), the establishment of the shortlist, expressions of interest, and withdrawals of firms before proposal submissions. Describe major events that may have affected the timing (delays, complaints from consultants, Request for Proposals (RFP), extension of proposal submission date, and so on).

Use about one-half to one page].

3. Technical Evaluation

[Describe briefly the meetings and actions taken by the Evaluation Committee: formation of a technical evaluation team, outside assistance, evaluation guidelines, justification of sub-criteria and associated weightings as indicated in the Standard Request for Proposals and compliance of evaluation with RFP.

Present results of the technical evaluation: scores and the award recommendation.

Highlight strengths and weaknesses of each Proposal (most important part of the report).

- (a) Strengths: Experience in very similar projects in the country; quality of the methodology proving a clear understanding of the scope of the assignment; strengths of the local partner; and experience of proposed staff in similar assignments.*
- (b) Weaknesses: Of a particular component of the Proposal; lack of experience in the country; low level of participation by the local partner; lack of practical experience (experience in studies rather than in implementation); lack of staff experience compared to the firm's experience; lack of experience of a key staffer (e.g., the team leader); lack of responsiveness; and of disqualifications (conflict of interest).*

Comment on individual evaluators' scores (discrepancies). Items requiring further negotiations.

Use up to three pages.]

¹ Section I applies to Quality and Cost-Based Selection (QCBS), Quality-Based Selection (QBS), Fixed-Budget Selection (FBS), and Least-Cost Selection (LCS). Provide appropriate information in the case of Selection Based on Qualifications (SBCQ) and Single-Source Selection (SSS).

Section II. Technical Evaluation Report—Forms²

- Form IIA. Technical Evaluation—Basic Data
- Form IIB. Evaluation Summary—Technical Scores/Ranking
- Form IIC. Individual Evaluations—Comparison (Average Scores)

² Section II applies to Quality and Cost-Based Selection (QCBS), Quality-Based Selection (QBS), Fixed-Budget Selection (FBS), and Least-Cost Selection (LCS). Supply appropriate data in cases of Selection Based on Qualifications (SBCQ) and Single-Source Selection (SSS) in Form IIA.

Form IIA. Technical Evaluation - Basic Data

- 2.1 Title of Consulting Services _____

- 2.2 Purchaser:
(a) name _____
(b) address, phone, facsimile _____

- 2.3 Type of assignment:

- 2.4 Method of selection: QCBS ___ Quality-Based (QBS) ___
Fixed-Budget (FBS) ___
Least-Cost (LCS) ___
Single-Source (SSS) ___
Qualifications (SBCQ) _____
- 2.6 Request for Expressions of Interest:
- (a) publication in national/Int'l newspaper(s) Yes _____ No _____
Yes _____ No _____
- (b) number of responses _____
- 2.7 Shortlist:
(a) names/nationality of firms/associations (mark foreign firms and firms that had expressed interest)
1. _____
2. _____
3. _____
4. _____
5. _____
6. _____
- 2.8 Request for Proposals:
(a) issuance to Consultants Date _____
- 2.9 Amendments and clarifications to the RFP _____

(describe)

2.10 Contract:

(a) Standard Time-Based

Yes _____

Price adjustment: Yes _____ No _____

(b) Standard Lump Sum

Yes _____

Price adjustment: Yes _____ No _____

2.11 Pre-proposal conference:

(a) minutes issued

Yes _____ No _____

Yes _____ No _____

2.12 Proposal submission:

(a) two envelopes (technical and financial proposals)

Yes _____

(b) one envelope (technical original submission)

Yes _____

Date _____ Time _____

(d) extensions(s)

Date _____ Time _____

2.13 Submission of Financial Proposal

Location _____

2.14 Opening of Technical Proposals by Tender Evaluation Committee

Date _____ Time _____

2.15 Number of Proposals submitted

2.16 Tender Evaluation Committee¹:

Members' names and titles (normally three to five)

1. _____

2. _____

3. _____

4. _____

5. _____

¹ It is important that evaluators be qualified.

2.17 Proposal validity period (days):

(a) original expiration date

Date _____ Time _____

(b) extension(s), if any

Date _____ Time _____

2.18 Evaluation Criteria/sub-criteria²:

(a) Consultants' experience

(i) _____

Weight _____

(ii) _____

Weight _____

(b) methodology

(i) _____

Weight _____

(ii) _____

Weight _____

(c) key staff

(i) individual(s)

(A) _____

Weight _____

(B) _____

Weight _____

(C) _____

Weight _____

(ii) group(s)

(A) _____

Weight _____

(B) _____

Weight _____

(C) _____

Weight _____

(d) training (optional)

(i) _____

Weight _____

(ii) _____

Weight _____

(e) local input (optional)

(i) _____

Weight _____

(ii) _____

Weight _____

² Maximum of three sub-criteria per criterion.

2.19 Technical scores by
Consultant:

Minimum qualifying score _____

Consultants' names

Technical scores

- | | |
|----------|-------|
| 1. _____ | _____ |
| 2. _____ | _____ |
| 3. _____ | _____ |
| 4. _____ | _____ |

2.20 Evaluation report:

(a) submission to Tenders
Committee for approval

Date _____

Form IIB. Evaluation Summary

Technical Scores/Ranking

Consultants' names	<i>[Insert name of Consultant 1]</i>	<i>[Insert name of Consultant 2]</i>	<i>[Insert name of Consultant 3]</i>	<i>[Insert name of Consultant 4]</i>
Criteria	Score	Score	Score	Score
Experience				
Methodology				
Proposed staff				
Training				
Local input				
Total score ^a				
Rank				

a. Proposals scoring below the minimum qualifying score of *[number]* points have been rejected.

Form IIC. Individual Evaluations—Comparison

Consultants' Names	<i>[Insert name of Consultant 1]</i>	<i>[Insert name of Consultant 2]</i>	<i>[Insert name of Consultant 3]</i>	<i>[Insert name of Consultant 4]</i>
Criteria				
Experience	A C AV ^a B D			
Methodology				
Key staff				
Training				
Local input				
Total				

a. A, B, C, and D = scores given by evaluators; AV = average score, see Annex I(i).

Section III. Financial Evaluation Report—Award Recommendation—Text³

[The text will indicate:

- (a) any issues faced during the evaluation, such as difficulty in obtaining the exchange rates to convert the prices into the common currency used for evaluation purposes;*
- (b) adjustments made to the prices of the proposal(s) (mainly to ensure consistency with the technical proposal) and determination of the evaluated price (does not apply to Quality-Based (QBS), Selection Based on Qualifications (SBCQ), and Single-Source Selection (SSS));*
- (c) tax-related problems;*
- (d) award recommendation; and*
- (e) any other important information.*

Taxes are not taken into account in the Financial evaluation whereas reimbursables are.]

³ Applies to QCBS, Fixed-Budget, and Least-Cost Selection. For Quality-Based, Qualifications (SBCQ), and Single-Source Selection provide relevant information as indicated.

Section IV. Financial Evaluation Report—Award Recommendation—Forms⁴

- Form IVA. Financial Evaluation—Basic Data
- Form IVB. Adjustments—Currency Conversion—Evaluated Prices
- Form IVC. QCBS—Combined Technical/Financial Evaluation—Award Recommendation
- Form IVD. Fixed-Budget and Least-Cost Selection—Award Recommendation

⁴ Applies to QCBS, Fixed-Budget, and Least-Cost Selection. For Quality-Based, Qualifications (SBCQ), and Single-Source Selection, provide relevant information as indicated.

Form IVA. Financial Evaluation—Basic Data

- 4.1 Tenders Committee approval of Technical evaluation report (Quality-Based, Qualifications (SBCQ), Single-Source) Date _____
- 4.2 Public opening of Financial Proposals Date _____ Time _____
 (a) Names and Proposal prices (mark Consultants that attended public opening)
 1. _____
 2. _____
 3. _____
 4. _____
- 4.3 Tender Evaluation Committee: Members' names and titles (if not the same as in the technical evaluation - Quality-Based, Qualifications, Single-Source)

- 4.4 Methodology (formula) for evaluation of cost (QCBS only; cross as appropriate) Weight inversely proportional to cost ____
 Other _____
- 4.5 Submission of final Technical/Financial evaluation report to Tenders Committee (Quality-Based, Qualifications, Single-Source) Date _____
- 4.6 QCBS
 (a) Technical, financial and final scores (Quality-Based (QBS): technical scores only)

	Consultant's Name	Technical score	Financial score	Final score
_____	_____	_____	_____	_____
_____	_____	_____	_____	_____
_____	_____	_____	_____	_____
_____	_____	_____	_____	_____

 (b) Award recommendation _____
- 4.7 Fixed-Budget and Least-Cost
 (a) Technical score, proposal and evaluated price

	Consultant's Name	Technical score	Proposal price	Evaluated price
_____	_____	_____	_____	_____
_____	_____	_____	_____	_____
_____	_____	_____	_____	_____
_____	_____	_____	_____	_____

 (b) Award recommendation _____
 (c) Fixed-Budget: best technical Proposal _____

within the budget
(evaluated price)
(d) Least-Cost: lowest
evaluated price
Proposal above
minimum qualifying
score

Name _____

Name _____

Form IVB. Adjustments—Currency Conversion—Evaluated Prices⁵

Consultant's Name	Proposal price ^a		Adjustments ^b	Evaluated price(s)	Conversion to currency of evaluation ^c		Financial score ^d
	Currency	Amounts (1)	(2)	(3) = (1) + (2)	Exchange rate(s) ^e (4)	Proposals' prices (5) = (3)(4)	(6)

- a. Comments, if any (e.g., exchange rates); three foreign currencies maximum, plus local currency.
- b. Arithmetical errors and omissions of items included in the technical proposals. Adjustments may be positive or negative.
- c. As per RFP.
- d. 100 points to the lowest evaluated Proposal; other scores to be determined in accordance with provisions of RFP.
- e. Value of one currency unit in the common currency used for evaluation purposes, normally the local currency (e.g., US\$1 = 2.00 BZD). Indicate source as per RFP.

⁵ For Quality-Based, Qualifications, and Single-Source Selection, fill out only up to column 3.

Form IVC. QCBS—Combined Technical/Financial Evaluation—Award Recommendation

Consultant's name	Technical Evaluation			Financial Evaluation		Combined Evaluation	
	Technical score ^a S(t)	Weighted score S(t) × T ^b	Technical rank	Financial score ^c S(f)	Weighted score S(f) × F ^d	Score S(t) T + S(f) F	Rank
Award recommendation	To highest combined technical/financial score. Consultant's name: _____						

- a. See Form IIB.
- b. T = As per RFP.
- c. See Form IVB.
- d. F = as per RFP.

Form IVD. Fixed-Budget and Least-Cost Selection—Award Recommendation⁶

Consultant's name	Fixed-Budget Selection		Least-Cost Selection	
	Technical score ^a	Evaluated price ^b	Technical score	Evaluated price
Award recommendation	To best technical score with evaluated price within budget. Consultant's name: _____		To lowest evaluated price above minimum qualifying score. Consultant's name: _____	

- a. See Form IIB.
- b. See Form IVB.

⁶ Fill in appropriate part of form.

Section V. Annexes⁷

Annex I. Individual Evaluations

Form V Annex I(i). Individual Evaluations

Form V Annex I(ii). Individual Evaluations—Key Personnel

Annex II. Information Data Monitoring

Annex III. Minutes of Public Opening of Financial Proposals

Annex IV. Request for Proposals

Annex V. Miscellaneous Annexes—Ad Hoc

⁷ Annex I applies to Quality-Based, Fixed-Budget and Least-Cost Selection. For Qualifications (SBCQ) and Single-Source Selection, it is replaced by a review of the strengths and weaknesses of the Proposal, which may be amended by one or several evaluators.

Annex I (i). Individual Evaluations

Consultant's name: _____

Criteria/Sub-Criteria	Maximum Scores	Evaluators					Average Scores
		1	2	3	4	5	
Experience							
-							
-							
-							
Methodology							
-							
-							
-							
Key Staff							
-							
-							
-							
Transfer of Knowledge (Training ^a)							
-							
-							
-							
Participation by Nationals ^a							
-							
-							
-							
Total	100						

a. If specified in the RFP

1. Evaluator's Name: _____ Signature: _____ Date: _____

2. Evaluator's Name: _____ Signature: _____ Date: _____

3. Evaluator's Name: _____ Signature: _____ Date: _____

4. Evaluator's Name: _____ Signature: _____ Date: _____

5. Evaluator's Name: _____ Signature: _____ Date: _____

Annex I(ii) Individual Evaluations—Key Personnel

Consultant's Name: _____

Key Staff Names ^a	Maximum Scores	General Qualifications () ^b	Adequacy for the Assignment () ^b	Experience in Region () ^b	Total Marks (100)	Scores
Total						

- a. Sometimes evaluations are made by groups instead of individuals. Each group (e.g. financial group) has a weight. The group score is obtained by the weighted scores of the members of the group. For example, the score of a group of three individuals scoring a, b, and c would be $ax + by + cz$ with x, y, and z representing the respective weights of the members ($x + y + z = 1$) in this group.
- b. Maximum marks as per RFP

Name of Evaluator: _____ Signature: _____ Date: _____

Annex II. Minutes of Public Opening of Financial Proposals⁸

MINUTES

[The minutes should indicate the names of the participants in the Proposal opening session, the proposal prices, discounts, technical scores, and any details that the Purchaser, at its discretion, may consider appropriate.]

All attendees must sign the Minutes.]

⁸ Annex II applies to QCBS, Fixed-Budget, and Least-Cost.

Annex III. Request for Proposals⁹

[Insert the document]

⁹ Annex III applies to all selection procedures (The Standard Request for Proposals may be used for Qualifications and Single-Source, with appropriate modifications).

Annex IV. Miscellaneous Annexes—Ad Hoc

[Insert documents as appropriate]

Annex V. Proposal Evaluation Checklist

1. General Factors

- a) Has the consultant responded with an appropriate technique or is he or she trying to fit the problem to favorite technique?
- b) What priority will this assignment receive from the consultant? How important will it be to his or her firm?
- c) Does the Proposal meet the Terms of Reference (TOR) and the intended scope of the study?
- d) How useful will the end product be?
- e) What degree of originality is present in the Proposal?
- f) Are the submission of progress reports and presentation of interim briefings required? What progress reports and interim briefings are planned?
- g) What degree of direct consultant - purchaser liaison is proposed? Does the consultant-purchaser relationship include a training component for the Purchaser's personnel? What type of training is proposed?
- h) Is the proposed content of progress reports in accordance with the requirements of the TOR? Will progress reports contain a monthly statement of costs incurred, commitments and if necessary, a revised estimated of total costs?
- i) What degree of follow-up and/or debriefing is proposed? To whom do the relevant data belong and what happens to them when the assignment is completed?

2. Past Performance

- a) Is the usual business of the consultant closely related to the proposed work?
- b) Does the reference to past experience include activities specifically related to the requirements of the proposed assignment?
- c) Has the consultant been honored by professional societies because of his/her performance in a specific professional area?
- d) What reputation does the firm hold in the area of the proposed assignment?
- e) Has the firm worked for the Purchaser before, and if so, with what

success?

- f) Are the statements of past performance worded so it can be identified what work was actually performed?
- g) Are there aspects of past performance that indicate particular weaknesses or strengths?

3. Scope of Work

- a) Has the Proposal demonstrated an understanding of the problems to be solved?
- b) Is this assignment area new to the company?
- c) Has the consultant made an accurate assessment of the problem based on an interpretation of the requirements set forth in the work statement?
- d) Has the consultant presented an approach that will achieve the stated objectives?
- e) Is the proposed approach supported with justification of why it should achieve the objectives?
- f) Do you think the suggested approach will work?
- g) Has the consultant introduced unanticipated events which may result in a project overrun or an expanded scope of work?
- h) Does the Proposal distinguish between the simpler and the more difficult performance requirements?
- i) Does the Proposal convincingly show a depth of understanding of the problem?
- j) Are the technical problems clearly delineated or are they merely “parroted” from the Request for Proposals?
- k) Have the limits of the problem been specified to show that the proposed assignment will be restricted to an appropriate scope?
- l) Is there a concise but adequate review of literature?

Annex VI. Statement on Ethical Conduct and Fraud and Corruption

We the undersigned confirm that:

1. During the procurement process and the evaluation of bids and proposals, that we have adhered to the ethical standards set out in the Government of Belize's Public Procurement Procedures Handbook for Goods, Works and Services.
2. We have gained in the execution of our duties, no benefit either monetary or in kind from any outside agency, bidder or consultant other than the official remuneration that we have received as public servants.
3. To the best of our knowledge that no colleague, associate or relative has received any benefit monetary or in kind from any outside agency, bidder or consultant other than official remuneration.
4. We are unaware of any fraudulent, corrupt, collusive or coercive practices that have taken place during this procurement process and fully understand our moral and ethical obligation to report such should we be aware of it.
5. No conflict of interest exists either on our part or the part of the bidder or consultant recommended for an award of contract, or as far as we are aware, the part of our immediate colleagues, associates and relatives.

Name	Position	Signature	Date