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**selection of consultants**
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Information to Users

Consultants[[1]](#footnote-2) employed by an executing or implementing agency (“Beneficiary”) of financing provided by OPEC Fund are engaged according to the *Principles for Procurement of Goods, Works and Services* (“Principles’) and the *Procedures for Procurement of Consulting Services* (‘Procedures’).

The Beneficiary (ies)/executing agencies are required to submit certain reports to the Fund during the selection process:

1. a technical evaluation report;
2. a combined (technical and financial) report with a recommendation for the selected proposal; and
3. a draft negotiated contract with the selected consultant.

This document sets out the sample format of the above reports that should be used by the Beneficiary concerned undertaking the consultant selection to facilitate the evaluation of consultant’s proposals and the subsequent review of these proposals by the Fund.

The evaluation must be in accordance with the criteria spelled out in the Request for Proposals (RFP) issued by the Beneficiary and carried out by qualified evaluators.

Financial proposals must not be opened before the Beneficiary has received no-objection from the Fund regarding the technical evaluation unless otherwise agreed by the Fund.

This document includes five sections:

Section I: A Short Report summarizing the Findings of the Technical Evaluation

Section II: Technical Evaluation Report – Forms

Section III: A Short Report summarizing the Findings of the Financial Evaluation

Section IV: Financial valuation 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. Explanation of the Quality and Cost Based Evaluation Procedure

This evaluation template is intended for use under application of the Quality and Cost Based Selection (QCBS) method. Appropriate adjustments must be made by the executing agency or users and may be subject to adaption for Quality Based Selection, Selection under Fixed Budget and Least Cost Selection.

Following the Fund’s no-objection to the combined (technical and financial) evaluation report, the Beneficiary invites the selected consultant to negotiate and finalize the contract. The draft contract, initialed page by page by both contracting parties, is then sent for no-objection to the Fund. Following no-objection, the Beneficiary signs the contract with the selected consultant and sends a signed and confirmed copy to the Fund.

Users of this evaluation report template are invited to submit comments on their experience with the document to:

The OPEC Fund for International Development

Parkring 8, 1010 Vienna, Austria

B. O. Box 995, A-1011 Vienna, Austria

Tel: +43-1-515 64-0

[www.opecfund.org](http://www.opecfund.org)

**consultAnt proposal EVALUATION REPORT**

Title of Consulting Services: [insert title]

RFP No.: *[insert reference number]*

Executing Agency*: [insert name of the implementing agency]*

Project Name*: [insert name of Project]*

Financier*: [insert name of the financing Institution]*

Project*: [insert project name]*

Date of submission of Evaluation Report*: [insert date]*
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# **Section I. Technical Evaluation Report – Text**

1. Background

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

1. 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), expression of interest, the establishment of the shortlist, and withdrawals of firms before proposal submissions and compliance to eligibility criteria in respect of administrative documents. Describe major events that may have affected the timing (delays, complaints from consultants, key correspondence with the Fund, Request for Proposals (RFP), extension of Proposal submission time date, and any other pertinent aspects).

Use about one-half to one page.

1. 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 RFP; relevant correspondences; and compliance of evaluation with RFP.

Present results of the technical evaluation: scores.

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

1. **Strengths**: experience in very similar projects in or outside the country; quality of the methodology, proving a clear understanding of the scope of the assignment; strengths of the Consultants and any associates and/or local partner; and experience of proposed staff in similar assignments.
2. **Weaknesses**: of a particular component of the proposal; of a lack of experience in the country; of a low level of participation by the local partner; of a lack of practical experience (experience in studies rather than in implementation); of staff experience compared to the firm’s experience; of a key staffer (e.g., the team leader); of a lack of responsiveness; and of disqualifications (conflict of interest) and any other eligibility or compliance related issues.

Comment on individual evaluators’ scores (discrepancies, if any).

List items requiring further negotiations (or potential conditions of negotiations for any recommended first-ranked firm.

Use up to three pages and not normally more than five (5) pages for this section.

# **Section II. Technical Evaluation Report – Forms**

Form IIA. Technical Evaluation – Basic Data

Form IIB. Evaluation Summary – Technical Scores/Ranking

Form IIC. Individual Evaluations – Comparison (Average Scores)

## **Form IIA. Technical Evaluation – Basic Data**

* 1. Name of the Country:
  2. Name of the Project:
  3. Executing Agency:

1. Name:
2. Address:
3. phone number:
4. Email address:
   1. Type of Assignment (pre-investment, preparation, or implementation), and brief description
   2. Method of Selection: Quality and Cost Based (QCBS), Quality Based Selection (QBS), Least Cost Selection (LCS), or Fixed Budget Selection (FBS)
   3. Shortlist (International or National Consultant):

|  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- |
| Sl. No. | Name of the Firm | Association type (JV or Sub-Consultant) | Remarks |
| 1 |  |  |  |
| 2 |  |  |  |
| 3 |  |  |  |

Note: if the selection process is subject to prior review, please quote the date of no-objection from the Fund and issuance to the Shortlisted Firms.

* 1. Request for Proposals:

1. Submission to the Fund for no-objection (date);
2. Funds’ no-objection (date):
3. Issuance to the Shortlisted Firms (date):
   1. Amendments and clarifications to the RFP (describe):
   2. Types of Contract:
4. Time-Based;
5. Lump-Sum:

Indicate if Price adjustment: Yes/No

* 1. Pre-proposal conference held: Yes (date)/No

Minutes issued (date): Yes/No

* 1. Proposal Submission:

1. two envelop (confirm: technical and financial proposals):
2. original submission (date and time):
3. extension(s), if any, (date and time):
   1. Location where Financial proposals are kept in sealed form:
   2. Opening of Technical Proposal by Selection Committee (date and time):
   3. List of Proposals submitted:
4. number of Firms who formally declined:
5. number of Firms who did not submit:
6. if Joint Venture (JV), was JV agreement submitted with the proposal?
   1. Evaluation Committee[[2]](#footnote-3):

|  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- |
| Sl. No. | Members Name | Member’s Title | Remarks |
| 1 |  |  |  |
| 2 |  |  |  |
| 3 |  |  |  |

* 1. Proposal validity period (days):

1. original expiration date (date and time):
2. extension(s), if any (date and time):
   1. Evaluation Criteria/Sub-Criteria[[3]](#footnote-4):

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
| Consultants’ experience: |  |
|  | Point: |
|  | Point: |
| Methodology: |  |
|  | Point: |
|  | Point: |
| Key Personnel: |  |
| 1. K1 | Point: |
| 1. K2 | Point: |
| 1. K3 | Point: |
| Training (if included in RFP): |  |
|  | Point: |
|  | Point: |
| Local input (if included in RFP): |  |
|  | Point: |
|  | Point: |

* 1. Technical Scores per Consultants:

Minimum Qualifying Score:

|  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- |
| Sl. No. | Consultants’ Name | Technical Score |
| 1 |  |  |
| 2 |  |  |
| 3 |  |  |
| 4 |  |  |
|  |  |  |

* 1. Evaluation Report: Submission to the Fund for no-objection (date):

## **Form IIB. Evaluation Summary Technical Scores/Ranking**

|  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| Consultant’s Name | *[Maximum Scores allotted as per RFP]* | *[insert name of Consultant A]* | *[insert name of Consultant B]* | *[insert name of Consultant C]* |
| Criteria | Scores | Scores | Scores | Scores |
| Experience |  |  |  |  |
| Methodology |  |  |  |  |
| Key Staff |  |  |  |  |
| Training (if included in RFP) |  |  |  |  |
| Local input (if included in RFP) |  |  |  |  |
| Total Score | 100 |  |  |  |
| Rank |  |  |  |  |

Proposal scoring below the minimum qualifying score of [number] points have been rejected.

## **Form IIC. Individual Evaluations – Comparison**

|  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| Consultant’s Name | *[insert name of Consultant 1]* | *[insert name of Consultant 2]* | *[insert name of Consultant 3]* | *[insert name of Consultant 4]* |
| Criteria | Individ. Eval. Scores  AVa |  |  |  |
| Experience |  |  |  |  |
| Methodology |  |  |  |  |
| Key Staff |  |  |  |  |
| Training (if included in RFP) |  |  |  |  |
| Local input (if included in RFP) |  |  |  |  |
| Total |  |  |  |  |

1. AV = average score given by evaluators, see Annex I(i)

FINANCIAL PROPOSALS EVALUATION

NOTE:

*Please see the Preface*

*Financial proposals must not be opened before the Beneficiary/Executing Agency has received no-objection from the Fund on the Technical Evaluation Report. The Technical Evaluation (technical scores in particular) cannot be modified following the opening of the financial proposals.*

# **Section III. Financial Evaluation Report - Text**

*[the text will indicate:*

1. *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;*
2. *adjustments made to the prices of the proposal(s) (mainly to ensure consistency with the technical proposal) and determination of the evaluated price;*
3. *tax-related problems;*
4. *recommendation for negotiations with the selected firm; and*
5. *any other important information.*

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

# **Section IV. Financial Evaluation Report - Forms**

Form IVA. Financial Evaluation – Basis Data

Form IVB. Adjustments – Currency conversion – Evaluated Prices

Form IVC. QCBS – Combined (Technical/Financial) Evaluation – Recommendation for negotiations with the selected Firm

## **Form IVA. Financial Evaluation – Basic Data**

* 1. Fund’s no-objection to Technical Evaluation Report (Date):
  2. Public opening of Financial Proposals (Date and time):

|  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- |
| Sl. No. | Names | Proposal Price | Attended |
| 1 |  |  |  |
| 2 |  |  |  |
| 3 |  |  |  |
| 4 |  |  |  |
|  |  |  |  |

* 1. Evaluation Committee: Members’s names and titles[[4]](#footnote-5):

|  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- |
| Sl. No. | Name | Functions |
| 1 |  |  |
| 2 |  |  |
| 3 |  |  |
|  |  |  |

Methodology (formula) for evaluation of cost: Quality and Cost Based: Lowest financial proposals (Fm) receives a financial score (Sf) of 100 points. The financial scores of the other financial proposals will be calculated as follows: Sf=100xFm/F (F being the proposed price of the consultant).

* 1. Final Consolidated Score obtained by weighting Technical and Financial Scores: for example: technical proposal: 80%; financial proposal: 20% (financial score weighting should not exceed 30%)
  2. Submission of combined (technical and financial) evaluation report to the Fund (Date);
  3. QCBS Scores and Award Recommendation:

|  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| Sl. No. | Consultant Name | Technical Score | Financial Score | Combined Score |
| 1 |  |  |  |  |
| 2 |  |  |  |  |
| 3 |  |  |  |  |
| 4 |  |  |  |  |
|  |  |  |  |  |

* 1. Recommendation for negotiations with selected (top ranked) candidate:

## **Form IVB. Adjustments – Currency conversion – Evaluated Prices**

|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| Consultants’ Names | Proposals’ pricesa | | Adjustmentsb | Evaluated price(s) | Conversion to currency of evaluationc | | Financial scoresd |
| Currency | Amounts  (1) | (2) | (3) = (1) + (2) | Exchange rate(s)e  (4) | Proposals’ prices  (5) = (3) x (4) | (6) |
|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |

1. comments, if any (e. g. Exchange rates); foreign currencies, plus local currency.
2. Arithmetical errors and omissions of items included in the technical proposals. Adjustment may be positive or negative.
3. As per RFP
4. 100 points to the lowest evaluated proposal; other scores to be determined on the basis of the lowest evaluated proposal (see Annex VI)
5. Value of one currency unit in the common currency used for evaluation purposes, normally the local currency indicate source as per RFP

## **Form IVC. QCBS – Combined (Technical/Financial) Evaluation – Recommendation**

|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| Consultants’ Names | Technical  Evaluation | | | Financial  Evaluation | | Combined  Evaluation | |
| Technical scoresa S(t) | Weighted scores  S(t) x Tb | Technical rank | Financial scoresc  S(f) | Weighted scores  S(t) x Fd | Scores  S(t) T + S(f) F | Rank |
|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Recommendation for negotiation of contract | To highest combined (technical and financial) score.  Consultant’s name: \_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_ | | | | | | |

1. See Form IIB

b. T = as per RFP

c. See Form IVB

d. F = as per RFP

# **Section V. Annexes**

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

Annex VI. Explanation of the Quality and Cost Based Evaluation Procedure

## **Annex I(i). Individual Evaluations**

Consultant’s Name: \_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_

|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
|  |  | Evaluators | | | | |  |
| Criteria/Sub-Criteria | Maximum Scores | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 | 5 | Average Scores |
| Experience |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| - |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| - |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| - |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Methodology |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| - |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| - |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| - |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Key Staff |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| - |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| - |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| - |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Training (if included in RFP) |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| - |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| - |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| - |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Local Input (if included in RFP) |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| - |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| - |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| - |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| **Total** | **100** |  |  |  |  |  |  |

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 Namesa | Maximum Scores | General Qualifications  ( )b | Adequacy  for the Assignment  ( )b | Experience in Country  ( )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. Information Data Monitoring**

* 1. Fund Financing/Grant

1. Project Code: *[insert Project code]*
2. Date of effectiveness: *[insert date]*
3. Closing date for submission:
4. original: *[insert date]*
5. revised: *[insert date]*
   1. Did the use of price as a factor of selection change the final raking[[5]](#footnote-6)?

Yes \_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_ No \_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_

* 1. Did transfer of knowledge/training and/or use of national experts as factor/sub-factor of selection change the technical ranking[[6]](#footnote-7)?

Yes \_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_ No \_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_

*Note: this is optional. If relevant and used, compute technical scores with (and without) use of these criteria/sub-criteria (see Form IIB, example of possible sub-criteria under Approach and Methodology)*

## **Annex III. Minutes of Public Opening of Financial Proposals**

MINUTES

*[The minutes should indicate the names of the participants in the proposal opening session, the proposal prices, discounts, (if any), technical scores, and any details that the Executing Agency, at its discretion, may consider appropriate.*

*All attendees to sign the Minutes.]*

## **Annex IV. Project vendor Integrity Due Diligence (IDD) Form**

**Introduction:** It is the primary responsibility of Executing Agencies (EA) to manage integrity risks related to projects being financed by the OPEC Fund for International Development (OPEC Fund). Integrity risks include fraud, corruption, money laundering, terrorism financing, and payment risks tied to financial sanctions. In this context, the EA is responsible for conducting adequate IDD on project vendors, that are providing goods or services related to OPEC Fund financed projects. This IDD Form is to be completed by EA and submitted to the OPEC Fund, as part of the No Objection request for prospective procurement tender winners.

1. **Reference Checks:** A minimum of 3 reference checks are to be conducted with prior project Executing Agencies for projects that have been provided as relevant project experience by the prospective project vendor tender winner.

**Confirmation check was completed:** Yes □ No □

**Results of check:** No issues identified □ Issue Identified □ (if so, provide summary below)

**Summary of Issue Identified:** \_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_ \_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_

\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_

1. **Adverse Media Checks:** Google search prospective project vendor tender winner, coupled with key words such as ‘Fraud’ and ‘Corruption’ and 'Sanctions' (checking specifically news articles).

**Confirmation check was completed:** Yes □ No □

**Results of check:** No issues identified □ Issue Identified □ (if so, provide summary below)

**Summary of Issue Identified:** \_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_ \_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_

\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_

1. **UN Sanctions Check :** Click on UN sanctions web site (<https://main.un.org/securitycouncil/en/content/un-sc-consolidated-list>). Select PDF format

On PDF format, click either option A. Individuals or B. Entities and Other Groups, as appropriate. Type ’Control + F’ and type the prospective project vendors name, to search for matches.

**Confirmation check was completed:** Yes □ No □

**Results of check:** No matches identified□ Matches Identified□ (if so, provide summary below)

**Summary of Matches Identified**: \_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_ \_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_

\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_

1. **US OFAC Sanctions Payment Risk Check:** Click on US OFAC sanctions web site (<https://sanctionssearch.ofac.treas.gov/>). Set ‘Minimum ‘Name Score’ to '90'. Type the prospective project vendors name in the ‘Name’ field, and add the ‘Country’, ‘City’, and ‘Address’ details if known. Click ‘Search’, to search for matches.

**Confirmation check was completed:** Yes □ No □

**Results of check:** No matches identified □ Matches Identified□ (if so, provide summary below)

**Summary of Matches Identified:** \_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_ \_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_

\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_

1. **EU Sanctions Payment Risk Check:** Click on EU sanctions web site (<https://www.sanctionsmap.eu/#/main>). Type the prospective project vendor’s name in the ‘Search’ field. Click ‘Search’, to search for matches.

**Confirmation check was completed:** Yes □ No □

**Results of check:** No matches identified□ Matches Identified□ (if so, provide summary below)

**Summary of Matches Identified:** \_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_ \_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_

\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_

1. **UK Sanctions Payment Risk Check:** Click on UK sanctions web site (<https://sanctionssearchapp.ofsi.hmtreasury.gov.uk/>). Type the prospective project vendors name in the ‘Search For’ field. Click 'Fuzzy Search'. ‘Search’, to search for matches.

**Confirmation check was completed:** Yes □ No □

**Results of check:** No matches identified □ Matches Identified□ (if so, provide summary below)

**Summary of Matches Identified:** \_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_ \_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_

\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_

## **Annex V. Request for Proposals**

*[Attach a copy of the RFP as issued, and any amendments thereto, including the applicable Summary and narrative Evaluation Criteria]*

## **Annex VI. Miscellaneous Annexes – Ad-hoc**

*[attach as relevant or appropriate]*

## **Annex VII. Explanation of the Quality and Cost Based Evaluation Procedure**

**Explanation of the Technical Proposals Evaluation Procedure**

Using the criteria for the technical evaluation given in the RFP, the evaluation team gives each consultant proposal a technical score “St”. The minimum qualifying technical score should be at least seventy (70) but is often set at seventy-five (75) to give greater relevance to technical quality.

The applicable criteria and any sub-criteria not explicitly mentioned in the RFP are set out in the Narrative and Summary Evaluation Criteria agreed by the Evaluation Committee or Consultant Selection Committee, i.e. Full Technical Proposal (FTP), Simplified Technical Proposal (STP) or Biodata Technical Proposal (BTP). The sub-criteria or parameters should be agreed upon and documented before initiating the evaluation.

After the technical evaluation is completed, if prior review applies, the Beneficiary sends the technical evaluation report and the associated Forms (i.e. Sections I and II and Annexes I(i) and (ii)) to the Fund for review and no-objection. An explanatory note should be added to highlight the most important aspects of the technical evaluation.

Once the technical evaluation is completed, evaluation committee is also required to perform Vendor Integrity Due Diligence (IDD) check using Annex IV in the BER template for all the technically qualified firms irrespective of whether the contract is subject to prior review or post review. For the prior review contracts, the Executing Agency (EA) is required to submit completed IDD Form along with Technical Evaluation Report (TER) for review and clearance. If there are any red flag against any prospective firms, please seek guidance.

Following issuance of the Fund’s no-objection, if applicable, to the TER, the EA informs the consultants whose technical proposals did not pass the minimum score, that their financial proposals will be returned unopened after completion of the process. Simultaneously, the EA will inform all technically qualified firms and indicate date, time and venue of opening of financial proposal. After receiving no-objection from the Fund to the technical evaluation, the scores for the technical evaluation cannot be changed.

Only the technical proposals which obtained the minimum technical score will be opened for financial evaluation. The Fund requires the executing agency to open the financial proposal in public for reasons of transparency. The executing agency invites the responsive consultants to attend the public opening of the financial proposal. A two (2) week period is normally allowed for consultants to be present or send their representatives at the opening of financial proposals. The Executing Agency then prepares the financial Forms IVA and IVB.

**Explanation of the Financial Evaluation Procedure**

The financial evaluation is important, because the Executing Agency needs to verify if the consultant has committed the necessary budget to implement what is in its technical proposal. It also needs to verify if there are no computational errors in the cost figures, the number of person-months and the associated costs, and if the number of person-months is in accordance with the technical commitment. The difference would need to be monetarized and adjusted to the financial proposal.

The lowest cost financial proposal calculated is “Fm” and gets a financial score “Sf” of 100 points. The financial scores “Sf” of the other proposals are inversely proportional to the amount of the financial proposal “F”, and calculated with the following formula: Sf = 100 x Fm/F (F being the price of the proposal to be evaluated).

On the basis of the results of the technical and financial evaluation, the Executing Agency prepares Form IVC for the combined (technical and financial) evaluation to arrive at the recommended selected proposal. An explanatory note should be added to highlight the most important aspects of the financial evaluation.

The weighting of the quality and cost scores shall normally be T= 80 percent (.80) for the technical score and P = 20 percent (.20) for the financial score. In proposals for more complex assignments such as multidisciplinary feasibility or management studies, where the technical quality requires more weight, the weighting should be T = 90 percent (.90) and P = 10 percent (.10) respectively. In proposals for straightforward and standard assignments (audits, simple feasibility or design studies), the weighting may be T= 70 percent (.70) and P = 30 percent (.30), respectively, but in no case should the weighting of the financial proposals exceed 30 percent. The technical quality of proposals is very important and has a key impact on the project’s execution, since the cost of the project is a multiple of the cost for the studies.

**Explanation of the Combined Financial and Technical Evaluation**

The combined score is obtained by attributing the technical weight T to the technical score (St) and the financial weight P to the financial score (Sf). The formula for the combined evaluation (S) is as follows: S = St x T + Sf x P. This is calculated for each consultant proposal admitted to the financial evaluation.

An example of the calculation of the technical and financial evaluation and the final score is given in the following tables on the next pages.

**TECHNICAL EVALUATION**

**Summary of the Technical Evaluations**

|  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| Consultant’s Name | *[Maximum Scores allotted as per RFP]* | *[Consultant A]* | *[Consultant B]* | *[Consultant C]* |
| Criteria | Scores | Scores | Scores | Scores |
| Experience | 10 | 8 | 9 | 7 |
| Methodology | 30 | 21 | 21.9 | 24.6 |
| Key Staff |  |  |  |  |
| Team Leader (K1) | 20 | 15 | 16 | 18 |
| Engineer (K2) | 10 | 6 | 7 | 6.50 |
| Economist (K3) | 10 | 8 | 7 | 8 |
| Financial Analyst (K4) | 5 | 3 | 3 | 4.50 |
| Training (if included in RFP) | 5 | 2.50 | 2.50 | 3.50 |
| Local input (if included in RFP) | 10 | 7 | 8 | 9 |
| Total Score | 100 | 70.50 | 74.40 | 81.10 |
| Rank |  | Third | Second | First |

It is assumed that as per PRF, minimum qualifying score is 70 points. In this example all three firms have scored more than minimum qualifying points. Therefore, all three firms have technically qualified

**FINANCIAL EVALUATION**

**Summary of the Financial Evaluations**

|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| Consultants’ Names | Proposals’ pricesa | | Adjustmentsb | Evaluated price(s) | Conversion to currency of evaluationc | | Financial scoresd |
| Currency | Amounts (millions)  (1) | (2) | (3) = (1) + (2) | Exchange rate(s)e  (4) | Proposals’ prices  (5) = (3) x (4) | (6) |
| Consultant A | USD | 9.000 | - | 9.000 | 1 | 9.000 | 86.60 |
| Consultant B | USD | 8.000 | - | 8.000 | 1 | 8.000 | 97.50 |
| Consultant C | USD | 7.800 | - | 7.800 | 1 | 7.800 | 100 |
|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |

1. In this example, all three firms have submitted their proposal in US Dollar, as permitted by RFP.
2. In this example, no arithmetical errors and omissions, therefore, no adjustments.
3. In this example, all three firms have submitted their proposals in US Dollar.
4. 100 points to the lowest evaluated proposal. Other scores are derived as follows:

Financial Score: Fm = 7.800 = Consultant C = 100

Sf Consultant A = 100 x Fm/F = 100 x (7800/9000) = 86.6

Sf Consultant B = 100 x Fm/F = 100 x (7800/8000) = 97.5

1. In this example, exchange rate used is (1:1) as all three firms have submitted their proposal in US Dollar.

**COMBINED TECHNICAL AND FINANCIAL EVALUATION**

|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| Consultants’ Names | Technical  Evaluation | | | Financial  Evaluation | | Combined  Evaluation | |
| Technical scoresa S(t) | Weighted score = .80b  S(t) x .80 = T | Technical rank | Financial scoresc  S(f) | Weighted scores = .20d  S(f) x .20 = F | Total Scores (S) = T + F | Rank |
| Consultant A | 70.50 | 56.40 | 3 | 86.60 | 17.32 | 73.72 | Third |
| Consultant B | 74.40 | 59.52 | 2 | 97.50 | 19.50 | 79.02 | Second |
| Consultant C | 81.10 | 64.80 | 1 | 100 | 20 | 84.80 | First |
|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Recommendation for negotiation of contract | To highest combined (technical and financial) score.  Consultant’s name: \_Consultant C\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_ | | | | | | |

1. See Form IIB

b. T = technical weight as per RFP is .80

c. See Form IVB

d. F = financial weight as per RFP is .20

1. The term Consultants in this document refers to Organizations (Firms) and not individuals [↑](#footnote-ref-2)
2. Evaluation Committee should be constituted with odd numbers (normally three or five) and evaluators should be an experienced and technically qualified to evaluate the proposals [↑](#footnote-ref-3)
3. Maximum of three sub-criteria per criterion [↑](#footnote-ref-4)
4. If they are different from the Technical Evaluation team. [↑](#footnote-ref-5)
5. Compare technical rank with rank in Form IVC. [↑](#footnote-ref-6)
6. Figure out technical scores with and without “local input” (Form IIB). [↑](#footnote-ref-7)