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# Preface

##### *This Preface is not part of the report. It should not appear in the report submitted to the Caribbean Development Bank (CDB). Similarly, notes to Recipient[[1]](#footnote-1) in italics throughout the template should also not be included in the report.*

##### *This document, for use with Proposals from consulting Firms, sets out the format of a sample evaluation report (hereinafter termed* ***“Proposal Evaluation Report – Consulting Firm - 1”*** *or* ***PER-CF-1****).*

1. *It is expected that PER-CF-1 will be used by Recipients to facilitate the evaluation of Consultants’ Proposals and to obtain the subsequent No Objection* ***(NO),*** *where required by CDB, for the four Selection Methods: Quality-and-Cost-Based Selection****(“QCBS”),*** *Quality-Based Selection* ***(“QBS”)****, Fixed-Budget Selection* ***(“FBS”),*** *and Least-Cost Selection* ***(“LCS”).*** *These Selection Methods are**described in the Procedures, Paragraphs 8.02 through 8.18, and summarised in the attached Annex I Evaluation and Contract Award Guidelines with process flow diagrams A and B.*
2. *Quality- and Cost-Based Selection* ***(QCBS)*** *is the most frequently appropriate Selection Method for Consulting Services. The steps in the evaluation process are detailed in the attached Annex I and flow diagrams A and B. However, each of the Sections and Forms of the PER-CF-1 contains a note indicating how to address each Selection Method.*
3. *A separate report,* ***PER-CF-2,*** *is to be used for the evaluation of combined Technical and Financial Proposals for the Selection Methods of Consultant’s Qualification-based Selection* ***(CQS****) and Direct Selection (****DS).***
4. *The PER-CF-1 consists of five sections.* ***Sections I and II*** *summarise the technical evaluation process with important aspects of the evaluation stage flagged. The completed PER-CF-1-Tech must be submitted to the Bank for prior no objection (NO), where applicable. Following CDB’s NO, the Recipient will open the Financial Proposal(s) and complete the evaluation. If subject to prior NO by CDB, the Recipient shall submit* ***Sections III and IV*** *as PER-CF-1 financial and award.* ***Section V Annex I*** *provides additional guidelines for the evaluation process.*

*Where CDB prior NO is not required, the complete PER-CF-1 (technical and financial) plus other related documents noted will be retained by the Recipient for possible future CDB review.*

1. *The defined terms and acronyms in the Procedures and the Standard Request for Proposals [SRFP] are, where applicable, the same as those in the PER-CF-1. Also, cross-referencing to the Procedures and the SRFP is used in this PER-CF-1 to assist users. However, for the PER-CF-1, the terms Firm, Proposer and Consultant are used interchangeably.*
2. *CDB’s current SRFP, including Instructions to Consultants (ITC) and related Standard Forms of Contract [*[*https://www.caribank.org/work-with-us/procurement/resources*](https://www.caribank.org/work-with-us/procurement/resources)*]shall be used with the four Selection Methods****.*** *The Guidance Note for Evaluating Expressions of Interest and Proposals for Consulting Services[[2]](#footnote-2) should also be consulted.*

*The SRFP provides, under conditions described in the SFRP Foreword, for the use of the following options that shall be reflected in the Request for Proposal (RFP) documents and during the evaluation:*

* *Technical Proposal – either full Technical Proposal****(FTP)*** *or simplified Technical Proposal* ***(STP).***

*and*

* *Standard Form of Contract – either large or simplified and time-based or lump sum.*

1. *Recipients should study the PER-CF-1, including Annex I, during project preparation to reflect requirements in the SRFP and to assess the managerial and administrative conditions needed for the evaluation. CDB staff are available to explain any aspects and, where required, permit the employment of experienced consultants to help in evaluations and, where allowed by the Financing Agreement, related fees be paid from CDB financing.*
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# Section I. Technical Evaluation Report—Text

*Use for QCBS, QBS, FBS, and LCS.*

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
| **1. Background** | *Include a brief description, context, scope, and objectives of the Consulting Services procured.* ***Use about a quarter of a page.*** |
| **2. The Selection Process (Before Technical Evaluation)** | *Elaborate on information provided in Form IIA.*  *Describe the selection process briefly, beginning with the advertising for EOIs, establishing the shortlist, and any withdrawals of Firms before submitting Proposals. Describe significant events that may have affected the timing (delays, complaints from Consultants, key correspondence with CDB, an extension of the submission date of the Proposal, and so on).*  ***Use about one-half to one page.*** |
| **3. Technical Evaluation** | *Briefly describe (i) the formation of a technical evaluation committee (EC) as required in Procedures, Paragraph 6.37; (ii) meetings and actions taken by the EC[[3]](#footnote-3); (iii) outside evaluation assistance, if any; (iv) evaluation guidelines; (v) details of and justification for criteria/sub-criteria and (vi) associated weightings for rated criteria used.*  *Include in the below Table 1 all Proposals received and identify any Proposals (i) found nonresponsive at preliminary examination (refer Section II Form IIB) or (ii) that failed to meet the minimum technical score from the detailed evaluation (refer to Section II Form IIC) and (iii) provide a summary of reason(s) for each.*  Technical minimum  score\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_  Table 1 Summary of the results of the detailed evaluation as follows*:*   |  |  |  | | --- | --- | --- | | **NAME OF CONSULTANT** | **TECHNICAL SCORE** | **FINANCIAL**  **OPENING** | | 1. |  | Y/N | | 2. |  | Y/N | | 3. |  | Y/N | | 4. |  | Y/N | | 5. |  | Y/N | | 6. |  | Y/N |   *Only Proposers that meet the minimum technical score will have their Financial Proposals opened (****QCBS, FBS, LCS****). For* ***QBS,*** *the Financial Proposal only of the Proposer given the highest technical score will be opened.*  *Highlight strengths[[4]](#footnote-4) and weaknesses of each responsive Proposal (the most important part of the report). The following are indicative aspects only; the Recipient is to select those applicable to the Consulting Services.*  *(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: concerns with a particular component of the Proposal; lack of experience in the country; low level of participation by the local partner; lack of practical experience (e.g. experience in studies rather than in implementation) of key experts; lack of responsiveness; grounds for disqualification (e.g. conflict of interest) noted after the preliminary evaluation.*  *Comment on individual evaluators’ scores (variances).*  *Identify items requiring further negotiations.*  ***Use up to three pages.*** |

*Note: This Section is designed primarily for submission to CDB for NO. However, even if such NO is not required, it is strongly recommended that the same procedure and documentation are followed. This approach will facilitate any post-review by CDB.*

# Section II. Technical Evaluation Report—Forms

Form II-A. Technical Evaluation - Basic Data

Form II-B. Preliminary Examination – Technical

Form II-C. Evaluation Summary - Technical Scores/Ranking

Form II-D. Individual Evaluations - Comparison

Form II-E. Individual Evaluations

Form II-F. Individual Evaluations - Key Personnel

Form II-G. Proposal Opening Records – Technical

Form II-G -1 Attendance Sheet for the Public Opening of Proposals

Form II-H Evaluation Committee Certification - Technical

## 

## Letter of Transmittal – Technical

*(QCBS, FBS, LCS and QBS)*

*Where CDB’s no objection (NO) is required for the evaluation results[[5]](#footnote-5), the PER-CF-1 (consisting of the following documents) should be attached with a Letter of Transmittal from the Recipient ministry, department, or agency responsible for communications with CDB. The letter should highlight conclusions and offer any additional information that would help to expedite review by CDB. In addition, highlight any unresolved or potentially contentious issues.*

*Where no Technical Proposals are responsive, the Recipient shall describe the proposed approaches to address this challenge.*

*The Letter should be sent to the CDB Operations Officer responsible for the project.*

*Where the results are subject to post review, the PER-CF-1 and all supporting documentation shall be retained in the Recipient’s project files for future review by CDB.*

Documents to be attached:

Section I Text

Section II Forms

Form II-A. Technical Evaluation - Basic Data

Form II-B. Preliminary Examination - Technical

Form II-C. Evaluation Summary - Technical Scores/Ranking

Form II-D. Individual Evaluations - Comparison

Form II-E. Individual Evaluations

Form II-F. Individual Evaluations - Key Personnel

Form II-G. Proposal Opening Records – Technical

Form II-G-1 Attendance Sheet for the Public Opening of Proposals

Form II-H Evaluation Committee Certification - Technical

## Form II-A. Technical Evaluation - Basic Data

*Use for QCBS, QBS, FBS and LCS*

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
| 2.1 (a) Name of country  (b) Name of Project |  |
| 2.2 Client: Name, address, phone, email |  |
| 2.3 Type of assignment | Choose an item. |
| 2.4 Selection Method: | Choose an item. |
| 2.5 CDB Prior Review Required/NO | Choose an item. |
| 2.6 Where applicable date of CDB’s NO to EOI Evaluation Report | Click or tap to enter a date. |
| 2.7 Request for Proposals:   1. Submission to CDB for NO 2. CDB’s NO 3. Issuance to Consultants | Date Click or tap to enter a date.  Date Click or tap to enter a date.  Date Click or tap to enter a date. |
| 2.8 Changes to the RFP[[6]](#footnote-6):  (a) Amendments – CDB’s NO  (b) Amendments – issued to Firms  (b) Clarifications – issued to Firms | (# and date(s*) - to and from CDB*  (# and date(s)  (# and date(s) *\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_* |
| 2.9 Contract:   1. Type of Contract:   (Describe, where applicable)   1. Size of Contract: 2. Contract Price subject to Adjustment | Choose an item.    Choose an item.  Choose an item. |
| 2.10 Pre-proposal conference (if required):   1. Minutes issued | Required: Choose an item.  Date: Click or tap to enter a date. \_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_ |
| 2.11 Proposal submission deadline:   1. Submission originally due   (b) Extensions(s) | Date: Click or tap to enter a date.  Time:  Date: Click or tap to enter a date.  Time: |
| 2.12 Receipt of Financial Proposals**[[7]](#footnote-7)** | Choose an item. |
| 2.13 (a) Opening of Technical Proposals by Evaluation Committee   1. Proposal opening location/electronic platform 2. Technical Proposal Opening Report (Form II-G) sent to Proposers/CDB | Date: Click or tap to enter a date. Time:  \_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_  Date: Click or tap to enter a date. |
| 2.14 (a) Number of Proposals submitted  (b) Number of Proposals found nonresponsive from preliminary examination *(refer Form II-B)* | \_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_ |
| 2.15 Proposal validity period (days):  (a) original expiration date  (b) extension(s)[[8]](#footnote-8), if any | Date: Click or tap to enter a date. Time:  Date: Click or tap to enter a date. Time: |
| 2.16 Technical scores for all Consultants (including those not achieving the minimum score – see *Form II-C*) | Minimum qualifying score:\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_   |  |  | | --- | --- | | **Name of Consultant** | **Technical Score** | |  |  | |  |  | |  |  | |  |  | |
| 2.17 Technical evaluation report:   1. submission to CDB for NO | Date: Click or tap to enter a date. \_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_ |

## **Form II-B. Preliminary Examination - Technical***[[9]](#footnote-9)*

*Use for QCBS, QBS, LCS, FBS*

|  |  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| **Consultants**  **(a)** | **Verification**  **(b)** | **Eligibility**  **(c)** | **Completeness of Proposal**  **(d)** | **Substantial Responsiveness**  **(e)** | **Acceptance for Detailed Evaluation**  **(f)** |
|  |  |  |  |  |  |
|  |  |  |  |  |  |
|  |  |  |  |  |  |
|  |  |  |  |  |  |
|  |  |  |  |  |  |
|  |  |  |  |  |  |

*The Proposers invited by RFP were shortlisted via the Request for Expression of Interest (REOI) process against some of the Pass/Fail criteria in this Form. This preliminary examination of the Proposals will ascertain that the Proposals are responsive and cleared for detailed technical evaluation. Nonresponsive Proposals shall be set aside and do not proceed to the next stage of detailed evaluation and the opening of the Financial Proposals; Financial Proposals will be returned unopened after award of Contract or termination of the procurement process. The reasons for finding Proposers nonresponsive should be provided here/attached sheet and summarised in section 2.12 of Form IIA.*

## Form II-C. Evaluation Summary - Technical Scores/Ranking

*Use for QCBS, QBS, LCS, FBS*

|  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| Consultants’ names | *[Insert name of  Consultant 1]* | *[Insert name of  Consultant 2]* | *[Insert name of  Consultant 3]* | *[Insert name of  Consultant 4]* |
| Criteria | Scores | Scores | Scores | Scores |
| Specific Experience |  |  |  |  |
| Methodology and Work Plan |  |  |  |  |
| Key Experts |  |  |  |  |
| Transfer of Knowledge (Training) |  |  |  |  |
| Participation by nationals among Key Experts |  |  |  |  |
| **Total score** |  |  |  |  |
| Rank |  |  |  |  |
| **MINIMUM SCORE:\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_**   1. *Only Proposals accepted for detailed examination (Table IIB, column f) should be included in this evaluation.* 2. *Proposals scoring below the above minimum qualifying technical score will be rejected, and the Proposers’ Financial Proposals will not be opened.* | | | | |

## 

## Form II-D. Individual Evaluations—Comparison

*Use for QCBS, QBS, LCS and FBS*

|  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| Consultants’ Names | *[Insert name of  Consultant 1]* | *[Insert name of  Consultant 2]* | *[Insert name of  Consultant 3]* | *[Insert name of  Consultant 4]* |
| Specific Experience | A B  AVa  C D |  |  |  |
| Methodology and Work Plan |  |  |  |  |
| Key Experts |  |  |  |  |
| Transfer of Knowledge (Training) |  |  |  |  |
| Participation by nationals among Key Experts |  |  |  |  |
| **Total** |  |  |  |  |
| 1. *A, B, C, and D = scores given by evaluators; AV = average score and transferred to Form IIC.*   ***Notations should be added here (and Forms IIE and F, if required) by evaluators to support the average scoring.*** | | | | |
|  | | | | |

|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| Form II-E Individual Evaluations *(Use for QCBS, QBS, LCS and FBS)*  Consultant’s name: \_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_   |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  | | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | |  |  | Evaluators | | | | |  | | Criteria/Sub-Criteria | Maximum Scores | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 | 5 | Average Scores | | Specific Experience |  |  |  |  |  |  |  | | - |  |  |  |  |  |  |  | | - |  |  |  |  |  |  |  | | - |  |  |  |  |  |  |  | | Methodology and Work Plan |  |  |  |  |  |  |  | | - |  |  |  |  |  |  |  | | - |  |  |  |  |  |  |  | | - |  |  |  |  |  |  |  | | Key Experts |  |  |  |  |  |  |  | | - |  |  |  |  |  |  |  | | - |  |  |  |  |  |  |  | | - |  |  |  |  |  |  |  | | Transfer of Knowledge (Training **a**) |  |  |  |  |  |  |  | | - |  |  |  |  |  |  |  | | - |  |  |  |  |  |  |  | | - |  |  |  |  |  |  |  | | Participation by Nationals among Key Experts **a** |  |  |  |  |  |  |  | | - |  |  |  |  |  |  |  | | - |  |  |  |  |  |  |  | | - |  |  |  |  |  |  |  | | **Total** | **100** |  |  |  |  |  |  | | a. If specified in the RFP | | | | | | | |   *NB: generally, variances of 5-10% in score between EC members can be appropriate. However, for more significant variances that cannot be condensed within the EC, there must be a complete explanation provided here, including, where applicable, how such is to be addressed in the final scoring.*  *Sub criteria are generally required (not more than three) to assist the evaluation.* |

## Form II-F Individual Evaluations—Key Experts

*(Use for QCBS, QBS, LCS and FBS)*

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

|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| Key Experts – Names a | Maximum Scores | General Qualifications  ( ) b | Adequacy  for the Assignment  ( ) b | Experience in Region  ( ) b | Total Marks  (100) | Scores |
|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| **Total** |  |  |  |  |  |  |

1. *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.*
2. *Maximum marks as per RFP*

Name of Evaluator: \_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_ Signature: \_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_ Date: \_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_

|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| Form II-G. Proposal Opening Record (POR) – Technical**[[10]](#footnote-10)**  The following Technical Proposals were submitted by the RFP stated deadline of (***time)*** on (***date).*** The Proposals were opened and read out in the presence of those signing the POR. Any Proposals received later than the above-stated deadline were not opened and are listed in the attached sheet.   |  |  |  | | --- | --- | --- | | **Country:** | **Loan/Grant No.:** | **Project Name:** | | **Client:** | **RFP No.:** | **Proposal Name:** | | **Date and start time of opening Proposals:** | **Proposal opening ended at (time):** | **Location/electronic platform of the Proposal opening*[[11]](#footnote-11)*:** |  |  |  |  |  |  | | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | | Name of Proposer*[[12]](#footnote-12)*  (A) | Modifications or Withdrawal*[[13]](#footnote-13)*  Yes/No  (B) | Financial Proposal – Received*[[14]](#footnote-14)?*  Yes/No  (C) | Media of Proposal – per the RFP*[[15]](#footnote-15)*  Yes/No  (D) | Signature of Proposer’s Representative*[[16]](#footnote-16)* | |  |  |  |  |  | |  |  |  |  |  | |  |  |  |  |  |   ­­­­­­­­­­­­­­­­­­­ \_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_ \_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_ \_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_  Name, Designation and Signature[[17]](#footnote-17) Name, Designation and Signature Name, Designation and Signature |

## Form II G-1 Attendance Sheet for the Public Opening of Proposals

|  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- |
| **Name and Country of**  **Registration of Consultant** | **Name of Representative**  **(Printed)** | **Designation** | **Signature of Representative of**  **Consultant** |
|  |  |  |  |
|  |  |  |  |
|  |  |  |  |
|  |  |  |  |

## Form II-H Evaluation Committee Certification – Technical

**Respectfully Submitted by the Evaluation Committee**

*(Use for QCBS, QBS, LCS, FBS)*

|  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- |
| **Name** | **Organisation/Position** | **Date** | **Signature** |
|  |  |  |  |
|  |  |  |  |
|  |  |  |  |
|  |  |  |  |
|  |  |  |  |
|  |  |  |  |
| I confirm that the technical evaluation was conducted in full compliance with the Request for Proposal and CDB’s Procurement Procedures. All members of the Evaluation Committee have certified no conflicts of interest in accordance with Procedures, Paragraph 6.37.  Chairperson’s Name:  Signature Date | | | |

*If no Firms are qualified at this stage, the Transmittal Letter (Section II) to CDB must describe the Recipient’s planned approach to addressing the situation.*

# 

# Section III. Financial Evaluation Report and Contract Award Recommendation—Text

For **QCBS, FBS, LCS, QBS,** where the Contract is subject to CDB's NO, Financial Proposals must not be opened before the Recipient has received the NO to the PER-CF-1. Following the opening of the Financial Proposals, the technical evaluations (including technical scores) cannot be changed.

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
| **1. Background** | *Include a brief description, context, scope, and objectives of the consulting services.* ***Use about a quarter of a page.*** |
| **2. Summarise the results of the Technical Evaluation** | *Elaborate on information provided in Form IIA and the results of CDB NO, where required.* ***Use about one-half page.*** |
| **3. Financial Evaluation** | *The overall evaluation process including: (i) number of Financial Proposals received and how many found responsive and evaluated (ii) any specific challenges in conducting the evaluations, e.g., financial adjustments needed (for time-based Selection Methods); (iii) any complaints from Proposers; (iv) any unresolved or potentially contentious issues.*  *For the evaluation committee (EC), describe (i) the formation, including any changes to the membership of the technical EC, as required in Procedures, Paragraph 6.37 (ii) meetings and actions taken by the EC[[18]](#footnote-18): (iii) outside assistance, if any: (iv) evaluation guidelines* |
| 1. **Results of the combined Technical and Financial Evaluation** | *Add the name here of the Firm selected for the award from results from Form IV-A, including (i) items of the Proposal to be subject to negotiation[[19]](#footnote-19) (ii) the geographical distribution of Firms; (iii) Any other important information.*  *When the Contract is subject to post review, the same documentation as noted above, and all supporting documentation, shall be retained in the Recipient's project files for future inspection by CDB.* |

# Section IV. Financial Evaluation Report—Award Recommendation—Forms

Form IV-A. Financial Evaluation—Basic Data

Form IV-B. Prices, as readout.

Form IV-C. Preliminary Examination - Financial

Form IV-D Adjustments—Currency Conversion—Evaluated Prices

Form IV-E QCBS—Combined Technical/Financial Evaluation—Award Recommendation

Form IV-F Fixed-Budget and Least-Cost Selection—Award Recommendation

Form IV-G Exchange Rates

Form IV-H Currency Conversion (Single or Multiple Currencies

Form IV-I Additions and Priced Deviations

Form IV-J Proposed Contract Award

Form IV-K Proposal Opening Record – Financial

Form IV-K-1 Attendance Sheet for the Public Opening of Proposals

Form IV-L Evaluation Committee Certification

## Letter of Transmittal

*Where CDB’s no objection (NO) is required for the evaluation report[[20]](#footnote-20), the PER-CF-1 (consisting of the relevant following attachments) should be attached with a Letter of Transmittal from the Recipient ministry, department, or agency responsible for communications with CDB be highlighted. The letter should be sent to the CDB Operations Officer responsible for the project.*

*Where the results are subject to post review, the PER-CF-1 and all supporting documentation shall be retained in the Recipient’s project files for future review by CDB.*

Form IV-A. Financial Evaluation—Basic Data

Form IV-B Prices, as readout.

Form IV-C. Preliminary Examination - Financial

Form IV-D. Adjustments—Currency Conversion—Evaluated Prices

Form IV-E. QCBS—Combined Technical/Financial Evaluation—Award Recommendation

Form IV-F Fixed-Budget and Least-Cost Selection—Award Recommendation

Form IV-G. Exchange Rates

Form IV-H. Currency Conversion (Single or Multiple Currencies

Form IV-I. Additions and Priced Deviations - QCBS

Form IV-J Proposed Contract Award

Form IV-K Proposal Opening Record – Financial

Form IV-K-1 Attendance Sheet for the Public Opening of Proposals

Form IV-L Evaluation Committee Certification

## 

## Form IV-A. Financial Evaluation—Basic Data

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
| * 1. CDB’s no-objection to technical evaluation report (QCBS, LCS, FBS, QBS) | Date Click or tap to enter a date. |
| 4.2 Public opening of financial Proposals (QCBS, LCS, FBS, QBS[[21]](#footnote-21))  (a) Names and Proposal prices, as readout *(from Form IV-B)* | Date Click or tap to enter a date. Time   |  |  | | --- | --- | | **Name of Consultant** | **Read-out Price(s)** | |  |  | |  |  | |  |  | |
| 4.3 QCBS - Award  (a) Weighted technical and financial scores and combined final scores *(transfer results from Section I Table 1 and Form IV-E)*  (b) Award recommendation | |  |  |  |  | | --- | --- | --- | --- | | **Name of Consultant** | **Technical score** | **Financial score** | **Final scores** | |  |  |  |  | |  |  |  |  | |  |  |  |  | |  |  |  |  | |  |  |  |  | |
| 4.4 QBS Award  (a) Technical scores *(transfer results from Section I Table 1)* *and Financial from Form IV-F),* only of the Firm with the highest technical score   1. Award recommendation | |  |  |  |  | | --- | --- | --- | --- | | **Name of Consultant** | **Technical score** | **Price readout** | **Evaluated Price** | |  |  |  |  |   Name:  \_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_ |
| 4.5 FBS Award   1. Technical scores *(transfer results from Section I Table 1)* *and Financial from Form IV-F),* only of Firm with highest technical score and within budget. 2. Award recommendation | |  |  |  |  | | --- | --- | --- | --- | | **Name of Consultant** | **Technical Score** | **Price Readout** | **Evaluated Price** | |  |  |  |  |   Name:\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_ |
| 4.6 LCS Award  (a) Technical scores *(transfer results from Section I Table 1)* *and Financial from Form IV-F),* only of lowest cost Firm that achieved minimum technical score   1. Award recommendation | |  |  |  |  | | --- | --- | --- | --- | | **Name of Consultant** | **Technical Score** | **Price Readout** | **Evaluated Price** | |  |  |  |  |   Name |
| 4.7 Submission of final technical/financial evaluation report to CDB (QCBS, QBS, FBS, LCS) | Date Click or tap to enter a date. |

## Form IV-B. Proposal Prices (as Readout)

|  |  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| **Proposer Identification** | | | **Readout Proposal Price(s)1** | | **Modifications or** |
| **Name** | **City/State or Province** | **Country** | **Currency(ies)** | **Amount(s)** | **Comments2** |
| ***(a)*** | ***(b)*** | ***(c)*** | ***(d)*** | ***(e)*** | ***(f)*** |
|  |  |  |  |  |  |
|  |  |  |  |  |  |
|  |  |  |  |  |  |
|  |  |  |  |  |  |
|  |  |  |  |  |  |
|  |  |  |  |  |  |
| *1 Where a Proposal price is composed of several currencies, each currency and the amount shall be entered on a separate line for the Proposer involved.*  *2 Describe any modifications to the readout, such as discounts offered.*  ***NB: Local taxes (per SRFP ITC Clause 25.2) are not considered in the financial evaluation but can be recorded in column f.*** | | | | | |

## Form IV-C. Preliminary Examination – Financial

(Use for QCBS, QBS, LCS and FBS)

|  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- |
| **Proposer** | **Completeness of Proposal** | **Substantial Responsiveness** | **Acceptance for Detailed Examination** |
| ***(a)*** | ***(b)*** | ***(c)*** | ***(d)*** |
|  |  |  |  |
|  |  |  |  |
|  |  |  |  |
|  |  |  |  |
|  |  |  |  |
|  |  |  |  |
|  |  |  |  |
|  |  |  |  |
|  |  |  |  |
|  |  |  |  |

***Note****: From the preliminary technical examination (Form II-B), key aspects of the overall responsiveness of Proposals were concluded. Therefore, the preliminary examination of Financial Proposals should examine if there are any changes from the technical evaluation that would impact the responsiveness. Also, the examination should focus on the responsiveness of Proposals under the above headings. For example, is the Letter of Proposal signed by the Authorised Signatory, are Price Schedules included, is Proposal validity duration consistent with the RFP. For a more detailed description of the above categories, refer to Section V Annex I.*

***If required, use a separate sheet to detail reasons for Proposals passing or failing the preliminary examination.***

## Form IV-D. Adjustments—Currency Conversion—Evaluated Prices

|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
|  | Proposals’ prices **a** | | Correction,  Discounts,  Adjustments **b** | Evaluated Price (s) | Conversion to the currency of evaluation **c** | | Financial scores **d** |
| Consultants’  Names | Currency | Amounts (1) | (2) | (3) = (1) + (2) | Exchange rate(s) (4) | Evaluated prices (5) = (3)(4) | (6) |
|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |

***a.*** *Prices (as readout) from Form IV-B*. *Comments, if any (e.g., exchange rates); up to three foreign currencies maximum, plus local currency.*

*b. Some are only applicable for time-based contracts. – Provide summary here – details refer Form IV- H and IV-I and Annex I section 4(e).*

*c. As per RFP and refer Forms IV-G and IV-H.*

***d.*** *Columns 1-6 all apply for* ***QCBS****. Columns 1-5 for* ***QBS*** *(only for the Proposer with the highest-ranked Technical Proposal) and columns 1-5 also for* ***LCS and FBS.***

## Form IV-E. QCBS-Technical/Financial Evaluation-Award Recommendation

|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
|  | Technical Evaluation | | | Financial Evaluation | | Combined Evaluation | |
| Consultants’ names | Technical scores a S(t) | Weighted scores S(t) ´ T b | Technical rank | Financial scores c S(f) | Weighted scores S(f) ´ F d | Scores S(t) T + S(f) F | Rank |
|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Award recommendation | To highest combined technical/financial score.  Consultant’s name: \_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_ | | | | | | |
| *a. See Form II-C.*  *b. T = As per RFP.*  *c. See Form IV-D.*  *d. F = as per RFP.* | | | | | | | |

**Calculation of Technical and Financial**

**QCBS - Combined Rated-type Criteria and Cost.**

Proposals are given a financial score that is inversely proportional to their prices. The weighting to combine the rated and financial scores to determine the Proposal offering the best Value for Money (VfM) shall be specified in the Instructions to Consultants (ITC) document. The relative weight assigned to the rated technical criteria should generally not exceed eighty percent (80%) and the financial weight of twenty percent (20%). Still, it may be adjusted if justified in the context of the assignment to achieve the best VfM.

The lowest evaluated Financial Proposal (Fm) is given the maximum financial score (Sf) of 100.

The formula for determining the financial scores (Sf) of all other Proposals is calculated as follows:

Sf = 100 x Fm/ F, in which (Sf) is the financial score; (Fm) is the lowest Price, and F is the Price of the Proposal under consideration.

The weights given to the Technical (T) and Financial (P) Proposals are:

**T** = ***[Insert weight – e.g. 20%:]***; and

**P** = ***[Insert weight – e.g. 80%:]***

Proposals are ranked according to their combined Technical (St) and financial (Sf) scores using the weights:

T = the weight given to the Technical Proposal.

P = the weight given to the Financial Proposal; T + P = 1) as following:

S = St x T% + Sf x P%.

## Form IV-F. FBS, LCS and QBS - Award Recommendation

|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
|  | | **Fixed-Budget Selection** | | | **Least-Cost Selection** | | | **Quality Based Selection** | | |
| **Consultants’ names** | | **Technical scores a** | **Read Out prices** | **Evaluated prices b** | **Technical scores** | **Read Out prices** | **Evaluated prices** | **Technical scores** | **Read Out prices** | **Evaluated Price** |
|  | |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
|  | |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
|  | |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
|  | |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
|  | |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
|  | |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Award recommendation | | To best technical score with the evaluated Price within budget.  Consultant’s name: | | | To lowest evaluated Price equal to/above minimum technical score.  Consultant’s name: | | | To the best technical score with an acceptable evaluated Price  Consultant’s name:\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_ | | |
|  | *a. See Form II-C. for FBS, LCS and QBS (one Price only)*  *b. See Form IV-D for FBS, LCS and QBS (one Price only)* | | | | | |  |  |  |  |

## 

## **Form IV-G. Exchange Rates**[[22]](#footnote-22)

Currency Used for Proposal Evaluation:

Effective Date of Exchange Rate: Click or tap to enter a date.

Authority or Publication Specified for Exchange Rate category to be used:

***Note:*** *Attach a copy of exchange rates provided by a specified authority or publication.*

## Form IV-H. Currency Conversion (Single or Multiple Currencies)

**Specify Evaluation Currency:**

|  |  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| **Proposer** | **Currency(ies) of Proposal** | **Corrected/Discounted** | **Applicable** | **Evaluation Currency** | |
|  |  | **Adjusted/Proposal Price(s)** | **Exchange Rate(s)1** | **Proposal Price(s)** | **Total Proposal Price2** |
| ***(a)*** | ***(b)*** | ***(c)*** | ***(d)*** | ***(e) = (c) x (d)*** | ***(f)*** |
|  |  |  |  |  |  |
|  |  |  |  |  |  |
|  |  |  |  |  |  |
|  |  |  |  |  |  |
|  |  |  |  |  |  |
|  |  |  |  |  |  |

***Note****: Columns a, b and c are from Form IV-I*

*1 Column d is from Form IV-G.*

*2 Column f is the sum of Proposal prices in column e for each Proposer.*

## Form IV-I. Adjustments

**Specify Evaluation Currency:**

**(Only applicable for time-based contracts)**

|  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- |
| **Proposer** | **Corrected/Discounted Proposal Price1** | **Adjustments2** | **Total Price** |
| ***(a)*** | ***(b)*** | ***(c)*** | ***(d) = (b) + (c))*** |
|  |  |  |  |
|  |  |  |  |
|  |  |  |  |
|  |  |  |  |
| Etc. |  |  |  |

*1 Column b is from Form IV-H, column f*

*2 Details to be provided plus calculations.*

## Form IV-J. Proposed Contract Award

*(Use for QCBS, QBS, FBS and LCS)*

|  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- |
| 1. Proposer recommended for contract award  (a) name  (b) address  (c) nationality |  | |
| 2. If Proposal from a joint venture, list all partners, nationalities, and estimated shares of contract. |  | |
| 1. Estimated date (month, year) of contract signing. |  | |
| 1. Estimated completion date (month, year) of the consultancy. |  | |
|  | Currency(ies) | Amount(s) |
| 5. Proposal Price(s) (Read-out)1 |  |  |
| 6. Corrections for Errors2 |  |  |
| 7. Discounts3 |  |  |
| 8. Other Adjustments4 |  |  |
| 9. Proposed Award5 |  |  |
| 10. Budget allocation |  |  |

1. *From Form IV-D.*
2. *From Form IV -D.*
3. *From Form IV - D*
4. *All adjustments should be explained in detail.*
5. *The sum of the prices in Items 7–10 in the Evaluation Currency. Where prices are quoted in more than one currency, add, as a footnote, the percentage of the total/Proposed Award of each currency.*

## **Form IV-K. Proposal Opening Record (POR) – Financial**[[23]](#footnote-23)

The following Financial Proposals were submitted by the RFP stated deadline of (***time)*** on (***date).*** The Proposals were opened and readout, in the presence of those signing the POR.

|  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- |
| **Country:** | **Loan/Grant No.:** | **Project Name:** |
| **Client:** | **RFP No.:** | **Proposal Name:** |
| **Date and start time of opening Proposals:** | **Proposal opening ended at (time):** | **Location/electronic platform of Proposal opening*[[24]](#footnote-24)*:** |

|  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| Name of Proposer*[[25]](#footnote-25)*  (A) | Total Technical Scores[[26]](#footnote-26)  (Weighted for QCBS)  (B) | Total Price and currencies  (C) | Media of Proposal – per the RFP*[[27]](#footnote-27)*  Yes/No  (D) | Signature of Proposer’s Representative[[28]](#footnote-28) |
|  |  |  |  |  |
|  |  |  |  |  |
|  |  |  |  |  |
|  |  |  |  |  |

­­­­­­­­­­­­­­­­­­­

* The following Financial Proposals were modified, or substitutes offered: *(Name(s) of Proposer(s)[[29]](#footnote-29)*

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

Name, Designation and Signature[[30]](#footnote-30) Name, Designation and Signature Name, Designation and Signature

## Form IV-K-1 Attendance Sheet for the Public Opening of Financial Proposals

|  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- |
| **Name and Country of Registration of Consultant** | **Name of Representative (Printed)** | **Designation** | **Signature of Representative of Consultant** |
|  |  |  |  |
|  |  |  |  |
|  |  |  |  |

## Form IV K-1. Attendance Sheet for the Public Opening of Proposals

|  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- |
| **Name and Country of**  **Registration of Consultant** | **Name of Representative**  **(Printed)** | **Designation** | **Signature of Representative of**  **Consultant** |
|  |  |  |  |
|  |  |  |  |
|  |  |  |  |
|  |  |  |  |

## Form IV-L Evaluation Committee Certification

**Respectfully Submitted by the Evaluation Committee**

*This certification must be used for QCBC, QBS, LCS and FBS.*

|  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- |
| **Name** | **Organisation/Position** | **Date** | **Signature** |
|  |  |  |  |
|  |  |  |  |
|  |  |  |  |
|  |  |  |  |
|  |  |  |  |
|  |  |  |  |
|  |  |  |  |
|  |  |  |  |
|  |  |  |  |
|  |  |  |  |
|  |  |  |  |
|  |  |  |  |
|  |  |  |  |
| I confirm that the financial evaluation and award recommendation was conducted in full compliance with the Request for Proposal and CDB's Procurement Procedures. All members of the Evaluation Committee have certified no conflict of interest in accordance with Procedures, Paragraph 6.37.    Chairperson's Name: Signature Date | | | |

# 

# Section V Annexes and Diagrams

## Annex I - Evaluation and Contract Award Guidelines

*This Guide addresses the Selection Methods of* ***QCBS, QBS, FBS and LCS[[31]](#footnote-31)****, which all use the SRFP template, including the* ***Instruction to Consultants (ITC).*** *In addition, some aspects relate to the evaluation of Technical or Financial Proposals; those aspects will be noted with* ***“T”*** *and* ***“F”*** *and* ***“[T&F]”*** *to indicate applicability to either or both the Technical and Financial Proposals.*

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
| ***1. Technical and Financial Evaluation Committees*** | *In accordance with Procedures Paragraph 6.37, CDB requires the appointment by the Recipient of an evaluation committee [EC], consisting of a minimum of three qualified members.*  *Where Proposals are submitted in hard copy, members conduct the evaluation in an office where all Proposals can be securely kept.*  *Electronic Proposals must be adequately protected from unauthorised access but can be remotely worked on by members.* ***[T&F]***  *There might be a considerable advantage if the EC members also participated in the preparation of the RFP.* ***[T&F].*** |
| ***2. Preliminary Examination of Technical and Financial Proposals*** | *All Firms selected to submit Proposals were shortlisted via the REOI against several of the following key criteria. The preliminary examination to be conducted on receipt of both the Technical and Financial Proposals will recheck continued compliance for the relevant criteria and compliance of additional ones, all summarised below.*  *If a Proposal fails a preliminary examination, the reasons must be documented in the PER-CF-1, (Forms II-B* ***(T)*** *and IV-C* ***(F).***   1. ***(a) Verification****: Attention should be directed toward deficiencies that, if accepted, would provide unfair advantages to the Proposer. Sound judgment must be used: for example, simple omissions or mistakes arguably occasioned by human error should not be grounds for rejection of the Proposal. Rarely is a Proposal perfect in all respects. However, for example:* 2. *The duration of the validity of each Proposal should be the one specified in the SRFP (ITC Clause 12) and should be confirmed by the Proposer* ***[T&F][[32]](#footnote-32).*** 3. *The signatures must not be in question – i.e. documents signed by the person(s) authorised to do so.* 4. *If the Proposer is a joint venture (JV), the JV agreement must be submitted. Where the JV is to be formed specifically for the Contract, the evidence of intent to form a JV is to be submitted.* 5. *All Proposal copies should be compared with the original and corrected accordingly, if necessary. After that, the original should be kept in a safe location, and only copies should be used in the evaluation. Similarly, for electronic Proposals, the Recipient should ensure adequate security* ***[T&F][[33]](#footnote-33)***   ***(b)******Eligibility****: The SRFP or other documents requesting proposals define the conditions for the eligibility of Consultants to obtain Contracts – refer to Procedures, Section 4 and Annex 1 and SRFP ITC Clause 6.*  *In addition, only Proposals from Proposers invited can be considered[[34]](#footnote-34), and only one Proposal per Proposer is allowed [refer to Procedures Paragraph 6.20 and SRFP ITC Clause 11].*  *A Proposer whose Proposal has deviations specified in the ITC as requiring rejection of the Proposal (such as the above or a conflict of interest) shall be rejected.*  *Consultants with conflicts of interest that would preclude independence and not allow Consultants to perform their Consulting Services objectively (refer to Procedures, Paragraphs 5.16 and 5.17 and SRFP ITC Clause 3) shall be ineligible. Similarly, Consultants with an unfair competitive advantage, that is not mitigated, are not eligible (refer to Procedures, Paragraph 5.18 and SRFP ITC Clause 4).*  ***(c)*** ***Completeness of Proposal****: Proposals not offering all the required scope should* *ordinarily be considered nonresponsive, unless the RFP specifically allowed partial Proposals for the Consulting Services, etc.*  *If any erasures, interlineations, additions, or other changes have been made for hard copy Proposals, they should be initialed by the Proposer. They may be acceptable if they are corrective, editorial, or explanatory. If they are not, they should be treated as deviations and should be analysed. Missing pages in the original copy of the Proposal may be cause for rejection of the Proposal.*   1. ***Substantial Responsiveness****: Major deviations to the commercial requirements and terms of reference are a basis for the rejection of Proposals. As a rule, major deviations are those that, if accepted, would mean that the services offered would not fulfill the requirements detailed in the RFP, or would prevent a fair comparison with Proposals that are properly responsive to the SRFP. Examples of major deviations include:* 2. *Failing to conform with material requirements of the Terms of Reference.* 3. *Stipulating price adjustment when fixed price Proposals were specified.* 4. *Not conforming to mandatory completion dates.* 5. *Changing joint venture partners or major subconsultants from those originally proposed at the EOI stage, without the Recipient’s prior permission.* 6. *Refusing to bear important responsibilities and liabilities allocated in the SRFP, such as not ceding to the Recipient the ownership of intellectual property developed under the Contract.* 7. *Taking exception to critical provisions such as applicable law, taxes and duties, and dispute resolution procedures* |
|  | *On occasion, the Recipient may request clarifications of Proposers concerning ambiguities or inconsistencies in the Proposals. As required in the Procedures Paragraphs 6.05 and 6.45 and the ITC Clause 13, such requests shall be in writing, and the responses from Proposers shall also be in writing.* ***[T&F]***  ***No circumstances shall justify meetings or conversations between the Recipient (or its consultants) and Proposers during the Proposal evaluation process.***  *Proposers frequently attempt to contact the Recipient during Proposal evaluation, directly or indirectly, to query the progress of evaluation, offer unsolicited clarifications, or provide criticisms of their competition. Receipt of such information should be acknowledged as to receipt only****[[35]](#footnote-35)****. Recipients must evaluate Proposals based on the information provided in the respective Proposals only.* ***[T&F]*** |
| 1. ***Detailed Examination of Proposals*** | *Only those Technical and Financial Proposals surviving preliminary examination should be examined in this phase.*  ***(a)*** ***Corrections for Errors:******[F]*** *The methodology for the correction of arithmetical or computational errors for time-based contracts is described in the SRFP ITC Clause 24(a). The readout Proposal prices and their corrections should be noted in Form IV-D. The corrections are considered binding on the Proposer.*  ***(b) Modifications and Withdrawals:*** *In accordance with SRFP ITC Clause 13.2, Proposers can submit, before the opening of the Technical Proposal, modifications or withdrawals to both their original Technical and Financial Proposals* ***[T&F].*** *These will be read out, as applicable at each Proposal opening. The impact of modifications should be fully reflected in the examination and evaluation of the Proposals. These modifications may include evidence of technical performance improvements or discounts to the Proposal prices that reflect last-minute business decisions. Accordingly, the original technical scopes or prices should be modified at this point in the evaluation.*  ***(c)*** ***Evaluation Currency:*** *The Proposals, as corrected for computational errors and adjusted for discounts, should be converted to a common evaluation currency, as described in the SRFP ITC Clause 26. The source of the exchange rates to be used in the calculations are those listed in the RFP and will be added to Form IV-G.*  *The ITC should permit the use of the multiple currency option, where the Proposal price can be expressed in several currencies, but usually not more than three plus the currency of the Recipient.*  ***(d)*** ***Adjustments:*** *For time-based contracts, technical or financial omissions (that are not material deviations) should be compensated for by adding the estimated costs for remedying the deficiency. The cost determined should be expressed in the evaluation currency and shown in Form IV-I.* |
| 1. ***Contract Negotiations*** | *The objective of negotiations is a mutually satisfactory Contract between the Recipient and the selected Consultant. The topics for negotiation generally will be identified by the Evaluation Committee and included in the evaluation reports for both the Technical and Financial Proposals.*  ***(i) Key Experts:******Before negotiations start, the Recipient should obtain confirmation in writing that all the Consultant’s key experts are still available.***  ***(ii) Local Taxes:*** *Proposers are instructed in SRFP – ITC that for all four Selection Methods, local taxes are not to be included in Proposers’ prices and are not considered in the evaluation process. These taxes are the subject of negotiations by the Recipient with the selected Firm, and identifiable local taxes cannot be financed by CDB.*  ***(iii) Financial Negotiations:*** *Where cost is a factor of selection (i.e., QCBS, FBS and LCS) and the basis of payment is either lump sum or time based, negotiation of the lump sum or unit rates costs [key experts, reimbursables] is not allowed****[[36]](#footnote-36)*** *- refer to SRFP ITC Clauses 28 and 29.*  *Where cost is not a factor in the selection process, i.e., QBS, then negotiation of all financial conditions is permitted.* |
| 1. ***CDB NO/Review (Where required)*** | *The project Procurement Plan identifies those Contracts for Consulting Services for CDB prior “no objection” (NO) or post review. For an overview of the activities requiring CDB, prior NO, refer to Procedures Annex 2 and summarised below.*   1. ***Prior No Objection (NO):*** *Under the Financing Agreement, the Recipient must submit the completed PER-CF-1 in sequence (Technical first, and then the Financial and contract award recommendation) containing the required summary to CDB as soon as possible after Proposal openings, the last PER-CF-1 [contract award] preferably no later than three (3) weeks before the expiration of the validity of the Proposal. The PER-CF-1 should include the appropriate Forms and other documents listed in Sections I to IV.* 2. *Recipients may be requested to provide additional information and justification for the recommendations. CDB will not contact Proposers. However, it may, in exceptional circumstances, ask the Recipient to do so for written clarifications. When CDB is satisfied with the evaluation of Proposals and recommendations of the award, a NO written communication will be issued to the Recipient by the CDB official designated for such correspondence.* 3. *Once CDB’s NO is received, the Recipient can negotiate with the selected Proposer. A draft Contract initialled by the Consultant is then submitted by the Recipient to CDB for NO and, upon CDB’s NO, the Contract can then be awarded.* 4. ***Post Review:*** *For Contracts subject to post review, the Recipient may award the Contract upon completion of the* *Technical and Financial evaluation, as reflected in the PER-CF-1, and subsequent negotiations. However, any doubts about the justification for the award should be raised by the Recipient with CDB before award signing. Recipients should ensure that all correspondence received from Proposers concerning evaluation has been considered. CDB does not finance contracts that have not been procured in accordance with the Financing Agreement.* |
| 1. ***Contract Standstill*** | *For some contracts, the option of a 10-working day “standstill period” (Procedures, Paragraphs 6.90 through 6.94) may be adopted. In this case, the Technical and Financial PER-CF-1 is approved by CDB and the Recipient issues a Notification of Intention to Award (NOIA) to the selected Proposer. Thus, the “standstill period” starts. Copies of the NOIA are also sent to all other responsive Proposers with the evaluated conclusions for their Proposals and those for the selected Proposer. This notification and standstill period allows time for the Recipient to provide debriefing to unsuccessful Proposers and time for challenges from unsuccessful Proposers about the Recipient's selection.* |

|  |
| --- |
| 1. **Quality- and Cost-Based Selection -** **QCBS - Procedures, Paragraphs 8.10-12**   Two envelope approach – An RFP is issued to a shortlist of Firms for Financial and Technical Proposals, which are submitted simultaneously but in separate envelopes. Technical Proposals are opened first in public and then scored; nonresponsive Proposals[[37]](#footnote-37) are set aside. Upon NO, where applicable, the Financial Proposals of the remaining Proposers are opened in public and scored. Then the technical and financial scores are combined; the Proposer with the highest score is invited to contract negotiations. Should negotiations prove successful, a Contract shall be awarded and if not, subject to CDB’s NO, where applicable, the Recipient shall terminate negotiations and proceed to negotiate with the second-ranked Firm and so on. **REF: Process Diagrams A & B.** |
| 1. **Quality Based Selection - QBS - Procedures, Paragraphs 8.13-15**   Two envelope approach – An RFP is issued to a shortlist of Firms for Technical and Financial Proposals submitted simultaneously but in separate envelopes or initially for only a Technical Proposal. All the Technical Proposals are opened first in public and scored; nonresponsive Proposals are set aside[[38]](#footnote-38). Upon NO, where applicable, only the Financial Proposal of the Proposer with the highest technical score is opened in public (or if only a Technical Proposal was sought initially, a Financial Proposal is sought only from the Proposer with the highest technical score), and a Contract is then negotiated with the Consultant, assuming their Financial Proposal is responsive. Should negotiations prove successful a Contract shall be awarded. If not, subject to CDB’s NO, where applicable, the Recipient shall terminate negotiations and proceed to seek/open the Financial Proposal of the Proposer with the second-ranked Technical Proposal and so on. **REF: Process Diagram A.** |
| 1. **Fixed Budget Selection - FBS - Procedures, Paragraphs 8.16**   Two envelope approach – RFP is issued, with financial budget stated, to a shortlist of Firms for Technical and Financial Proposals to be submitted simultaneously but in separate envelopes. All the Technical Proposals are opened first in public and scored; nonresponsive Proposals[[39]](#footnote-39)are set aside. Upon NO where applicable, the Financial Proposals for all other Proposers are opened in public. Proposals that are over budget are discarded. The Proposer with the highest scored Technical Proposal is invited to negotiate a Contract. Should negotiations prove successful a Contract shall be awarded, and if not, subject to CDB’s NO, where applicable, the Recipient shall terminate negotiations and proceed to negotiate with the second-ranked Firm and so on. **REF: Process Diagram A.** |
| 1. **Least-Cost Selection - LCS - Procedures, Paragraphs 8.17-18**   Two envelope approach – RFP is issued to a shortlist of Firms for Financial and Technical Proposals to be submitted simultaneously but in separate envelopes. The Technical Proposals are opened in public and scored. Nonresponsive Technical Proposals are set aside[[40]](#footnote-40). Upon NO where applicable, Financial Proposals of the remaining Proposers are opened in public. The lowest-priced Proposer is awarded a contract without negotiations. **REF: Process Diagrams A.** |

## Process Flow Diagram A



## Process Flow Diagram B



1. *“Recipient” refers here to the entity which signed the Financing Agreement with CDB who may be represented by an implementing or executing agency, and which may also be called the “Client”.*  [↑](#footnote-ref-1)
2. <https://www.caribank.org/sites/default/files/publication-resources/220411%20Guidance%20Note%20for%20Evaluation%20of%20Consulting%20Services%20.pdf> [↑](#footnote-ref-2)
3. *This would include the results of RFP Clarifications and Amendments (refer Form II-A, item 2.6) and the results of clarification correspondence between the Recipient and Proposers* [↑](#footnote-ref-3)
4. *The evaluation criteria, and hence strengths and weaknesses, shall reflect the Recipient’s request for either a full technical Proposal****(FTP)*** *or simplified technical Proposal* ***(STP).*** [↑](#footnote-ref-4)
5. *See Procedures, Paragraphs 5.04 -5.07 and 8.02-8.09.* [↑](#footnote-ref-5)
6. *Refer to SRFP ITC Clause 13 that describes “Clarifications” and “Amendments”. Where CBD prior NO is required (Yes) then this must be received for* ***Amendments****, before the issue to the Firms and details to be summarised here i.e. The number of each Amendment, date(s) of submission to CDB, date(s) of NO receipt and date(s) of issue of Amendment(s) to the Firms. For Clarifications record here the Clarification number and date(s) of issue to Firms.* [↑](#footnote-ref-6)
7. *Refer Technical Proposal Opening Report Form II-G. Tick “No” for QBS, where the Financial Proposal will be opened or requested only from the Proposer with the highest technical score.* [↑](#footnote-ref-7)
8. *CDB NO required where applicable for validity extensions - Procedures, Annex 2 paragraph 5(b).*  [↑](#footnote-ref-8)
9. *For details of the examination categories refer to Annex I herein.* [↑](#footnote-ref-9)
10. *At the opening of the Technical Proposal, the minimum that is read out and recorded is limited to the content of columns (A) through (D). However, when required, other criteria can be added to the RFP and added to the POR by the Recipient and read out from the Proposals, as required.* [↑](#footnote-ref-10)
11. *This information should be the same as specified in the Instruction to Consultants (ITC) section of the RFP documents.* [↑](#footnote-ref-11)
12. *Where a Proposer is a joint venture, the names of all the parties to the joint venture should be read out and recorded.* [↑](#footnote-ref-12)
13. *These must be received by the Recipient prior to the Proposal submission deadline and the impact of such to be read out prior to Proposal opening. A withdrawal will result in the Proposers’ Technical and Financial Proposals being set aside and returned to the Proposer(s) once the Contract is awarded.* [↑](#footnote-ref-13)
14. *A physical verification of receipt of the Financial Proposals is required but not the opening – refer footnote #14. Depending on the option selected for QBS (refer to Section V Annex I -A), a Financial Proposal may not be required at this stage from all Firms but only after the completion of the technical evaluation and then, only from the Proposer with the highest technical score.*  [↑](#footnote-ref-14)
15. *For column D the Recipient shall ensure that the media used for the received Proposals is as specified in the ITC of the RFP, e.g., hard copy, USB, electronic copy and suitably protected prior to opening e.g., sealing of envelopes, password protected. The Recipient’s e-procurement system must be pre-approved by CDB and offer an adequate protection of Proposals against loss, tampering or unauthorised access.* [↑](#footnote-ref-15)
16. *A copy of the completed POR, signed by all attendees will be distributed immediately after the public opening to all Proposers, including those that chose not to attend but submitted Proposals.* [↑](#footnote-ref-16)
17. *All members of the Bid Opening Committee to sign.* [↑](#footnote-ref-17)
18. *This would include (i) the confirmation that RFP Clarifications and Amendments (refer Form II-A, item 2.6) are reflected in the Proposals and (ii) clarification correspondence (post opening of Proposals) between the Recipient and Proposers.*  [↑](#footnote-ref-18)
19. *Refer to Section V Annex I for negotiation guidelines.*  [↑](#footnote-ref-19)
20. *See Procedures, Paragraphs 5.04 -5.07 and 8.02-8.09.* [↑](#footnote-ref-20)
21. ***QCBS, FBS and LCS*** *- Financial Proposals are opened (in public) only for Firms that submitted responsive Technical Proposals that met or exceeded the minimum technical score****.*** *For* ***QBS*** *the opening of the Financial Proposal takes place in public but only for the Proposer* *whose technical Proposal was scored highest (refer Section I, item 3 Table 1) – for details refer Section V Annex I-A.*  [↑](#footnote-ref-21)
22. *As specified in RFP*  [↑](#footnote-ref-22)
23. *QBS - for either option selected by the Recipient (for the timing for submission Financial Proposals - refer to Section V Annex I-A), only the Financial Proposal of the Proposer with the highest technical score will be opened in public. In addition, the technical scores will be readout of all responsive Technical Proposals.*  [↑](#footnote-ref-23)
24. *This information should be the same as specified in the Instruction to Consultants (ITC) section of the RFP documents.* [↑](#footnote-ref-24)
25. *Where a Proposer is a joint venture, the names of all the parties to the joint venture should be read out and recorded.* [↑](#footnote-ref-25)
26. *A separate sheet should be attached recording the read-out scores against RFP assigned values for the main criteria/sub-criteria.* [↑](#footnote-ref-26)
27. *For column D the Recipient shall ensure that the media used for the received Proposals will be as specified in the ITC of the RFP, e.g., hard copy, USB, electronic copy and suitably protected prior to opening e.g., sealing of envelopes, password protected. The Recipient’s e-procurement system must be pre-approved by CDB and offer an adequate protection of Proposals against loss, tampering or unauthorised access.* [↑](#footnote-ref-27)
28. *A copy of the completed POR, signed by all attendees, will be distributed* *immediately after the public opening, to all Proposers including those that chose not to attend but submitted responsive Technical Proposals.* [↑](#footnote-ref-28)
29. *These must be received by the Recipient prior to the Technical Proposal submission deadline. Record the readout nature of the modification or substitution in the applicable part of the Record or add a text paragraph to this Record.*  [↑](#footnote-ref-29)
30. *All members of the Bid Opening Committee to sign*. [↑](#footnote-ref-30)
31. *A summary of these four Selection Methods can be found in the attached Annex I-A and Flow Diagram A; QCBS is further detailed in Flow Diagram B.*  [↑](#footnote-ref-31)
32. *If exceptional circumstances occur in which award cannot be made within the validity period, extensions in writing should be requested of Proposers, in accordance with the ITC Clause 12 and Procedures, Paragraph 6.89.* [↑](#footnote-ref-32)
33. *Where an electronic Proposal system is used, it must be pre-approved by CDB and offer an adequate protection of Proposals against loss, corruption, tampering or unauthorised access.* [↑](#footnote-ref-33)
34. *The juridic entities of the prequalified Proposers may not be modified in the submitted Proposals.* [↑](#footnote-ref-34)
35. [↑](#footnote-ref-35)
36. *On occasions, Proposers approach CDB with information. CDB’s policy is to acknowledge the correspondence and pass it on to the Recipient for its consideration. An exception to this would be where key experts’ rates are far above market rates and above the rates usually charged by Consultants for similar work. The Recipient is entitled to ask for an explanation and details of the methods used to develop the key experts’ rates.* [↑](#footnote-ref-36)
37. *Nonresponsive includes Proposals that failed preliminary technical examination [see Form II-B] or failed to meet the technical score threshold stated in the RFP [refer Form II-A item 2.14].*  [↑](#footnote-ref-37)
38. *See footnote 1.* [↑](#footnote-ref-38)
39. *See footnote 1.* [↑](#footnote-ref-39)
40. *See footnote 1.* [↑](#footnote-ref-40)