



GUIDANCE NOTE ON EVALUATING EXPRESSIONS OF INTEREST AND PROPOSALS FOR CONSULTING SERVICES

April 2022

Prepared by The Caribbean Development Bank



COMMON ABBREVIATIONS AND DEFINED TERMS

Common abbreviations and defined terms that are used in this Guidance Note. Defined terms are written using capital letters.

Abbreviation/term	Full terminology/definition
Bank	CDB
Bid	An offer, by a Bidder, in response to a Request for Bids, to provide the required Goods, and/or Works and/or related services.
Bidder	A Firm that submits a Bid for the provision of Goods and/or Works and/or related Services.
BMCs	Borrowing Member Countries.
CDB	Caribbean Development Bank.
Consulting Services	Intellectual services delivered by a Consulting Firm or an Individual Consultant. Consulting Services are normally of a professional, expert, or advisory nature.
CQS	Consultants' Qualifications Selection.
CV	Curriculum Vitae.
DS	Direct Selection.
EOIs	Expressions of Interest.
e-procurement	Electronic procurement.
FBS	Fixed-Budget Selection.
Firm	Any eligible private, public or government-owned legal entity, or any combination thereof, that intends to enter into an agreement or is bound by an existing agreement in the form of a Joint Venture, consortium or Association, for-profit or not, that provides Goods, Works, or Services.
Goods	A category of Procurement that includes, for example: consumables, equipment, machinery, vehicles commodities, raw materials, or industrial plant. The term may also include related services, such as: transportation, insurance, installation, commissioning, training, or initial maintenance.
GN	Guidance Note.
JV	Joint Venture.
LCS	Least-Cost Selection.
Non-Consulting Services	Services which are not Consulting Services. Non-Consulting Services are normally Bid and contracted based on performance of measurable outputs, and for which performance standards can be clearly identified and consistently applied. Examples include drilling, aerial photography, satellite imagery, mapping, and similar operations.
The Policy	The Procurement Policy for Projects Financed by CDB.
The Procedures	The Procurement Procedures for Projects Financed by CDB.



Abbreviation/term	Full terminology/definition
Procurement Framework	Consists of the Policy and the Procedures.
Procurement Plan	The Recipient's Procurement Plan for a CDB financed Project, as detailed in Paragraphs 5.09 – 5.14 of the Procedures.
Procurement Strategy	The project-level document that describes how the procurement will deliver the intended development objectives and provide value for money through the application of CDB's core procurement principles.
Prohibited Practices	These consist of corruption, fraud, collusion, coercion and obstruction, as defined in the Procedures.
Proposal	An offer, usually in response to an RFP, to provide Consulting Services.
Proposer	Consultant, submitting Expressions of Interests or Proposals.
QBS	Quality-Based Selection.
QCBS	Quality and Cost-Based Selection.
REOI	Request for Expressions of Interest.
RFP	Request for Proposals.
TER	Technical Evaluation Report.
Terminal Disbursement Date	Final date when disbursements can be made under a project.
USD	United States Dollars.
Works	A category of Procurement that refers to construction, repair, rehabilitation, demolition, restoration, maintenance of civil work structures, and related services such as transportation, insurance, installation, commissioning, and training.



Table of Contents

SECTION 1 – INTRODUCTION AND BACKGROUND	1
Overview	1
Purpose of this Guidance Note.....	1
Background	1
SECTION 2 – EVALUATING EXPRESSIONS OF INTEREST FROM FIRMS	3
Basis for Evaluating Expressions of Interest (EOIs)	3
Evaluation Approach.....	3
Where CQS and DS are Employed	5
SECTION 3 – EVALUATING TECHNICAL PROPOSALS FROM FIRMS	6
Public Opening of Technical Proposals	6
General Principles Guiding the Technical Evaluation	7
Technical Evaluation Stages	8
(1) Preliminary Evaluation	8
Verification	8
Eligibility	9
Completeness of Bid.....	9
Substantial Responsiveness	9
(2) Detailed Technical Evaluation	9
Requests for Clarification	12
Scoring and Preparation of TER.....	12
Communication with Proposers Who Fail to Achieve the Minimum Technical Score ...	13
Where CQS and DS are Employed	13
SECTION 4 – EVALUATING FINANCIAL PROPOSALS FROM FIRMS.....	14
Public Opening of Financial Proposals	14
Financial Evaluation Stages	14
(1) Preliminary Evaluation	14
(2) Detailed Financial Evaluation.....	15
SECTION 5 – FINALISATION OF TECHNICAL AND FINANCIAL EVALUATION FOR FIRMS.....	17
Quality and Cost-Based Selection.....	17
Quality-Based Selection.....	18
Fixed-Budget Selection	18
Least-Cost Selection.....	19
Standstill Period.....	19



SECTION 6 – EVALUATING EXPRESSIONS OF INTEREST FROM INDIVIDUAL CONSULTANTS	20
Approach to Individual Consultant Evaluation	20
Evaluation Approach.....	20
ANNEX I: SAMPLE RECORDS FOR PUBLIC OPENINGS OF TECHNICAL AND FINANCIAL PROPOSALS.....	22
ANNEX II: SAMPLE SCORING GUIDE	26



SECTION 1 – INTRODUCTION AND BACKGROUND

Overview

This Guidance Note (GN) is written in accordance with the Caribbean Development Bank’s (CDB’s) Procurement Policy for Projects Financed by CDB (November 2019) and the Procurement Procedures for Projects Financed by CDB (January 2021), herein referred to as “the Policy” and “the Procedures” respectively and together as “the Procurement Framework.”

Purpose of this Guidance Note

This GN provides guidance on the evaluation of Expressions of Interest (EOI) and Proposals for Consulting Services procured in accordance with the above-mentioned Policy and Procedures. It does not address the evaluation of Bids for Goods, Works and Non-consulting Services¹.

The GN complements but does not supersede CDB’s prevailing templates for Requests for Expressions of Interest (REOI), Request for Proposals (RFP) and evaluation templates for Consulting Services, which, are expected to be used by all CDB’s Borrowing Member Countries (BMCs). Use of this GN is not mandatory. Rather, it is intended to offer guidance to BMCs on the steps to follow when evaluating EOIs and Proposals and on dealing with commonly encountered issues that arise.

As such, the guidance and examples cited in this GN do not carry the force of precedent and should not, therefore, be treated as binding rules.

Background

Consulting Services are defined under the Procedures as being “advisory or intellectual services, delivered by a Consulting Firm or an Individual Consultant.” Under CDB financed projects Consulting Services typically involve preparation studies for a downstream project(s), such as feasibility studies or sector master plans, implementation services, such as engineering supervision services and gender mainstreaming services, and advisory services, such as policy development, reform activities or capacity enhancement. They are at the heart of most technical assistance projects and, while typically lower in value than contracts for Goods and Works, are often on the critical path of capital projects, directly determining their ultimate success.

Consulting Services are fundamentally different to Goods, Works and Non-consulting services, which by their nature, are more tangible with clearly measurable physical attributes or outputs. The procurement of Consulting Services is primarily driven by the need for high quality services but determining the quality offered can be challenging, not least, because procuring entities, by virtue of having to acquire external expertise that is typically lacking “in-house,” face information asymmetry challenges. Given this, CDB’s Procurement Framework provides for the use of specific selection methods and approaches for the evaluation of Consulting Services.

^{1/} The evaluation of Bids for Goods, Works and Non-consulting services is covered by other Guidance Notes which can be found on CDB website at: www.caribank.org/work-with-us/procurement/resources



It should also be noted that the procurement and evaluation approach differs for Consulting Firms and Individual Consultants and these two approaches are considered in this GN.



SECTION 2 – EVALUATING EXPRESSIONS OF INTEREST FROM FIRMS

Basis for Evaluating Expressions of Interest (EOIs)

The initial phase of the procurement process for Consulting Services, provided by a Firm, involves inviting Proposers to submit EOIs. These are submitted in response to an REOI, which is a form of procurement notice, that is advertised in accordance with the requirements set out in the Procedures. Except where the selection methods of Consultants' Qualifications Selection (CQS) and Direct Selection (DS) are utilised, which are detailed shortly, the process seeks to identify a group of between three (3) and six (6) suitably experienced and qualified Proposers, known as a "shortlist," to be invited to submit Proposals for the assignment in question from the "long list" of all those who submitted EOIs.

The REOI should specify the general experience and expertise required, along with other criteria, that will form the basis for the evaluation of the EOIs. The evaluation criteria will seek to identify those Firms that are generally suitable and qualified to be shortlisted to prepare Proposals to respond to the specific requirements of the assignment. However, rather than evaluating on this basis many procuring entities make the mistake of prematurely seeking to evaluate EOIs against the specific requirements of the assignment in question.

Evaluation Approach

The evaluation process is far simpler and quicker than that for Proposals, which is covered later in the GN. Public openings are not held for the evaluation of EOIs, and late submissions may be considered so long as the evaluation process has not been completed. The evaluation committee formed should prepare a scoring guide to inform the EOI evaluation process. The advice on scoring guides in Section 3 and Annex II can be used to inform this process but the scoring guides will be simpler and have considerably fewer criteria at this stage.

It is important to ensure before commencing the evaluation process that the EOIs are from entities that have an appropriate status to participate in the process. Particular attention should be paid to:

- (a) individual consultants: they are not eligible for consideration, even if they submit an EOI under a corporate registration. Firms provide a depth of technical expertise and technical "back-stopping," along with administrative support, that would be lacking from individual consultants and in turn they have a different cost structure. Therefore, an evaluation of individuals and firms together is not possible on a "like-for-like" basis and would not conform with CDB's core procurement principle of Equality and Fairness;
- (b) groups of individual consultants: such legally unincorporated groupings are generally not eligible as they lack a suitable legal entity to contract under as a group and the broader technical "backstopping," coordination and support that comes with a Firm. Importantly as the evaluation needs to consider the group as a whole, rather than individuals, they generally would also not be able to demonstrate the required collective track record of experience; and
- (c) submissions from Consultants other than commercial Consulting Firms, such as non-governmental organisations, international or regional organisations or universities: these are only acceptable where the initial selection decision to negotiate with or award



a contract to a particular Consultant is based on the technical offers received^{1/}. This is because such an approach ensures a “level playing field” by removing cost from the initial selection decision, given that the legal and commercial status of the aforementioned organisations tends to be very different to those of privately owned Consulting Firms.

Having established that the status of the Consultants allows them to participate, the EOIs will be subject to some pass/fail criteria and others that include scoring against particular criteria or sub-criteria. For example, Proposers will need to conform with core pass/fail eligibility requirements related to:

- (i) the country eligibility requirements stated in the REOI, which should align with those of the Policy and the Financing Agreement;
- (ii) the integrity requirements and conflict of interest provisions that apply under CDB’s Procurement Framework, which are referenced in the REOI; and
- (iii) any financial requirements. Unlike for prequalification exercises for Goods, Works and Non-consulting services, where the emphasis is on ensuring the successful Bidder can finance often high mobilisation costs and significant investments in goods and materials, the emphasis is limited to ensuring that the Consultant is broadly financially sound and, therefore, able to perform the required services.

There may be other pass/fail requirements related to a minimum quantum of experience and expertise in a particular area but then typically scoring will be used to reflect the extent of this experience. For example, there may be a requirement for Proposers to demonstrate at least five (5) years’ experience in providing marine engineering services but beyond that the extent of relevant experience would be scored to reflect the depth and duration of such experience, in accordance with the scoring guide developed for the evaluation.

It is essential that the procuring entity carefully evaluates the general experience of the Proposers at this stage, as at the Proposal stage only experience specific to the assignment is assessed and this is capped at ten (10) percent of the total available technical evaluation score.

Some key points to note when conducting the evaluation of EOIs include:

- (a) the evaluation must be limited to the information that forms part of the EOIs and should not consider what the procuring entity knows or thinks it knows about a particular Proposer and the services they have provided under other contracts;
- (b) where Consultants submit EOIs in association with sub-consultants only the experience of the prime Consultant shall be evaluated. However, where associations take the form of a joint venture (JV) the experience of all JV partners can be considered;
- (c) there is sometimes a tendency for Consultants to claim experience that is not rightfully theirs to claim e.g., they may claim experience for an entire contract when they were only a sub-consultant supporting part of an assignment. If there are concerns about claimed experience, where possible, this should be checked with other clients in-country or the wider region, and any apparent misrepresentation of experience should be reported to CDB for investigation as it could represent fraud. Fraud is a Prohibited

^{1/}This would be restricted to where the selection methods of Consultants’ Qualifications Selection and Quality Based Selection are used.



Practice under CDB's Procurement Framework and if confirmed would be grounds for exclusion from the process and possible wider sanctions; and

- (d) as mentioned above, only the general experience, expertise and qualifications of the Proposer as a Firm is considered at this stage. The REOI may permit the evaluation of the relevant pool of human resources that the Consultant has at its disposal to provide the kind of services required but it is not acceptable to evaluate individuals at the EOI stage. Proposers commonly include indicative curriculum vitae (CVs) or pen portraits of key experts in their EOIs to demonstrate the calibre of resources they have available which can lead to procuring entities incorrectly evaluating specific individuals against key expert roles for the assignment.

CDB requires, where there are submissions from suitably qualified and experienced Consultants, that the shortlist includes Firms from at least two (2) different eligible countries and one (1) BMC. If, for example, after the evaluation process the procuring entity has a shortlist of six (6) Firms, none of which are from a BMC, but a Firm from a BMC was ranked just below the sixth firm on the shortlist, and is deemed to be suitably qualified and experienced, then the lowest ranked Firm on the shortlist would be replaced with the Firm from the BMC. This approach encourages the development of the regional consulting industry and great diversity.

CDB's prevailing EOI evaluation template should be utilised to capture the evaluation criteria and scoring, as well as to facilitate the preparation of a concise evaluation report. Where prior review applies this report should be submitted to CDB for its no objection. Where post review applies all documentation should be retained for possible future review by CDB.

If the evaluation of the EOIs does not identify at least three (3) Firms to shortlist the procuring entity may approach suitable Consultants and ask them to submit EOIs and also ask CDB for any recommended Firms to approach. Any candidates suggested by CDB are not endorsed by the Bank and the procuring entity would have full responsibility for evaluating them.

Firms that are not shortlisted should be informed that they will not be invited to submit a Proposal and which Proposers have been shortlisted. CDB receives a considerable number of complaints from Consultants who do not receive this communication and so are unclear on the status of the procurement.

Where CQS and DS are Employed

Where CQS is utilised as the selection method there is no shortlisting process but rather the EOI evaluation will identify the most qualified and experienced Proposer, whom alone will be invited to submit a combined technical and financial Proposal. Otherwise, the requirements of Section 2 are the same.

Where DS is employed EOIs are not sought, as only one Proposer is being approached, but a combined technical and financial Proposal will be sought from the selected Consultant.



SECTION 3 – EVALUATING TECHNICAL PROPOSALS FROM FIRMS

Public Opening of Technical Proposals

With the possible exception of Quality Based Selection, for competitive processes that follow a shortlisting exercise Proposers are required to submit separate technical and financial Proposals at the same time. This is sometimes referred to as a “two (2) envelopes” approach, although increasingly with the use of electronic procurement (e-procurement) in practice it involves submissions to different electronic Proposal boxes or equivalents.

Once the deadline has passed for the submission of Proposals there will be a public opening of the technical Proposals. Holding a public opening of the technical Proposals is an essential element of transparency in public procurement, as it allows Proposers and the general public who attend to know which Consultants have submitted Proposals. The public opening of the technical Proposals will involve:

- (a) the names of the Proposers who submitted Proposals being read out;
- (b) the opening of the technical Proposals; and
- (c) the confirmation of the presence or absence of the accompanying financial Proposal.

All Proposals received after the deadline, shall be declared late, rejected and promptly returned unopened. Only technical Proposals that are opened at the public opening may be subject to the technical evaluation which follows.

Missteps made during the public opening of technical Proposals invariably directly affects the entire evaluation process. Some such missteps can prove fatal to the entire procurement process in that, once they have occurred, they cannot be corrected after the fact and will necessitate the cancellation of the procurement process. If there is insufficient project implementation time left until the Terminal Disbursement Date of the project, such a misstep may result in the loss of the contract from the project.

Such missteps may include:

- (a) failure to provide timely, accurate information to Proposers about the time and location of the public opening of technical Proposals, thus causing one or more Proposers to be prevented from exercising their right to attend the public opening;
- (b) failure to open a technical Proposal and read out a confirmation that it has been duly submitted and is accompanied by an unopened financial Proposal;
- (c) opening a technical Proposal before the deadline for the submission of Proposals has passed;
- (d) opening the financial Proposals at the technical Proposal opening stage;
- (e) opening a Proposal that was submitted late;
- (f) disclosing information about the contents of a technical Proposal that should not be disclosed during the public opening;



- (g) failure to disclose information about a Proposal that is required to be publicly disclosed at the public opening of technical Proposals;
- (h) discussing the merits or demerits of a technical Proposal at the public opening;
- (i) rejecting a Proposals at the public opening of technical Proposal, other than a late Proposal; or
- (j) incorrectly recording information about a Proposal, such as the names of the Proposers, in the Record of Public Opening of Technical Proposals.

Any one of these missteps may result in the cancellation of the entire procurement process and precipitate a new procurement process. In the case of a procurement process that is subject to prior review, CDB's no-objection shall be obtained before rejecting all Proposals and commencing a new procurement process^{3/}.

The Procedures require that the Record of the Public Opening of Technical Proposals shall be promptly sent to all Proposers who submitted a Proposal by the Proposal submission deadline and, where the procurement process is subject to prior review, to CDB^{4/}.

Where the purchaser uses an e-procurement system to conduct the procurement process, including for the submission and opening of Proposals, it shall provide for the use of such e-procurement system in the RFP and shall ensure that CDB is satisfied with the adequacy of the system, including *inter alia* its accessibility, security and integrity, confidentiality, and audit trail features^{5/}. An e-procurement system used in the procurement of CDB-financed contracts shall maintain the integrity, confidentiality and authenticity of Proposals submitted and shall use an electronic signature system or equivalent to keep Proposers bound to their offers.

See Annex I for a Sample Record of Public Opening for Technical Proposals.

General Principles Guiding the Technical Evaluation

Following the public opening of the technical Proposals the evaluation committee shall commence the technical evaluation. The team should consist of at least three (3) individuals who have the appropriate expertise, being mindful of the aforementioned potential challenge of information asymmetry. If the procuring entity lacks suitable expertise "in-house" if may be necessary to seek external experts to sit on committee and the executing agency can confirm with CDB whether any costs related to procuring such expertise would be considered as eligible expenditure under the project. Before commencing the evaluation all the members of the committee should sign declarations that they are not subject to any conflicts of interest, and should any be identified, they must immediately recuse themselves from the process.

It is important that:

- (a) the technical Proposals are only made available to the evaluation committee members and care should be taken that when they are not conducting the evaluation that the technical Proposals cannot be accessed by parties not involved in the evaluation;
- (b) the financial Proposals are suitably secured and not opened until the public opening of the financial Proposals. In the case of physical submissions, the financial Proposals should be provided to an independent entity outside of the team(s) responsible for the

^{3/} See the Procedures, paragraph 6.88.

^{4/} See the Procedures, paragraph 6.68.

^{5/} See the Procedures, paragraph 6.05.



procurement and the subsequent contract management, such as an internal audit function. Electronic submissions should remain secured and unopened; and

- (c) all information concerning the evaluation process remains confidential and that communications with the Proposers are limited to the formal requests for clarification and negotiations processes permitted until the notification of intention to award a contract and/or publication of the award of a contract notice or the termination of the procurement process. This is an essential requirement in fulfilling the principles of equality, fairness and transparency, as defined in CDB's core procurement principles.

Technical Evaluation Stages

(1) Preliminary Evaluation

During the preliminary evaluation of the technical Proposals, the following steps shall be conducted in the order listed below.

Verification

At the stage of verification, the following actions should be taken, and relevant aspects of the Proposal should be checked for correctness and completeness.

- (a) The Technical Proposal Submission Form (Form TECH-1) should be signed by an authorised signatory of the Proposer to bind them to their technical Proposal and the signatory should also initial all the pages of the Proposal. A Power of Attorney confirming the authorised signatory, if required, should be provided as part of the technical Proposal. An unsigned or improperly signed Technical Proposal Submission Form is invariably a major deviation as it does not bind the Proposer to the technical Proposal. Therefore, it requires the rejection of the Proposal.
- (b) If the Proposer is a JV, the Technical Proposal Submission Form shall be in the name of the JV (that is, all the parties to the JV) or, if the lead partner in the JV has signed the Proposal on behalf of the JV, that the Proposal includes acceptable documentation evidencing that the junior partners of the JV have authorised the lead partner to sign the Technical Proposal Submission Form on their behalf, binding them to the technical Proposal.
- (c) In the case of a Proposal submitted by a JV, the Joint Venture Agreement (JVA) or letter of intent to enter into a JVA, if awarded the contract, between the parties to the JV should be submitted as part of the technical Proposal.
- (d) The Proposal should comprise of all required forms and supporting documents, in accordance with the Documents Comprising the Proposal listed in the Instructions to Consultants section of the RFP. It is important to check that the CVs for the Key Experts have been signed by the key experts in question, confirming they are available to undertake the assignment if the Proposer is awarded a contract. There have been cases where Proposers have included highly qualified experts to obtain a better technical score but without obtaining the key expert's approval. This is considered a form of fraud by CDB and could potentially lead to sanctions against the Proposer. The RFP may also have page limits for some sections of the technical Proposal and if these are exceeded these procuring entities should not be evaluate beyond the stated maximum length.



- (e) The Proposal should be valid for the period of time required in the RFP. A technical Proposal with a validity which is shorter than the minimum period of time required by the RFP, limits the procuring entity's rights in the conduct of the procurement process. Also, acceptance of a Proposal with a short validity would unfairly disadvantage other Proposers who have submitted Proposals which offer the correct period of validity.

Eligibility

The procuring entity should check that the Proposers:

- (a) are those who were invited to submit Proposals as only the shortlisted Proposers are eligible to submit Proposals; and
- (b) continue to comply with the country eligibility and integrity and conflict of interest requirements that were assessed at the EOI stage, but which also form part of the eligibility requirements in the RFP.

A technical Proposal that is submitted by an ineligible Proposer shall be rejected.

Completeness of Bid

Proposers shall submit all the required forms and documentation listed in the Instructions to Consultants and Section 3 of the RFP, suitably completed. The content will vary depending on whether a full or simplified technical Proposal is requested. A failure to include key forms or information will normally result in the technical Proposal being evaluated as non-responsive and rejected. It should be noted that there should be no financial information included within the technical Proposal and its inclusion shall result in the rejection of the Proposal.

Substantial Responsiveness

Technical Proposals must be substantively responsive to the requirements of the RFP and the terms of reference (TOR) or they shall be rejected. Few Proposals are perfect in every detail; most have imperfections, errors, omissions or other forms of deviations from the requirements of the RFP and the TOR, and such deficiencies generally are taken into account in the scoring of the technical Proposals in the next phase of the technical evaluation process but some may be material such as:

- (a) providing a methodology and approach that fundamentally fails to respond to the TOR or repeats the contents of the TOR with little relevant additionality;
- (b) refusing to assume responsibilities or liabilities assigned to the Consultant under the TOR or form of contract in the RFP;
- (c) not ceding the ownership of intellectual property developed under the contract to the Client as required by the RFP; or
- (d) refusing to accept critical contractual provisions such as those related to the applicable law, taxes and duties, and dispute resolution procedures.

(2) Detailed Technical Evaluation

Technical Proposals that pass the preliminary evaluation are subjected to a detailed technical evaluation, where scores are allocated against the criteria detailed in Table 1 below to total one hundred (100) points. It should be noted that some of the criteria listed in the table may not always



be used, especially criteria 4 and 5, as we shall examine shortly, and that where a simplified technical Proposal is required in the RFP only criteria 2 and 3 would normally be evaluated.

The below criteria maybe further broken down into sub-criteria with, for example:

- (a) criteria 2 often broken down into sub-criteria examining the methodology and workplan and another the organisation and staffing of the overall proposed team; and
- (b) criteria 3 broken down into sub-criteria evaluating the qualifications, adequacy for the assignment and regional experience of each key expert.

Further guidance can be found in the RFP template. It is, however, advised not to have too many sub-criteria or the exercise can become overly complicated and “mechanical.” Importantly evaluators will still need to invoke informed professional judgement in their scoring.

TABLE 1: OVERVIEW OF TECHNICAL EVALUATION CRITERIA

Number	Technical Evaluation Criteria	Points Range
1.	Specific experience relevant to the assignment	0 - 10
2.	Methodology and work plan	20 – 50
3.	Relevant experience and qualification of key experts	30 – 60
4.	Transfer of knowledge	0 – 10
5.	Participation by nationals among proposed Key Experts	0 – 10

Given the challenges in evaluating Consulting Services detailed in Section 1 of this GN, it is recommended that before the technical evaluation process commences the evaluation committee prepare a scoring guide to provide for a more uniform approach between evaluators, which in turn would support the CDB’s core procurement principles of equality and fairness and transparency. The scoring guide can be attached to the technical evaluation report (TER) and help justify the approach taken and the scores assigned. Against each criteria and sub-criteria the scoring can be broken into bands for a “poor”, “satisfactory”, “good” or “very good” response or equivalent. The evaluators will still need to exercise judgement as to how to score the criteria or sub-criteria within each band. Scoring guides will need to be prepared to reflect each specific assignment and this will take some time but an upfront investment in developing a guide should result in a better evaluation outcome. Annex 2 provides an example of such a scoring guide.

It is recommended that for each criteria or sub-criteria the evaluators, referring to the scoring guide, provide a score as a percentage i.e. out of hundred which will then be multiplied by the available points for that criteria or sub-criteria to provide a score. For example, for a particular assignment the specific experience criteria may have a maximum of 10 points assigned to it and if a technical Proposal was evaluated, in line with the scoring guide, as being satisfactory and awarded seventy (70%) percent this would result in a score of 7 (70% x 10 points). CDB has developed a simple [technical evaluation scoresheet](#), which allows evaluators to assign the points assigned to each criteria and sub-criteria and then enter the percentage⁶ score for each, with the tool automatically calculating the actual technical score for each criteria and sub-criteria and the total technical score for each Proposer.

⁶ Expect in the case of criteria 5 where months for the key experts are inserted.



The below gives more information on each of the technical evaluation criteria:

- (a) Specific experience relevant to the assignment: as Proposers are shortlisted based on their general experience this experience related criteria is capped at ten (10) points. This criteria allows the Proposer to demonstrate their specific experience for the assignment in question using the templates for recording details of previous assignments in Form TECH-2 of the RFP. The RFP will include the timeframe in which relevant experience will be considered for evaluation, for example assignments in the last five (5) years, and it should be noted that assignments included by the Proposer need to be fully completed to be evaluated. As with EOIs, the evaluators should only evaluate the experience of the Proposer(s), not sub-consultants, and carefully scrutinise the experience claimed, being prepared to check the experience claimed and to raise any concerns with CDB.
- (b) Methodology and Work Plan: this generally represents a significant proportion of the points, given that a credible methodology and approach is key to the success of the assignment. The evaluators will want to ensure that:
- (i) the Proposers fully understand and respond to the requirements set out in the TOR and have a creditable approach to undertaking the assignment. As noted previously, some methodologies may largely repeat the content of the TOR which suggests a limited understanding of the assignment and will result in a low score. Equally signs that large sections of the methodology were copied from methodologies used in other technical Proposals and thus are not tailored to the assignment in question will also likely lead to a lower score. The efficiency and flexibility of the approach is likely to be carefully examined, given its importance to a successful outcome. It may be that the scoring guide specifically rewards methodologies that provide for greater efficiencies and innovation and in this regard the Proposers suggestions on the TOR in Form TECH-3 of the RFP should be carefully considered. If the required services have very different sub-components or phases, there may be a need to have sub-criteria that assess the specific methodology and approach for each key component or phase.
 - (ii) the work schedule, as detailed in Form TECH-5 of the RFP, is clear and consistent with the wider methodology, and shows the activities will be performed and deliverables provided in a logical and timely fashion.
 - (iii) the overall staffing and organisation arrangements are robust. This does not evaluate the qualifications and experience of the individual key experts but rather considers the overall structure, balance, expertise and deployment of the entire team. This part of the evaluation is informed in part by the submission of the completed Form TECH-6 in the RFP. This is particularly important for larger and more complex team structures. The roles and responsibilities of the team members and the timing of their inputs should be clear and ideally there will be a robust quality management system in place and appropriate technical oversight and “backstopping.” Particularly for assignments involving construction supervision, the TOR should require the consultant to submit a Code of Conduct for its team working on the project site(s) and demonstrate suitable experience of managing environmental, social and health and safety risks and these areas should be evaluated accordingly. Some Consultants tend to “body shop” where they recruit key experts who do not have a history of



working together or with the Proposer and then deploy them to perform an assignment with minimal oversight and if this is suggested by the Proposal the Proposer would generally be marked down.

- (c) Relevant experience and qualifications of key experts: this is the other criteria which represents a significant proportion of the total points as the capabilities and suitability of the key experts directly influences the success of the assignment. The key experts will be evaluated against the CVs submitted, based on the template provided in Form Tech-6 of the RFP. The key experts are generally evaluated against the sub-criteria of (i) general qualifications: this generally considers professional or technical qualifications but there may be a need to consider the trade-off between qualifications and practical experience in the scoring guide (ii) adequacy for the assignment: this considers how suitable the expert is for the role. Have they undertaken similar assignments or activities to those required under recent assignments? This is particularly important if evaluating a candidate for a Team Leader/Project Manager role, and: (iii) experience in the region and language: this sub-criteria is not always applied and depends on the specifics of the assignment in question. In the Caribbean context, to avoid marking down otherwise suitable key experts, it is sometimes tweaked to reward those with experience of working with small island developing states more widely, but it is recognised that language can be an important factor, especially for assignments involving Haiti and Suriname.
- (d) Transfer of Knowledge: this criteria only applies to assignments which seek to transfer knowledge to the Recipient, thus building their capacity and making the outcomes of the assignment more sustainable. It is usually capped at ten (10) points and will, amongst other areas, consider the relevance, methodology and specific workplan for this component. The scoring guide will need to be tailored based on the specifics of the transfer of knowledge requirements detailed in the TOR.
- (e) Participation by nationals among proposed Key Experts: this is an optional criteria that seeks to build consulting capacity in the country of the Recipient. It is capped at ten (10) points and is evaluated simply by calculating the participation of nationals among key experts (whether presented by foreign or national Firms) and calculated as the ratio of key national experts' time (in-person months), to the total number of key experts' time (in-person months), in the Proposal. This approach avoids the Proposer including a "token" national who provides very limited inputs to gain points.

Requests for Clarification

Proposers shall not be permitted to amend their technical Proposals after the deadline for submission and the evaluation shall only be conducted based on the information in the technical Proposal. Requests for clarification from Proposers shall be limited to routine inquiries that shall be undertaken in writing and in the case of prior review requires CDB's no objection.

Scoring and Preparation of TER

The RFP will have a minimum technical score that the Proposer must achieve under the technical evaluation to proceed to the financial evaluation. It is typically eighty (80) points out of hundred (100) but may be reduced if quality is less of a priority e.g., for standard financial assessments but would not normally be less than seventy (70) points.

The individual evaluators will each score the technical Proposals independently and their individual score sheets will be annexed to the TER. The TER will record the average score for



each technical Proposal with supporting text explaining the strengths and weaknesses of each Proposal. If there are large variances in the scoring against the criteria the chairperson of the committee may need to convene a meeting to ensure everyone is interpreting the scoring guide in the same manner. There may be legitimate explanations as to why different evaluators have significantly different scores but these will need to be documented in the TER.

Where the contract is subject to prior review the TER must be submitted to CDB and no objection received before the procuring entity proceeds to open the financial Proposals.

Communication with Proposers Who Fail to Achieve the Minimum Technical Score

Proposers that fail to achieve the minimum technical score will not have their financial Proposals opened and will be informed of their technical score, as a total and against the individual criteria and sub-criteria stated in the RFP, prior to the opening of the financial Proposals of those Proposers who achieved the minimum technical score. In a similar manner to Proposers not being informed that they have not been shortlisted, CDB receives a considerable number of complaints from Proposers who do not receive this information. It is important that they are informed so they can release key experts and resources that they have allocated to their Proposal. The financial Proposals of Proposers who fail to achieve the minimum technical score shall be returned unopened after the conclusion of the procurement process.

Where CQS and DS are Employed

Where CQS and DS are the selection methods employed an edited form of CDB's RFP is generally used with the same key forms to request a combined technical and financial Proposal from the sole Proposer. The Proposal is evaluated to ensure that it is substantively responsive and if so, the Proposer is invited for negotiations.



SECTION 4 – EVALUATING FINANCIAL PROPOSALS FROM FIRMS

Public Opening of Financial Proposals

Proposers whose technical Proposals achieve the minimum technical score shall be invited to the public opening of the financial Proposals. In the case of Quality Based Selection only the Proposer with the highest scoring technical Proposal shall be invited to submit a financial Proposal and/or have their financial Proposal opened, as set out in Section 5.

Sufficient time should be allowed to facilitate the attendance of Proposers at the public opening. The public opening of financial Proposals provides transparency to the procurement process in the same way as the public opening of technical Proposals does. The public opening of the financial Proposals will involve:

- (a) the technical score, as a total and against each criteria, of the remaining Proposers being readout;
- (b) the opening of the financial Proposals; and
- (c) the confirmation of the total price of each financial Proposal as recorded in the Financial Proposal Submission Form (Form FIN-1).

Only financial Proposals that are opened at the public opening may be subject to the financial evaluation which follows, and care should be taken to avoid the relevant potential missteps detailed in Section 3.

The Procedures require that the Record of the Public Opening of Financial Proposals shall be promptly sent to all Proposers whose technical Proposals achieved the minimum technical score and, where the procurement process is subject to prior review, also to CDB. See Annex I for a Sample Record for Public Openings of Financial Proposals.

As with the technical opening, the use of an e-procurement system to conduct the public opening of financial Proposals shall be approved by CDB. The general considerations detailed in Section 3 related to the need to ensure confidentiality during the evaluation process and to limit communications with the Proposers also apply to the financial evaluation.

Financial Evaluation Stages

(1) Preliminary Evaluation:

During the preliminary evaluation of the financial Proposals, the following steps shall be conducted in the order listed below.

Verification

At the stage of verification, the following actions should be taken, and relevant aspects of the Proposal should be checked for correctness and completeness:

- (a) The Financial Proposal Submission Form (Form FIN-1) should be signed by an authorised signatory of the Proposer to bind the Proposer to their financial Proposal, and they should have initialed all the pages of the Proposal. A Power of Attorney confirming the authorised signatory, if required, should be provided as part of the



financial Proposal. An unsigned or improperly signed Financial Proposal Submission Form is invariably a major deviation as it does not bind the Proposer to the financial Proposal. Therefore, it requires the rejection of the Proposal.

- (b) If the Proposer is a JV, the Financial Proposal Submission Form shall be in the name of the JV (that is, all the parties to the JV) or, if the lead partner in the JV has signed the Proposal on behalf of the JV, that the Proposal includes acceptable documentation evidencing that the junior partners of the JV have authorised the lead partner to sign the Financial Proposal Submission Form on their behalf, binding them to the financial Proposal.
- (c) The financial Proposal shall comprise of all required forms and supporting documents, in accordance with the Documents Comprising the Proposal of the Instructions to Consultants section of the RFP.
- (d) The financial Proposal should be valid for the period of time required in the RFP as was the case with the technical proposal.

Eligibility

The procuring entity should check that the Proposers whose financial Proposals are being evaluated comply with the country eligibility and integrity and conflict of interest requirements that were assessed under the technical evaluation.

Completeness of Proposal

Proposers shall submit all the required forms and documentation listed in the Instructions to Consultants and Section 4 of the RFP, duly completed. A failure to include key forms or information will normally result in the financial Proposal being evaluated as non-responsive and rejected.

(2) Detailed Financial Evaluation

Financial Proposals that pass the aforementioned preliminary evaluation are subjected to a detailed financial evaluation. Although it is generally less of an issue with financial Proposals, the evaluation committee should ensure the Proposals are substantively responsive. For example, for a lump-sum fixed priced contract if the financial Proposal includes a condition that the financial Proposal is contingent on the acceptance of adjustable pricing under any resulting contract this would not be acceptable, and the Proposal would not further be evaluated.

It should be noted that in order to provide for a “level playing field” for Proposers from different tax jurisdictions local identifiable indirect taxes do not form part of the financial evaluation but are referenced by the Proposer in their financial Proposal separately from their financial offer. These local taxes cannot be financed by CDB, but the Recipient will need to finance them under the resulting contract either by exempting them (if this is permitted), adding them to the contract price or arranging for the Consultant to pay them and to subsequently seek reimbursement from the Recipient. Such details will be finalised at the contract negotiation stage.

The financial evaluation will:

- (a) Convert all prices into to a single currency using the official exchange rate and date for the exchange rate specified in the RFP for the purposes of evaluation. Proposers can price their services singly or in a combination of up to three (3) fully convertible foreign currencies and there may be a requirement for local costs in the procuring entity’s



country to be priced in local currency. CDB's evaluation report template has a table for this conversion process to be recorded.

- (b) Make necessary corrections and adjustments. This does not apply for assignments subject to a lump-sum form of contract where the price in the Financial Proposal Submission Form shall be considered final. However, for time-based forms of contracts:
 - (i) arithmetical errors shall be corrected. Where there are discrepancies between (i) a partial amount (sub-total) and the total amount, or (ii) between the amount derived by multiplication of unit price with quantity and the total price, or (iii) between words and figures, the former will prevail; and
 - (ii) adjustments shall be made where there are discrepancies between the technical and financial Proposals in indicating quantities of input. In such instances the technical Proposal prevails, and the evaluation committee shall correct the quantification indicated in the Financial Proposal so as to make it consistent with that indicated in the Technical Proposal, apply the relevant unit price included in the financial Proposal to the corrected quantity, and correct the total Proposal cost.

The relevant table in CDB evaluation report can be utilised to record any necessary corrections and adjustments.

It should be noted that there are no provisions in the Procedures or RFP to reject abnormally low financial Proposals and this is generally a low risk given that the selection decision is primarily driven by quality. Where this is an issue many such Consultants aggressively employ "body shopping", reduced technical oversight and more limited technical offerings which should receive lower scores at the technical Proposal stage. Should the concern arise at the financial Proposal stage requests for clarification may need to be sought from the Proposer in question to obtain further information on their pricing and a suitable approach agreed for negotiations if the Proposer is recommended to proceed to this stage. In the case of prior review any such concerns should be highlighted in the evaluation report and discussed with CDB.

The above-mentioned financial evaluation process will provide the total evaluated price for each of the financial Proposals received.



SECTION 5 – FINALISATION OF TECHNICAL AND FINANCIAL EVALUATION FOR FIRMS

The process to conclude the evaluation and determine the Proposer to be invited to negotiations or awarded a contract depends on which selection method is used. For further details on which selection method is appropriate for a particular assignment please refer to Section 8 of the Procedures. The details of how the evaluation process is conducted for each competitive selection method utilising shortlisting is as follows:

Quality and Cost-Based Selection (QCBS): this selection method evaluates both the quality offered by the technical Proposal and the cost offered by the financial Proposal but given that the primary driver in the selection decision is the quality of the Consulting Services it weights the two factors heavily in favour of the quality, usually on an 80:20 basis but this may be adjusted slightly depending on the specifics of the assignment in question. The weighting for quality against cost would not be expected to less than 70:30 to retain quality as the primary driver and to exceed 90:10, as otherwise cost has a negligible influence on the evaluation outcome and in such scenarios Quality-Based Selection is more likely to be the appropriate selection method.

The following example demonstrates the use of QCBS in practice:

There are four (4) Proposers whose technical and financial Proposals are recorded in Table 2. The weighting between quality and cost is 80:20 and minimum technical score is 80.

TABLE 2: QCBS EXAMPLE - TECHNICAL SCORES AND PRICES

Proposer	Total Technical Score	Total Evaluated Price (USD)
Consultant A	85	850,000
Consultant B	76	Not applicable
Consultant C	88	950,000
Consultant D	92	1,350,000

Consultant B did not meet the minimum technical score so did not have their financial Proposal opened.

The financial Proposals need to be converted into scores out of hundred (100). In accordance with the requirements of the RFP, the lowest priced financial Proposal is awarded a hundred points (100) i.e., the maximum points under the financial evaluation and the others have a score calculated based on the formula of the lowest price divided by the price under consideration, multiplied by one hundred (100). As noted above Consultant B is not considered as they did not achieve the minimum technical score. The calculation of the score for the other Proposers is set out in Table 3 below.

TABLE 3: QCBS EXAMPLE – ESTABLISHING THE FINANCIAL SCORES

Proposer	Price (USD)	Calculation	Financial Score
Consultant A	850,000	As lowest price awarded maximum points	100.00
Consultant C	950,000	$(850,000/950,000)*100$	89.47
Consultant D	1,350,000	$(850,000/1,350,000)*100$	62.96



Now that we have both technical and financial scores for each Proposer that achieved the minimum technical score, we can apply the weighting of 80% to each technical score and 20% to each financial score to establish a final technical and financial score for each Proposer and add these two weighted scores together to provide a final combined score as set out in Table 4 below.

TABLE 4: QCBS EXAMPLE: APPLYING WEIGHTING TO THE TECHNICAL AND FINANCIAL PROPOSAL SCORES AND CALCULATING THE TOTAL COMBINED SCORE FOR EACH PROPOSER

Proposer	Technical Score	Calculation to Apply Weighting of 80%	Final Technical Score (A)	Financial Score	Calculation to Apply Weighting of 20%	Final Financial Score (B)	Total Combined Score (A+B)
Consultant A	85	85*80%	68.00	100.00	100.00*20%	20.00	88.00
Consultant C	88	88*80%	70.40	89.47	89.47*20%	17.89	88.29
Consultant D	92	92*80%	73.60	62.96	62.96*20%	12.59	86.19

As shown in Table 4, Consultant C is ultimately the first ranked Consultant who will be invited to negotiations. This is despite not having the highest technical score or the lowest price.

The aforementioned QCBS example is setup in a [spreadsheet on CDB's website](#) which can be adjusted and used for all such evaluations, as per the instructions, to calculate the financial score based on the total prices in the financial Proposals, the weighted technical and financial scores and the total combined score.

Quality-Based Selection (QBS): this selection method makes the initial selection decision as to whom will be invited to submit a financial Proposal based on the technical Proposals. As previously mentioned, only the Proposer with the higher technical score will have their financial Proposal opened and then technical and financial negotiations shall be undertaken with that Proposer.

If we consider the technical evaluation of our previous example only Consultant D would have their financial Proposal opened and be invited to negotiations.

Fixed-Budget Selection (FBS): under this selection method the RFP will state the fixed budget that is available for the assignment. The technical Proposals shall be evaluated in accordance with QCBS and QBS and the financial Proposals of those Proposers who achieve the minimum technical score opened. Then any financial Proposals that exceed the fixed budget indicated in the RFP shall be rejected and of the remaining Proposers the one with the highest technical score shall be invited to negotiate a contract.

If we consider the example in Table 5 below, with a minimum technical score of 75 and a fixed budget stated in the RFP as USD650,000, Consultant C would be rejected for exceeding the fixed budget. The consultant invited to negotiations would be Consultant D as they have the highest technical score and have not exceeded the fixed budget.

**TABLE 5: FBS EXAMPLE**

Proposer	Total Technical Score	Total Evaluated Price (USD)
Consultant A	75	650,000
Consultant B	80	650,000
Consultant C	95	660,000
Consultant D	91	650,000
Consultant E	78	650,000
Consultant F	90	640,000

Least-Cost Selection (LCS): under this selection method technical Proposals shall be evaluated in accordance with the previous selection methods and the financial Proposals of those Proposers who achieve the minimum technical score opened. Then the Proposer with the lowest price shall be awarded a contract without negotiations.

If we consider the example in Table 6 below, where the minimum technical score is 75, Consultant E would be awarded the contract, despite having the lowest technical score, they achieved the minimum technical score and offered the lowest price.

TABLE 6: LCS EXAMPLE

Proposer	Total Technical Score	Total Evaluated Price (USD)
Consultant A	77	205,000
Consultant B	92	190,000
Consultant C	88	300,000
Consultant D	83	250,000
Consultant E	75	182,000

CDB's evaluation template should be used to capture the financial evaluation and the finalisation of the technical and financial evaluation process, taking into account the above-mentioned specifics of the selection method utilised. Where the contract is subject to prior review the evaluation report must be submitted to CDB and no objection received before the procuring entity proceeds to commence negotiations or award a contract.

Standstill Period

Procuring entities may take up the option of a standstill period in accordance with Paragraphs 6.90-6.94 of the Procedures. If this option is taken up the procuring entity will issue a Notice of Intention to Award a Contract to the Proposers after the completion of the evaluation process and receipt of any required no objection from CDB.



SECTION 6 – EVALUATING EXPRESSIONS OF INTEREST FROM INDIVIDUAL CONSULTANTS

Approach to Individual Consultant Evaluation

Individual Consultants are evaluated to select the best candidate to negotiate a contract with, on the basis of their qualifications and experience, rather than other factors, including cost. This reflects the importance of seeking high quality services from individual Consultants, who often perform critical inputs on CDB financed projects, including in project implementation units, that directly impact the success and timeliness of project implementation.

Opportunities for Individual Consultants are more likely to be advertised for higher-value assignments or where the procuring entity does not have a suitable pool of qualified Consultants to approach. If an opportunity is advertised CDB's standard REOI template for individual Consultants should be used. As with REOIs for Firms, the evaluation criteria will be stated in the REOI but, unlike for Firms, these will be entirely focused on the individual's qualifications and experience. Whether the procuring entity advertises opportunities or directly approaches individuals EOIs are sought, which essentially take the form of a cover letter and CV tailored to the assignment in question, for evaluation.

Evaluation Approach

The evaluation process conforms very closely with the evaluation of EOIs from firms and again there is no public opening of EOIs, and late submissions may be considered so long as the evaluation process has not been completed. The evaluation committee formed should prepare a scoring guide to inform the EOI evaluation process.

It is important to ensure before commencing the evaluation process that the EOIs are from individuals that are permitted to participate in the process based on their status. In particular:

- (a) individual consultants may submit EOIs under a corporate registration for a sole proprietorship as they are still operating as an individual;
- (b) individual consultants submitted through a Firm, other than in the scenario mentioned above, maybe acceptable given a lack of suitable Individual Consultants. However, the evaluation would not consider the experience or expertise of the Firm, only that of the nominated individual. It should also be noted that a Firm putting forward an individual for a role should include confirmation in the EOI that the individual is available and willing to perform the role if selected and they will not be permitted to substitute the individual nominated for another candidate; and
- (c) groups of individual consultants should not be considered as the opportunity is for an individual. Sometimes an Individual Consultant might mention in their EOI that they intend to sub-contract some research or administrative activities to an assistant, and this is permissible as it does not remove their prime responsibility for providing the services but again any contract signed should only be with the individual in question.

Having established that the status of the Consultants allows them to participate, the EOIs will be evaluated against some pass/fail criteria and others that include scoring against particular criteria or sub-criteria. For example, individuals will need to conform with core pass/fail eligibility requirements related to:

- (i) the country eligibility requirements stated in the REOI; and



- (ii) the integrity requirements and conflict of interest provisions that apply under CDB's Procurement Framework, which are referenced in the REOI.

There may be other pass/fail requirements related to a minimum level/type of qualifications and quantum of experience but then these will typically be scoring to reflect the extent of the qualifications and experience. There may need to be some thought about the tradeoff between qualifications and experience, for example how is a Master's Degree obtained thirty (30) years ago rated against twenty (20) years of highly relevant experience, in how the scoring is undertaken?

As with EOIs from Firms, it is recommended that a scoring guide is developed to support the evaluation committee in its scoring and that CDB's evaluation template for EOIs for individuals is used.

As with EOIs from Firms it is important to note that:

- (a) the evaluation must be limited to the information that forms part of the EOIs and the evaluation committee should not consider what they know or think they know about a particular individual and the services they have provided under other contracts; and
- (b) procuring entities should be watchful in ensuring that the experience detailed in an EOI is rightfully an individual's to claim. If there are any concerns about the legitimacy of the claimed experience the procuring entity should check with clients for the previous experience listed in the EOI and report any concerns to CDB.

CDB requires that at least three (3) qualified candidates are evaluated. Where the procuring entity is unable to identify three (3) qualified individuals to evaluate they may directly approach additional candidates to seek EOIs or ask CDB for suggestions. Any candidates suggested by CDB are not endorsed by the Bank and the procuring entity would have full responsibility for evaluating them.

The procuring entity shall prepare a concise evaluation report, using the aforementioned CDB template, and submit it to CDB for no objection where prior review applies.

The top ranked individual shall not be required to submit a Proposal but to inform negotiations it is normal practice for them to share with the procuring entity details of their proposed approach, a workplan and a breakdown of the fees and reimbursable costs requested.

It should be noted that a standstill period is not used after evaluating Individual Consultants.



ANNEX I: SAMPLE RECORDS FOR PUBLIC OPENINGS OF TECHNICAL AND FINANCIAL PROPOSALS

RECORD OF PUBLIC OPENING OF TECHNICAL PROPOSALS^{1/}

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 this record. 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^{2/}:

Name of Proposer ^{3/} (A)	Modifications or Withdrawal ^{4/} Yes/No (B)	Financial Proposal – Received ^{5/} ? Yes/No (C)	Media of Proposal – per the RFP ^{6/} Yes/No (D)	Signature of Proposer’s Representative ^{7/}
1.				
2.				
3.				

Name, Designation and Signature^{8/}

Name, Designation and Signature

Name, Designation and Signature

Name, Designation and Signature

Name, Designation and Signature

Name, Designation and Signature

^{1/} At the opening of the Technical Proposal, the information 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 record by the Recipient and read out from the Proposals, as required.

^{2/} This information should be the same as specified in the Instruction to Consultants (ITC) section of the RFP documents.

^{3/} Where a Proposer is a joint venture, the names of all the parties to the joint venture should be read out and recorded.

^{4/} These must be received by the Recipient prior to the Proposal submission deadline to be read out at the 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.

^{5/} A physical verification of receipt of the Financial Proposals is required but not the opening. If QBS is the selection method, 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.

^{6/} 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. Where appropriate, 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.

^{7/} A copy of the completed record, 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, and where subject to prior review also to CDB.

^{8/} All members of the Technical Proposal Opening Committee to sign.

**Attendance Sheet for Public Opening of Technical Proposals**

Name and Country of Registration of Proposer	Name of Representative (Printed)	Designation	Signature of Representative of Proposer



RECORD OF PUBLIC OPENING OF FINANCIAL PROPOSALS

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 this record.

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^{1/}:

Name of Proposer ^{2/}	Total Technical Scores ^{3/}	Total Price and currencies	Media of Proposal – per the RFP ^{4/} Yes/No	Signature of Proposer's Representative ^{5/}
(A)	(B)	(C)	(D)	
1.				
2.				
3.				

The following Financial Proposals were modified, or substitutes offered: (*Name(s) of Proposer(s)*)^{6/}

Name, Designation and Signature^{7/}

Name, Designation and Signature

Name, Designation and Signature

^{1/} This information should be the same as specified in the Instruction to Consultants (ITC) section of the RFP documents.

^{2/} Where a Proposer is a joint venture, the names of all the parties to the joint venture should be read out and recorded.

^{3/} A separate sheet should be attached recording the read-out scores against RFP assigned values for the main criteria/sub-criteria

^{4/} 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. Where appropriate, 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.

^{5/} A copy of the completed record, 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, and where prior applies to CDB.

^{6/} These must be received by the Recipient prior to the 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.

^{7/} All members of the Financial Proposals Opening Committee to sign.

**Attendance Sheet for Public Opening of Financial Proposals**

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



ANNEX II: SAMPLE SCORING GUIDE

Sample scoring guide for a consultancy to prepare designs, bidding documents and costings for costal defense infrastructure. Such guides will need to be prepared specifically for each procurement.

Criteria	Rating (%)	Grade	Definition	Comment
1. Specific Experience	>90-100	Very Good	The Proposer has outstanding experience of designing marine infrastructure, including similar costal defenses (more than 10 similar projects in the last 10 years) with a significant number in developing countries. The Proposer demonstrates that they integrate climate change, natural disaster and gender considerations into their designs as a standard operating procedure. They have previously demonstrated world-class approaches and methodologies for such assignments. The Consultants have extensive experience of working in the Caribbean (more than 10 projects in the last 10 years).	Since all Proposers are shortlisted based largely on experience it is anticipated they should all be satisfactory or better.
	>80-90	Good	The Proposer has significant experience of designing marine infrastructure, including similar costal defenses (6-10 similar projects in the last 10 years) with a significant number in developing countries. The Proposer has extensive experience of integrating climate change, natural disaster and gender considerations into their designs. They have previously demonstrated robust approaches and methodologies for such assignments. The Consultants have extensive experience of working in the Caribbean (>5 projects in the last 10 years).	
	>70-80	Satisfactory	The Proposer has relevant experience of designing marine infrastructure, including similar costal defenses (4> similar projects in the last 10 years) with some in developing countries. The Proposer has experience of integrating climate change, natural disaster and	



Criteria	Rating (%)	Grade	Definition	Comment
			gender considerations into their designs. They have previously demonstrated adequate approaches and methodologies for such assignments. The Consultants have experience of working in the Caribbean (>3 projects in the last 10 years).	
	≤70	Poor	The Proposer has some experience of designing marine infrastructure, including similar coastal defenses (<4 similar projects in the last 10 years) with a limited amount or none in developing countries. The Proposer has limited or no experience of integrating climate change, natural disaster and gender considerations into their designs. They have previously demonstrated inadequate or failed to reference the approaches and methodologies for such assignments. The Consultants have no or limited experience of working in the Caribbean in the last 10 years with <3 projects.	It should be noted that a very poor response may suggest a serious lack of specific experience and a non-responsive technical Proposal. This is true across criteria and particularly for criteria 2 and 3 given the points assigned to them.
2. (a) Methodology & Approach	>90-100	Very Good	In addition to the requirements listed under 'Good:' <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Important issues are approached in an innovative and efficient way, indicating that the Proposer has understood the main issues of the assignment; • The methodology proposes the use of state-of-the-art know-how and the adoption of advanced technologies; and • The Proposal details ways to improve the results and the quality of the assignment by using advanced approaches, methodologies, and knowledge; and standards/approaches to ensure high quality standards relevant to this assignment are provided. 	
	>80-90	Good	The proposed approach is discussed in detail, and the methodology is specifically tailored to the characteristics of the assignment. The	



Criteria	Rating (%)	Grade	Definition	Comment
			approach is coherent, with activities logically linked, and key milestones defined, including conceptual designs, detailed designs, final costings and draft bidding documents. The approach and methodology of Proposal are flexible enough to allow it to adapt to changes that may occur during execution of the services. There are some provisions to ensure quality standards and they are tailored to the specific characteristics of the assignment.	
	>70-80	Satisfactory	The approach to carrying out the different activities in the TOR is discussed generically in response to the objectives indicated. The approach is standard and not specifically tailored to all requirements of the assignment. Although the approach and methodology are suitable, they do not include a discussion on how to deal with critical characteristics of the assignment and with any contingency. There are provisions to ensure quality, but they are generic and do not reflect the specific features of the assignment.	
	≤70	Poor	Technical approach and/or the methodology are/is inappropriate or very poorly presented with relevant elements and points not coherent and poorly defined. There are unclear points indicating that important aspects of the scope of work are misunderstood. The technical approach does not respond to the objectives and requirements indicated in the TOR. The technical approach/methodology has no reference to how quality will be ensured under the review.	
2. (b) Workplan	Very Good	>90-100	In addition to criteria listed under 'Good': <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Decision points and sequence/timing of activities are very well defined, indicating optimal use of resources; • A specific explanation of the work plan and how it relates to proposed approach has been provided; and 	



Criteria	Rating (%)	Grade	Definition	Comment
			<ul style="list-style-type: none"> The work plan allows for flexibility to accommodate contingencies. 	
	Good	>80-90	All important activities, including preparing conceptual designs, detailed designs, final costings and draft bidding documents, are detailed in the schedule. The timings are appropriate and consistent with outputs. The Interrelations between activities are realistic and consistent with approach/methodology.	
	Satisfactory	>70-80	All key activities included in the schedule but they are not well detailed. There are minor inconsistencies with approach/methodology.	
	Poor	≤70	Activity schedule omits important tasks. The timing of activities/correlations are inconsistent with the approach/methodology and there is a lack of logic/clarity in sequencing.	
2. (c) Organisation and Staffing	Very Good	>90-100	In addition to criteria listed under 'Good': <ul style="list-style-type: none"> well integrated team (e.g., have worked together before) detailed explanation of Recipient's role and integration in the assignment is provided. 	
	Good	>80-90	In addition to the 'Satisfactory' criteria below: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> team well balanced (clear and detailed definition of roles and responsibilities, not too many short term and generalist experts). staff skills are well matched to project needs. 	
	Satisfactory	>70-80	Organisation chart is complete and detailed. Technical level and composition of staffing arrangements adequate. Staffing is consistent with timing and outputs.	



Criteria	Rating (%)	Grade	Definition			Comment
	Poor	≤ 70	Organisation chart is superficial, staffing plan is weak in important area. Staffing schedule is inconsistent timing of most important outputs. Lack of clarity in allocation tasks and responsibilities. Evidence of widespread “body shopping” and inadequate technical backstopping.			
3. (a) Key Expert 1: Project Manager/Civil Engineer	Very Good	>90-100	General Qualifications	Adequacy for Assignment	Experience in Region/Language	
			<ul style="list-style-type: none"> >15 years civil engineering experience (majority in public infrastructure such as coastal defenses, roads, bridges, etc.). > 10 years project management experience and leading infrastructure projects. Master’s degree in civil engineering and membership of 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> >15 years experience in similar role assigned on this project including preparing designs, costings and bidding documents for similar assignments. 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> >5 years experience in Caribbean countries. In depth experience of working with public sector institutions in the Region and with regional building codes/standards. 	



Criteria	Rating (%)	Grade	Definition			Comment
			professional institute or association. • Recognised Project management qualification.			
	Good	>80-90	• 11 - 15 years civil engineering experience (majority in public infrastructure such as coastal defenses, roads, bridges etc.). • 5-10 years project management experience and leading infrastructure projects. • Degree and further qualifications short of a	> 10 years experience in similar role assigned on this project including preparing designs, costings and bidding documents for similar assignments.	• >3-5 years experience in Caribbean countries. • Experience of working with public sector institutions in the region and with regional building codes/standards.	



Criteria	Rating (%)	Grade	Definition			Comment
			<p>Master's, such as a post-graduate diploma, in civil engineering membership of professional institute or association.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Recognised Project management qualification. 			
	Satisfactory	>70-80	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> 5-10 years civil engineering experience (some in public infrastructure such as coastal defenses, roads, bridges, etc.). 3-5 years project management experience and leading infrastructure projects. 	5-10 years experience in similar role assigned on this project including preparing designs, costings and bidding documents for similar assignments.	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> 2-3 years experience in Caribbean countries. Some experience of working with public sector institutions in the Region and with regional building codes/standards. 	



Criteria	Rating (%)	Grade	Definition		Comment	
			<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Degree in civil engineering membership of professional institute or association. Recognised Project management qualification. 			
	Poor	≤ 70	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <5 years civil engineering experience (some in public infrastructure such as coastal defenses, roads, bridges etc.). <3 years project management experience and leading infrastructure projects. Degree in civil engineering. 	<5 years' experience in similar role assigned on this project including preparing designs, costings and bidding documents for similar assignments.	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <2 years' experience in Caribbean countries. Limited or no experience of working with public sector institutions in the Region and with regional building codes/standards. 	



Criteria	Rating (%)	Grade	Definition			Comment
3. (b) Key Expert 2: Climate Change Specialist			General Qualifications	Adequacy for Assignment	Experience in Region/Language	
	Very Good	>90-100	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • >10 years experience in undertaking climate change risk and vulnerability assessments of built infrastructure and identification of relevant adaptation and resilient measures. • Master's degree or PhD in relevant discipline. • Recognised professional qualification and evidence of leadership in 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • >7 years experience in similar roles assigned on this project including in area of marine infrastructure. • In-depth experience of working on multilateral development bank (MDB) projects or equivalents. 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • >5 years experience in Caribbean countries. 	



Criteria	Rating (%)	Grade	Definition			Comment
			climate change field.			
	Good	>80-90	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> >7 years experience in undertaking climate change risk and vulnerability assessments of built infrastructure and identification of relevant adaptation and resilient measures. Master's degree in relevant discipline. Recognised professional qualification. 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> >5 years' experience in similar roles assigned on this project including in area of marine infrastructure. Good experience of working on MDB projects or equivalents. 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> >3 years' experience in Caribbean countries. 	
	Satisfactory	>70-80	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> >5 years' experience in undertaking 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> >3 years' experience in similar roles 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> >2 years' experience in 	



Criteria	Rating (%)	Grade	Definition			Comment
			<p>climate change risk and vulnerability assessments of built infrastructure and identification of relevant adaptation and resilient measures.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Master's degree in relevant discipline. • Recognised professional qualification. 	<p>assigned on this project including in area of marine infrastructure.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Some experience of working on MDB projects or equivalents. 	<p>Caribbean countries.</p>	
	Poor	≤70	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • <5 years experience in undertaking climate change risk and vulnerability assessments of built infrastructure and 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • <3 years experience in similar roles assigned on this project with limited or no experience in area of marine infrastructure. 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • <2 years or no experience in Caribbean countries. 	



Criteria	Rating (%)	Grade	Definition			Comment
			identification of relevant adaptation and resilient measures. <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Degree in relevant discipline. 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Limited or no experience of working on MDB projects or equivalents. 		
3. (c) Key Expert 3: Environmental Specialist			General Qualifications	Adequacy for Assignment	Experience in Region/Language	
	Very Good	>90-100	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> >15 years experience in undertaking environmental assessments for infrastructure projects and contributing to Environmental and Social Impact Assessments. Master's degree or PhD in 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> >8 years experience in similar roles assigned on this project including in area of marine infrastructure. In-depth experience working on multilateral development bank (MDB) projects or 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> >6 years experience in Caribbean countries. In-depth experience of working with public sector institutions in the region and with regional and national environmental standards and regulations. 	



Criteria	Rating (%)	Grade	Definition			Comment
			<p>relevant discipline.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Recognised professional qualification and evidence of leadership in environmental field. 	<p>equivalents and with associated policies, guidelines and requirements.</p>		
	Good	>80-90	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> >10 years experience in undertaking environmental assessments for infrastructure projects and contributing to Environmental and Social Impact Assessments. Master's degree in relevant discipline. Recognised professional qualification. 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> >6 years experience in similar roles assigned on this project including in area of marine infrastructure. Good experience working on MDB projects or equivalents and with associated policies, guidelines and requirements. 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> >4 years experience in Caribbean countries. Good experience of working with public sector institutions in the Region and with regional and national environmental standards and regulations. 	



Criteria	Rating (%)	Grade	Definition			Comment
	Satisfactory	>70-80	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • 5-7 years experience in undertaking environmental assessments for infrastructure projects and contributing to Environmental and Social Impact Assessments. • Master's degree in relevant discipline. • Recognised professional qualification. 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • 4-6 years experience in similar roles assigned on this project including in area of marine infrastructure. • Relevant experience working on MDB projects or equivalents and with associated policies, guidelines and requirements. 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • 2-4 years experience in Caribbean countries. • Some experience of working with public sector institutions in the region and with regional and national environmental standards and regulations. 	
	Poor	<70	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • <5 years experience in undertaking environmental assessments for infrastructure projects and 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • <4 years experience in similar roles assigned on this project. • Limited or no experience 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • <2 years experience in Caribbean countries. • Limited or no experience of working with public sector 	



Criteria	Rating (%)	Grade	Definition			Comment
			contributing to Environmental and Social Impact Assessments. <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Degree in relevant discipline. 	working on MDB projects or equivalents and with associated policies, guidelines and requirements.	institutions in the region and with regional and national environmental standards and regulations.	
4. Transfer of Knowledge			NOT APPLICABLE TO THIS ASSIGNMENT.			
5. Participation by nationals among proposed Key Experts	N/A	N/A	Calculated as the ratio of key national experts' time (in-person months), to the total number of key experts' time (in-person months), in the Proposal.			

CARIBBEAN DEVELOPMENT BANK



P.O. Box 408, Wildey, St. Michael
Barbados BB 11000



246-539-1600



246-426-7269



www.caribank.org