

# **SAMPLE FORM OF EVALUATION REPORT**

## **SELECTION OF CONSULTANTS**



**The Caribbean Development Bank**

**September 2015**



## Preface<sup>1</sup>

Consultants<sup>2</sup> employed by CDB's Recipients and financed by CDB or under trust funds<sup>3</sup> are hired according to CDB's *Guidelines for the Selection and Engagement of Consultants (Guidelines)*.<sup>4</sup> The *Guidelines* specify the Borrowers' obligations to submit certain reports to the Bank during the selection process:

- (a) for contracts subject to prior review by CDB (see Appendix 1, para. 2(a), of the *Guidelines*):
  - (i) a technical evaluation report subject to prior review by CDB, such as CDB's no-objection prior to opening the financial proposals; or
  - (ii) a technical evaluation notice for contracts above the prior review threshold but below a higher threshold indicated in the Financing Agreement. In such case, the Recipient needs not wait for CDB's no-objection to open the financial proposals;

In both cases the Recipient must send to CDB for prior review the combined technical/financial evaluation report;

- (b) for contracts subject to post-review by CDB:
  - (i) a combined technical/financial report to be reviewed or audited subsequently.

This document sets out the format of a sample evaluation report. It is provided to Recipients to facilitate the evaluation of consultants' proposals and the subsequent review of these proposals by CDB. Its use is strongly recommended but not mandatory.

The evaluation must be in accordance with the criteria spelled out in the Request for Proposals and carried out by qualified evaluators. The Request for Proposals should be prepared in agreement with the *Guidelines* (para. 2.9).

---

<sup>1</sup> This preface is not part of the report. It should not appear in the report submitted to CDB.

<sup>2</sup> The term *Consultants* in this document refers to organizations and not individuals.

<sup>3</sup> Trust funds are funds provided by donors and administered by CDB.

<sup>4</sup> All references to the *Guidelines* made in this report are to *the Guidelines for the Selection and Engagement of Consultants* (October 2011). Copies of the *Guidelines* are available at [www.caribank.org](http://www.caribank.org).

The evaluation report includes five sections:

- Section I. A Short Report Summarizing the Findings of the Technical Evaluation;
- Section II. Technical Evaluation Report—Forms;
- Section III. A Short Report Summarizing the Findings of the Financial Evaluation;
- Section IV. Financial Evaluation Report—Forms;
- Section V. Annexes:
  - Annex I. Individual Evaluations;
  - Annex II. Information Data Monitoring;
  - Annex III. Minutes of the Public Opening of the Financial Proposals;
  - Annex IV. Copy of the Request for Proposals;
  - Annex V. Miscellaneous Annexes—Ad Hoc.

The report can be used for all methods of selection described in the *Guidelines*. Though it mainly addresses Quality- and Cost-Based Selection, each section contains a note indicating the data and forms that are to be provided for the other methods of selection.

The evaluation notice is sent to CDB after the technical evaluation is completed. It includes only Form IIB and a short explanatory note to flag important aspects of the evaluation. Following CDB's no-objection to the evaluation notice, the Recipient prepares Forms IVC and IVD and a short explanatory note to highlight the most important aspects of the financial evaluation.

For complex, specialized assignments, the Recipient may wish to obtain assistance from consultants to evaluate proposals. Such consultants or individual consultants may be financed under the relevant loan, credit, or grant.

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

Procurement Policy Unit  
Caribbean Development Bank  
procurement@caribank.org

# CONSULTANT EVALUATION REPORT

*Country* [insert: name of country]

*Project Name* [insert: project name]

*Ref No.* [insert: ref number]

*Title of Consulting Services* [insert: title]

*Date of Submission* [insert: date]

## Contents

Section I. Technical Evaluation Report—Text	1
Section II. Technical Evaluation Report—Forms	3
Form IIA. Technical Evaluation - Basic Data	4
Form IIB. Evaluation Summary	8
Form IIC. Individual Evaluations—Comparison	9
Section III. Financial Evaluation Report—Award Recommendation—Text	11
Section IV. Financial Evaluation Report—Award Recommendation—Forms	13
Form IVA. Financial Evaluation—Basic Data	14
Form IVB. Adjustments—Currency Conversion—Evaluated Prices	16
Form IVC. QCBS—Combined Technical/Financial Evaluation—Award Recommendation	17
Form IVD. Fixed-Budget and Least-Cost Selection—Award Recommendation	18
Section V. Annexes	19
Annex I(i). Individual Evaluations	20
Annex I(ii). Individual Evaluations—Key Personnel	21
Annex II. Information Data Monitoring	22
Annex III. Minutes of Public Opening of Financial Proposals	23
Annex IV. Request for Proposals	24
Annex V. Miscellaneous Annexes—Ad Hoc	25

## Section I. Technical Evaluation Report—Text<sup>5</sup>

- 1. Background**                      Include a brief description, context, scope, and objectives of the services. Use about a quarter of a page.
  
- 2. The Selection Process (Prior to Technical Evaluation)**                      Elaborate on information provided in Form IIA.

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

Use about one-half to one page.
  
- 3. Technical Evaluation**                      Describe briefly the meetings and actions taken by the evaluation committee: formation of a technical evaluation team, outside assistance, evaluation guidelines, justification of subcriteria and associated weightings as indicated in the Standard Request for Proposals; relevant correspondence with CDB; and compliance of evaluation with RFP.

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

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

  - (a) Strengths: Experience in very similar projects in the country; quality of the methodology, proving a clear understanding of the scope of the assignment; strengths of the local partner; and experience of proposed staff in similar assignments.
  - (b) Weaknesses: Of a particular component of the proposal; of a lack of experience in the country; of a low level of participation by the local partner; of a lack of practical experience (experience in studies rather than in

---

<sup>5</sup> Section I applies to Quality- and Cost-Based Selection (QCBS), Quality-Based Selection (Quality-Based), Fixed-Budget Selection (Fixed-Budget), and Least-Cost Selection (Least-Cost). Provide appropriate information in the case of Selection Based on Qualifications (Qualifications) and Single-Source Selection (SS).

implementation); of staff experience compared to the firm's experience; of a key staffer (e.g., the team leader); of a lack of responsiveness; and of disqualifications (conflict of interest).

Comment on individual evaluators' scores (discrepancies).

Items requiring further negotiations.

Use up to three pages.



## **Section II. Technical Evaluation Report—Forms<sup>6</sup>**

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

---

<sup>6</sup> Section II applies to Quality- and Cost-Based Selection (QCBS), Quality-Based Selection (Quality-Based), Fixed-Budget Selection (Fixed-Budget), and Least-Cost Selection (Least-Cost). Supply appropriate data in cases of Selection Based on Qualifications (Qualifications) and Single-Source Selection (Single-Source) in Form IIA.



- 5.
- 6.
- (b) Submission to CDB for no-objection Date
- (c) CDB's no-objection Date
- 2.8 Request for Proposals:
- (a) submission to the Bank for no-objection Date
- (b) Bank's no-objection Date
- (c) issuance to Consultants Date
- 2.9 Amendments and clarifications to the RFP (describe)
- 2.10 Contract:
- (a) Bank Standard Time-Based Yes \_\_\_\_\_  
Price adjustment: Yes \_\_\_\_\_ No \_\_\_\_\_
- (b) Bank Standard Lump Sum Yes \_\_\_\_\_  
Price adjustment: Yes \_\_\_\_\_ No \_\_\_\_\_
- (c) other (describe)
- 2.11 Pre-proposal conference:
- (a) minutes issued Yes No  
Yes No
- 2.12 Proposal submission: Points
- (a) two envelopes (technical and financial proposals) Yes
- (b) one envelope (technical) Yes
- (c) original submission Date Time
- (d) extensions(s) Date Time
- 2.13 Submission of Financial Proposal Location
- 2.14 Opening of Technical Proposals by selection committee Date Time
- 2.15 Number of proposals submitted
- 2.16 Evaluation committee<sup>10</sup>:

---

<sup>10</sup> It is important that evaluators be qualified.

- Members' names and titles  
(normally three to five)
- 1.
  - 2.
  - 3.
  - 4.
  - 5.

2.17 Proposal validity period (days):

- |                              |      |      |
|------------------------------|------|------|
| (a) original expiration date | Date | Time |
| (b) extension(s), if any     | Date | Time |

2.18 Evaluation Criteria/subcriteria<sup>11</sup>:

- (a) Consultants' experience
- (i) Weight
  - (ii) Weight
- (b) methodology
- (i) Weight
  - (ii) Weight
- (c) key staff
- (i) individual(s)
    - (A) \_\_\_\_\_ Weight
    - (B) \_\_\_\_\_ Weight
    - (C) \_\_\_\_\_ Weight
  - (ii) group(s)
    - (A) \_\_\_\_\_ Weight
    - (B) \_\_\_\_\_ Weight
    - (C) \_\_\_\_\_ Weight
- (d) training (optional)
- (i) Weight
  - (ii) Weight
- (e) local input (optional)
- (i) Weight
  - (ii) Weight

2.19 Technical scores by Consultant      Minimum qualifying score

Consultants' names	Technical scores
1.	
2.	

<sup>11</sup> Maximum of three subcriteria per criterion.

- |    |  |
|----|--|
| 3. |  |
| 4. |  |

2.20 Evaluation report:

(a) submission to CDB for  
no-objection

Date

2.21 Evaluation notice:

(a) submission to CDB:

Date

## Form IIB. Evaluation Summary

### Technical Scores/Ranking

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

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

## Form IIC. Individual Evaluations—Comparison

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

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

***NOTE:***

*Please see the Preface.*

*For contracts above a threshold indicated in the Financing Agreement and requiring CDB's no-objection of the technical evaluation report, financial proposals must not be opened before the Recipient has received such no-objection. The technical evaluation (technical scores in particular) cannot be changed following the opening of the financial proposals.*



### **Section III. Financial Evaluation Report—Award Recommendation—Text<sup>12</sup>**

*[The text will indicate:*

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

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

---

<sup>12</sup> Applies to QCBS, Fixed-Budget, and Least-Cost. For Quality-Based, Qualifications, and Single-Source provide relevant information as indicated.

## **Section IV. Financial Evaluation Report—Award Recommendation—Forms<sup>13</sup>**

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

---

<sup>13</sup> Applies to QCBS, Fixed-Budget, and Least-Cost. For Quality-Based, Qualifications, and Single-Source, provide relevant information as indicated.

## Form IVA. Financial Evaluation—Basic Data

- |   |  |                     |                     |                     |
|---|--|---------------------|---------------------|---------------------|
| 4.1 CDB’s no-objection to technical evaluation report (Quality-Based, Qualifications, Single-Source)  | Date   |                     |                     |                     |
| 4.2 Public opening of financial proposals   | Date   | Time                |                     |                     |
| (a) Names and proposal prices (mark Consultants that attended public opening)   | 1.<br>2.<br>3.<br>4.                           |                     |                     |                     |
| 4.3 Evaluation committee: members’ names and titles (if not the same as in the technical evaluation - Quality-Based, Qualifications, Single-Source) |  |                     |                     |                     |
| 4.4 Methodology (formula) for evaluation of cost (QCBS only; cross as appropriate)  | Weight inversely proportional to cost<br>Other |                     |                     |                     |
| 4.5 Submission of final technical/financial evaluation report to CDB (Quality-Based, Qualifications, Single-Source)                                 | Date   |                     |                     |                     |
| 4.6 QCBS  | Consultant’<br>Name                            | Technical<br>scores | Financial<br>scores | Final<br>scores     |
| (a) Technical, financial and final scores (Quality-Based: technical scores only)  |  |                     |                     |                     |
| (b) Award recommendation  |  |                     |                     |                     |
| 4.7 Fixed Budget and Least-Cost   | Consultant’<br>Name                            | Technical<br>scores | Proposal<br>prices  | Evaluated<br>prices |
| (a) Technical scores, proposal and evaluated prices   |  |                     |                     |                     |
| (b) Award recommendation  |  |                     |                     |                     |

(c) Fixed-Budget: best technical proposal within the budget (evaluated price) Name

(d) Least-Cost: lowest evaluated price proposal above minimum qualifying score Name

**Form IVB. Adjustments—Currency Conversion—Evaluated  
Prices<sup>14</sup>**

Consultants' Names	Proposals' prices <sup>a</sup>		Adjustments <sup>b</sup>	Evaluated price(s)	Conversion to currency of evaluation <sup>c</sup>	
	Currency	Amounts (1)	(2)	(3) = (1) + (2)	Exchange rate(s) <sup>e</sup> (4)	Proposals' prices (5) = (3)(4)

- a. Comments, if any (e.g., exchange rates); three foreign currencies maximum, plus local currency.
- b. Arithmetical errors and omissions of items included in the technical proposals. Adjustments may be positive or negative.
- c. As per RFP.
- d. 100 points to the lowest evaluated proposal; other scores to be determined in accordance with provisions of RFP.
- e. Value of one currency unit in the common currency used for evaluation purposes, normally the local currency (e.g., US\$1 = 30). Indicate source as per RFP.

---

<sup>14</sup> For Quality-Based, Qualifications, and Single-Source, fill out only up to column 3.

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

Consultants' names	Technical Evaluation			Financial Evaluation		Combined Ev
	Technical scores <sup>a</sup> S(t)	Weighted scores S(t) × T <sup>b</sup>	Technical rank	Financial scores <sup>c</sup> S(f)	Weighted scores S(f) × F <sup>d</sup>	Scores S(t) T + S(f) F
Award recommendation	To highest combined technical/financial score. Consultant's name: _____					

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

**Form IVD. Fixed-Budget and Least-Cost Selection—Award Recommendation<sup>15</sup>**

Consultants' names	Fixed-Budget Selection		Least-Cost Selection	
	Technical scores <sup>a</sup>	Evaluated prices <sup>b</sup>	Technical scores	Evaluated prices
Award recommendation	To best technical score with evaluated price within budget. Consultant's name:		To lowest evaluated price above minimum quality score. Consultant's name:	

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

---

<sup>15</sup> Fill in appropriate part of form.

## **Section V. Annexes<sup>16</sup>**

Annex I. Individual Evaluations

Form V Annex I(i). Individual Evaluations

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

Annex II. Information Data Monitoring

Annex III. Minutes of Public Opening of Financial Proposals

Annex IV. Request for Proposals

Annex V. Miscellaneous Annexes—Ad Hoc

---

<sup>16</sup> Annex I applies to Quality-Based, Fixed-Budget and Least-Cost. For Qualifications and Single-Source, it is replaced by a review of the strengths and weaknesses of the proposal, which may be amended by one or several evaluators.



## Annex I (i). Individual Evaluations

Consultant's name: \_\_\_\_\_

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

a. If specified in the RFP

1. Evaluator's Name: \_\_\_\_\_ Signature: \_\_\_\_\_ Date: \_\_\_\_\_

2. Evaluator's Name: \_\_\_\_\_ Signature: \_\_\_\_\_ Date: \_\_\_\_\_

3. Evaluator's Name: \_\_\_\_\_ Signature: \_\_\_\_\_ Date: \_\_\_\_\_

4. Evaluator's Name: \_\_\_\_\_ Signature: \_\_\_\_\_ Date: \_\_\_\_\_

5. Evaluator's Name: \_\_\_\_\_ Signature: \_\_\_\_\_ Date: \_\_\_\_\_

## Annex I(ii) Individual Evaluations—Key Personnel

Consultant's Name: \_\_\_\_\_

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

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

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

## Annex II. Information Data Monitoring

- 5.1 Financing Agreement:
- (a) number
  - (b) date of effectiveness
  - (c) closing date
    - (i) original
    - (ii) revised
- 5.2 General Procurement Notice
- (a) first issue date
  - (b) latest update
- 5.3 Request for expressions of interest<sup>17</sup>
- :
- (a) publication in *United Nations Development Business* (UNDB)      Date
  - (b) publication in national local newspaper(s)      Name of newspaper(s) and date(s)
- 5.4 Did the use of price as a factor of selection change the final ranking?<sup>18</sup>      Yes      No
- 5.5 Did the use of “local input” as a factor of selection change the technical ranking?<sup>19</sup>      Yes      No

---

<sup>17</sup> Required for large contracts (see *Guidelines*).

<sup>18</sup> Compare technical rank with rank in Form IVC.

<sup>19</sup> Figure out technical scores with and without “local input” (Form IIB).

## **Annex III. Minutes of Public Opening of Financial Proposals<sup>20</sup>**

### MINUTES

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

*All attendees must sign the Minutes.]*

---

<sup>20</sup> Annex III applies to QCBS, Fixed-Budget, and Least-Cost.

## **Annex IV. Request for Proposals<sup>21</sup>**

*[A Standard Request for Proposals must be used for CDB-financed contracts unless not required under the selection method in question or otherwise agreed by CDB. The Standard Request for Proposals is available on CDB's website: [www.caribank.org](http://www.caribank.org)]*

---

<sup>21</sup> Annex IV applies to all selection procedures (CDB Standard Request for Proposals may be used for Qualifications and Single-Source, with appropriate modifications).

**Annex V. Miscellaneous Annexes—Ad Hoc**