

**Evaluation Report and Recommendation for Award of Contract for Consulting Services (Firms)**

**Using the Selection Methods of: Consultants’ Qualifications Selection (CQS) and Direct Selection (DS)**

**(*PER-CF-2)***

**July 2023**

# Preface

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

##### *This document sets out the format of a sample evaluation report (hereinafter termed* ***“Proposal Evaluation Report – Consulting Firm****’[[2]](#footnote-2)****-2”*** *or* ***PER-CF-2****) and Contract award recommendation* ***(Form II-H)****.* *PER-CF-2 is expected to be used by Recipients for the tasks below for the two Selection Methods: Consultants’ Qualifications Selection* ***(CQS****) and Direct Selection (****DS),*** *as described in the Procedures, Paragraphs 8.19 through 8.22, and, if required, to obtain the subsequent No Objection (NO) by CDB, at the relevant stages of the process. Recipients are expected to choose an option from each dropdown box as they appear in the report for display.*

##### *The PER-CF-2 and Form II-H are to be used to:*

* *Facilitate the evaluation of the Proposal.*
* *Record the results of the evaluation process, contract negotiations and details of recommendation to award the proposed Contract.*
* *Seek CDB’s prior No Objection (NO), where required, to the results of the evaluation process and to Contract award recommendation, before entering into negotiations[[3]](#footnote-3), as reflected in the draft Contract to be attached.*
* *Be retained by the Recipient for CDB’s possible post review, where required.*

##### *Under both Selection Methods of CQS and DS, a combined technical and financial proposal is requested from a single Consultant, and the Proposal is evaluated to ensure that it is substantively responsive and if so, the Proposer is invited for negotiations, where necessary. The evaluation and the resulting* ***PER-CF-2*** *need not necessarily be lengthy.Full details of the policies and procedures guiding the evaluation process for both CQS and DS can be found in Annex I attached.*

1. *The defined terms and acronyms in the Procurement Procedures for CDB funded Projects (January 2021) and the Standard Request for Proposals (SRFP) [both available on the CDB website* [*https://www.caribank.org/work-with-us/procurement*](https://www.caribank.org/work-with-us/procurement)*] are, where applicable, the same as those in this PER-CF-2. Also, cross-referencing to the Procedures and the SRFP is used herein to assist users. However, in PER-CF-2, the:*

* *The terms Firm, Proposer and Consultant are used interchangeably.*

* *The scope of documentation used by the Recipient to request a Proposal will vary based on the value and complexity of the Consulting Services. Nevertheless, the request to the Firm for a Proposal will be termed here “Request for Proposal” (RFP), and the responding submission by a Firm a “Proposal”.*

1. *Recipients should study the PER-CF-2, the Guidance Note for Evaluating Expressions of Interest and Proposals for Consulting Services[[4]](#footnote-4) and Annex I during project preparation, to: (i) reflect requirements in the RFP and (ii) assess the Recipient’s managerial and administrative conditions needed for the evaluation. CDB staff are available to explain any aspects and, where required, permit the employment of experienced consultants to help in evaluations and, where allowed by the Financing Agreement, fees be paid from CDB financing.*
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# 

# Section I. Technical And Financial Evaluation Report—Text[[5]](#footnote-5)

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

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
| **1. Background** | *Include a brief description, context, scope, and objectives of the Consulting Services.* |
| **2. The Selection Process (Prior to Proposal Receipt)** | *Elaborate on information provided in Form IIA and briefly describe the Selection Method, beginning (for CQS) with the advertising (if any) for EOIs and the selection of the highest scored Firm invited to submit a combined technical and financial Proposal. For DS, briefly summarise the rationale for the use of DS and the selection of the Firm required to submit a combined technical and financial proposal.*  *For both, describe major events that may have affected the timing of the evaluation and Contract award recommendation (delays in responses from the Firm, complaints from other Consultants, etc.).*  *Briefly describe (i) the formation of a technical and financial evaluation committee (EC) as required in Procedures, Paragraph 6.37 (ii) meetings and actions taken by the EC[[6]](#footnote-6);(iii) outside evaluation assistance, if any; (iv) summarise evaluation criteria used, based on those in the RFP and the results of the evaluation process.* |
| **3. Technical and Financial Examination and Evaluation and Results** | **Results – Preliminary Examination *-*** *Summarise from Form II-B*  **Results – Detailed Evaluation***[[7]](#footnote-7)* **-** *Summarise from Form II-C and II-D, II-E and II-F as appropriate.*  *Highlight strengths and weaknesses of the Proposal and comment on individual evaluator’s variances in assessments.*  *List points (if any) requiring further technical and financial negotiations with the Proposer (refer to Procedures, Paragraphs 6.82 – 6.84).*  *For Contracts subject to Prior Review only, the evaluation process pauses and the PER-CF-2 is sent to CDB for review and No Objection, before commencing any negotiation with the Proposer or otherwise proceeding to the next stage of the procurement process.* |
| **4. Contract Negotiations and Contract award Decision** | **Results** – *Summarise from Form II-C and II-H* |
| **Letter of Transmittal – Technical and Financial**  *Where CDB’s no objection (NO) is required for the Contract negotiations and Contract award results[[8]](#footnote-8), the PER-CF-2 (consisting of the following documents) should be attached with a Letter of Transmittal from the Recipient ministry department, or agency responsible for communications with CDB. The letter should highlight conclusions and offer any additional information that would help to expedite review by CDB. In addition, any unresolved or potentially contentious issues should be highlighted. The letter should be sent to the CDB Operations Officer responsible for the project.*  *Where the results are subject to post review, the PER-CF-2 and all supporting documentation shall be retained in the Recipient’s project files for future review by CDB.* | |
| *Documents to be attached:*   * *Section I – Text* * *Forms II - A through H* * *Draft Contract* | | |

## Form II-A – Technical and Financial Evaluation - Basic Data

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
| 2.1 Name of country  Name of Project |  |
| 2.2 Name of Client:  2.3 Type of assignment: | Choose an item. |
| 2.4 Selection Method | Choose an item. |
| 2.5 CDB Prior Review Required/NO | Click or tap to enter a date. |
| 2.6 In case of CQS, where applicable date of CDB’s NO to EOI Evaluation Report. | Click or tap to enter a date. |
| 2.7 Changes to the RFP[[9]](#footnote-9):  (a) Amendments – CDB’s NO  (b) Amendments – issued to Firm  (c) Clarifications– issued to Firm | # and date – to and from CDB  # and date(s)  # and date(s) |
| * 1. Contract:  1. Type of Contract:   (Describe, where applicable)   1. Size of Contract: 2. Contract Price subject to Adjustment | Choose an item.  Choose an item.  Choose an item. |
| 2.9 Proposal validity period (days):  (a) original expiration date  (b) extension(s)[[10]](#footnote-10), if any | Click or tap to enter a date. Time  Click or tap to enter a date. Time |
| 2.10 Evaluation report to CDB for NO *(prior review contracts only)* | Click or tap to enter a date. |

## Form II-B – Preliminary Technical and Financial Examination

Verification:

Eligibility:

Completeness of Proposal:

Substantially Responsive:

Acceptance for detailed evaluation: Choose an item.

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

*For explanations of headings and checklist for compliance, refer to GN Section – Preliminary Examination pages 8-9 and Annex I of the PER-CF-2.*

*If the Proposal is found responsive from the Preliminary Examination, it proceeds to Detailed Evaluation where the quality and compliance of the technical proposal and other aspects of the financial proposal are evaluated in detail against the evaluation criteria of the RFP.*

## Form II-C – Detailed Technical and Financial Evaluation - Summary

*While the evaluation criteria will vary depending on the nature of the Consulting Services, the following are some suggested technical and financial aspects that require consideration and evaluation.*

Specific experience: *from Form II-D*

Methodology and Work Plan: *from Form II-D*

Key Experts: *from Forms II-D and II-E*

Transfer of Knowledge/Training: *from Form II-D*

Participation of nationals among Key Experts: *from Form II-D*

Schedule of deliverables: *from Proposal*

Price components [breakdown of lump sum or time-based; payment rates of key experts and reimbursable costs] – *from Form II-F*

*List technical and financial points requiring negotiation with the Proposer.*

## Form II-D – Individual Technical Evaluations

|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
|  |  | **Evaluators** | | | | |  |
| Criteria/Sub-Criteria | Maximum Scores | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 | 5 | Average Scores |
| Specific Experience |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| - |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| - |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| - |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Methodology and Work Plan |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| - |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| - |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| - |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Key Experts (refer Form II-E) |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| - |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| - |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| - |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Transfer of Knowledge (e.g., Training, if required) |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| - |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| - |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| - |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Participation by Nationals among Key Experts (if required) |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| - |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| - |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| - |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| **Total** | **100** |  |  |  |  |  |  |
|  | | | | | | | |

*Form II-D can be used (as a working tool) for* ***DS*** *and* ***CQS*** *evaluations. With a few exceptions for DS and for some CQS Consulting Services, a full evaluation of the technical proposal is required. The pass/fail criteria will be addressed in Forms II-B. The evaluation criteria will be reflected in the RFP, but scores/points are not stated. The intent of the score/points is to assist, where appropriate, in evaluation focus and consistency for the evaluators involved.* ***The evaluation results and aspects to be negotiated would be summarised in Form II-C.***

## Form II-E – Individual Technical Evaluations—Key Personnel

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

*Form II-E can be used (as a working tool) for* ***DS*** *and* ***CQS*** *evaluations. With a few exceptions for DS and for some CQS Consulting Services, a full evaluation of the Technical Proposal is required, especially for Key Experts. The pass/fail criteria will be addressed in Forms II-B. The evaluation criteria will be reflected in the RFP, but the score/points are not stated. The intent of the points is to assist, where appropriate, in evaluation focus and consistency for the evaluators involved.* ***The evaluation results and aspects to be negotiated will be summarised in Form II-C.***

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

## Form II-F – Financial Evaluation[[11]](#footnote-11)

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
| **Cost of the Financial Proposal** | **Currency(ies) of Proposal** |
| Including: |  |
| (1) **Remuneration** |  |
| (2) **Reimbursables** |  |
| **Total Cost of the Financial Proposal (Excluding local taxes):** |  |
| ***(Insert type of local tax. e.g., VAT or sales tax)*** |  |
| ***(Insert type of local tax, e.g., income tax on non-resident experts)*** |  |
| **Total Estimate for Indirect Local Taxes:** |  |

*A summary of this price information is to be included in Form II-C.*

## Form II-G – Evaluation Committee Certification – Technical and Financial

**Respectfully Submitted by the Evaluation Committee**

|  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- |
| **Name** | **Organisation/Position** | **Date** | **Signature** |
|  |  |  |  |
|  |  |  |  |
|  |  |  |  |
|  |  |  |  |
|  |  |  |  |

I confirm that the technical and financial evaluation was conducted in full compliance with the Proposal request/RFP documentationand CDB’s Procurement Procedures. All members of the Evaluation Committee have certified no conflicts of interest in accordance with Procedures, Paragraph 6.37.

**Chairperson’s Name:**

**Signature Date**

## 

## Form II-H – Proposed Contract Award

|  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- |
| 1. Firm recommended for Contract award  (a) name  (b) address  (c) nationality |  | |
| 2. If Proposal from a joint venture, list all partners, nationalities, and estimated shares of Contract. |  | |
| 3. Estimated date (month, year) of Contract signing |  | |
| 4. Estimated completion date (month, year) of the Consulting Services |  | |
|  | Currency(ies) | Amount(s) |
| 5. Proposal Price(s) |  |  |
| 6. Corrections for Errors |  |  |
| 7. Discounts |  |  |
| 8. Other Adjustments[[12]](#footnote-12) |  |  |
| 9. Proposed Award[[13]](#footnote-13) |  |  |
| 10. Budget allocation |  |  |

Attached draft Contract:

Submitted for CDB NO, where required – *Date:\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_*

## Annex I – Evaluation Guide for CQS and DS

***A: Overview of the Selection Methods***

*The justification for the Selection Method together with budget and schedule for the delivery of the Consulting Services were reflected in the Recipient’s Procurement Plan accepted by CDB and categorized further procedural CDB decision points as either prior NO or post review – refer to Item B-6 below for further details.*

*Both Methods seek a Proposal from a single Firm, which, subject to successful negotiations, will result in an award of Contract to that Firm, but under different Selection Methods. Therefore, for both Methods, the Proposal submitted by the Firm is not subject to direct market competition. Nevertheless, the Recipient should structure the RFP to obtain sufficient technical and financial details to determine the responsiveness of the technical and financial offer and in turn achieve Value for Money. Such details would include methodology, workplan, CVs for key experts and overall and key experts’ levels of effort, unit rates, reimbursables, etc. This information is to be used by the Recipient to examine the technical offering and to compare the financial offering to the Recipient’s estimates and to similar previous Contracts, market knowledge or other sources for comparison. Issues related to the methodology, workplan or team makeup and variances in the financial offering with that budgeted may form the basis for subsequent negotiations.*

*Further details of each Selection Method follow below:*

***A-1. Consultants’ Qualifications Selection -******CQS - Procedures, Paragraphs 8.19-20[[14]](#footnote-14).*** *Firms were invited, either by an open or limited selection, to submit Expressions of Interest (EOIs) in response to a Request for Expressions of Interest (REOI), including TORs. The Recipient evaluated the EOIs, and the Firm with the highest technical scored EOI[[15]](#footnote-15) was selected to submit a combined Technical and Financial Proposal.*

*The RFP is sought based on the TORs used for the REOI (updated as required), the technical and financial forms from the CDB’s Standard Request for Proposals [SRFP], as applicable, and a standard form of CDB Contract used with the RFP. The Proposal is not opened in public. If the Proposal is found responsive and acceptable, the Proposer is invited for negotiations or, in the absence of negotiations, awarded a Contract.*

*For contracts subject to CDB’s Prior Review, prior to entering into negotiations or awarding a Contract, the PER-CF-2 must be submitted to CDB for review and No Objection. Once CDB NO is received, the Recipient can negotiate with the selected Proposer. Negotiations are conducted on all technical and financial aspects, including any points noted in the EOI evaluation report [FE-ER]. The signed minutes of negotiations and the draft Contract initialled by the Consultant are then submitted by the Recipient to CDB for final review and NO. The Recipient shall confirm the award and sign the Contract only after receiving CDB NO.*

*For contracts subject to CDB’s Post Review, after completion of the combined technical and financial evaluation, and negotiations (as necessary),the Contract may be awarded without seeking a NO from CDB. The complete PER-CF-2 plus other related documents noted will be retained by the Recipient for possible future CDB review.*

***A-2. Direct Selection - DS - Procedures, Paragraphs 8.21-22.*** *DS shall be used only in exceptional cases as described in Procedures, Paragraph 8.21-8.22. The use of DS shall be detailed in the Procurement Plan, along with the identified Firm, the scope of the Services, the justification for using DS, an estimated budget, the appropriate type of contract [e.g., lump-sum or time-based][[16]](#footnote-16), and a schedule. Under DS, the Recipient is not required to issue a full RFP, however an edited form of CDB’s SFRP is generally used with the same key forms to request a combined Technical and Financial Proposal from the sole Proposer against the TORs and a draft form of Contract complete with key terms defined[[17]](#footnote-17). The Proposal is not opened in public but evaluated to ensure it is substantively responsive and if so, the Proposer is invited for negotiations on all technical and financial[[18]](#footnote-18) issues as applicable.*

*For Contracts subject to CDB’s Prior Review, before commencing any negotiations or awarding a Contract, the draft PER-CF-2 is submitted to CDB for review and No Objection. Upon receipt of CDB’s NO to the evaluation report, negotiations can start. The signed minutes of negotiations and the draft Contract initialled by the Consultant are then submitted by the Recipient to CDB for NO. The Recipient shall confirm the award and sign the Contract only after receiving CDB NO.*

*For Contracts subject to CDB’s Post Review, the Recipient may proceed with Contract award. Any relevant documentation, including the combined evaluation report and the signed original Contract, shall be retained by the Recipient and be furnished to CDB upon request.*

***B: General Considerations in Evaluating Proposals*** *(applicable to both Methods unless specifically stated)*

***B-1 Technical and Financial Evaluation Committees:*** *Procedures Paragraph 6.37 requires the appointment by the Recipient of an evaluation committee [EC], consisting of a minimum of three qualified members. While only single Firms are involved in these Selection Methods, the Recipient must exercise due diligence; in addition, confidentiality and technical and financial acumen is required. The Recipient shall appoint an EC with a number of members and skills commensurate with the scope of the Consulting Services. For example:*

* *A DS used for a continuation with the same Firm of a recently completed Consulting Services Contract (refer to Procedures, Paragraph 8.22 (b)) would require a quick assessment that essential conditions are unchanged. However, contracting with a new Firm for a significant value/complex Contract as the only source for the Consulting Services (refer to Procedures, Paragraph 8.22 (e) could require an extensive level of effort of various skills and possibly a range of issues would require negotiating.*
* *For CQS, the price would be relatively low, plus eligibility and other compliance aspects were conducted as part of the EOI evaluation and selection process. Consequently, the evaluation and negotiation levels of effort are likely low.*

*All EC members shall make a written declaration (before commencing their work) to keep proposal-related information confidential and have no conflicts of interest.*

*Where a Proposal is submitted in hard copy, EC members evaluate in a secure office where all copies of the Proposal can be kept. Electronic Proposals must be adequately protected from unauthorised access but can be remotely worked on by members.*

***B-2. Preliminary Evaluation of the Proposal****: the following key aspects require examining and the results documented, with a level of effort by the EC commensurate with the scope of the Consulting Services.*

1. ***Verification****: check the validity of the Proposal itself should be confirmed. For example, the Proposal must be signed by an authorized signatory of the Proposal. If required, a Power of Attorney confirming the authorized signatory should be provided in the Proposal.*

*If the Proposer is a Joint Venture (JV), the JV Agreement must be submitted. Where the JV is to be formed specifically for the Contract, the evidence of intent to form a JV must be submitted.*

1. ***Eligibility****: RFP defines eligibility requirements to be fulfilled by a Consultant to obtain a Contract, including country eligibility and integrity and conflict of interest requirements – refer to Procedures, Section 4 and Annex 1.*

*Consultants with conflicts of interest that would preclude independence and not allow Consultants to perform their Consulting Services objectively (refer to Procedures, Paragraphs 5.16 and 5.17) shall be ineligible.*

1. ***Completeness of Technical and Financial Proposal****: The Proposal should be checked to ensure the full scope of the Consulting Services in the RFP is addressed and all other documents or data requested, including full pricing, are provided*
2. ***Substantially Responsiveness****: minor deviations to the commercial requirements and technical specifications are noted and raised in negotiations. As a rule, major deviations are those that, if accepted, would mean that the Consulting Services offered would not fulfill the requirements detailed in the RFP. Examples of major deviations include:*
3. *Stipulating a price adjustment when a fixed price Proposal was specified.*
4. *Not conforming to mandatory completion dates.*
5. *Changing joint venture partners or major subconsultants from those originally proposed, e.g., for CQS’ at the EOI stage.*
6. *Refusing to bear important responsibilities and liabilities as required by the RFP, such as not ceding to the Recipient the ownership of intellectual property developed under the Contract.*
7. *Refusing to accept in full critical contractual provisions such as applicable law, taxes and duties, and dispute resolution procedures.*

***B-3. Detailed Evaluation of Proposals*** *(applicable to both DS and CQS unless stated differently).*

1. ***Proposal Validity:*** *The duration of the validity of a Proposal should be the one specified in the RFP and should be confirmed by the Proposer. If exceptional circumstances occur in which award cannot be made by the Recipient within the validity period, extensions in writing should be requested of Proposer in accordance with the Procedures, Paragraph 6.89.*
2. ***Corrections for Errors:*** *For time-based Contracts, errors will be brought to the attention of the Firm during negotiations. For lump-sum Contracts, major errors only should be discussed to prevent future problems, including work stoppage or default by the Firm.*
3. ***Currency:*** *Prices shall be converted to a single currency, selected by the Recipient as stated in the RFP[[19]](#footnote-19). The Recipient makes this conversion by using the selling rates for those currencies, specified in the RFP along with the date of the exchange rate.*

***B-4. Contract Negotiations:*** *The objective of negotiations is to conclude a Contract with the selected Consultant which maximizes Value for Money for the Recipient. Procedures 6.82 to 6.88 details the relevant aspects which shall inform the negotiation process. The topics for negotiation generally will be identified by the EC during the evaluation process, as well as the following:*

1. ***Key Experts:*** *Before negotiations start, the Recipient should obtain confirmation in writing that all the Consultant’s key experts are still available.*
2. ***Correction for Errors:*** *Any errors not resolved during the detailed evaluation [Refer paragraph 3(b) above], should be included in negotiations.*
3. ***Local Taxes:*** *Proposers are to be instructed in the RFP that local taxes are not to be included in prices but quoted separately (refer to Procedures. Paragraph 6.84). Local taxes are the object of negotiations by the Recipient with the selected Firm; identifiable local taxes cannot be financed by CDB.*
4. ***Financial Negotiations:*** *the Recipient must determine that the technical and financial aspects of the Proposal are fair and reasonable resulting in “Value for Money”.*

*Where deficiencies in Proposals cannot be resolved via negotiations and negotiations with the highest-ranked Proposer therefore fail then the Recipient may need to consider alternative options, for example:*

* *CQS: request a combined technical and financial Proposal to the next highest scored Consultant from the EOI stage, who may then be invited to negotiate a Contract provided that the Proposal is responsive [refer to results in FE-ER and Procedures, Paragraph 6.85].*
* *DS: options for the Recipient depend on the reasons for the initial choice of DS – refer Procedures, Paragraph 8.22. Possible options include (a) increase the geographic scope of potential Proposers, (b) adjusting TORs, (c) accepting time delays and (d) seeking competitive Proposals.*

*For Contracts subject to prior review, CDB’s NO must be obtained before the Recipient formally ends negotiations with the first ranked Consultant under CQS or the only Consultant under DS and pursues any options.*

***B-5. Standstill Period:*** *Under Procedures, Paragraph 6.90, a standstill period* ***shall not*** *apply to Contracts awarded under DS and CQS.*

***B-6. CDB Prior Review/NO (where required)*** *As noted above in Item A, the project Procurement Plan identifies those Contracts for Consulting Services requiring CDB’s Prior Review and issuance of a No Objection (NO) or to post review. For an overview of the activities requiring CDB’s prior review and NO, refer to Procedures, Annex 2 and summarised below.*

1. ***Prior Review****: before entering into any negotiations with the Proposer, the Recipient must submit the draft combined technical and financial evaluation report (PER-CF-2) to CDB for review and No Objection upon completion of the evaluation process. The latter shall be completed preferably no later than three (3) weeks before the expiration of the Proposal validity period. The PER-CF-2 should include the appropriate Forms and other documents listed in the Transmittal Letter.*

*Recipients may be requested to provide additional information and justification for the recommendation of award. CDB will not contact Proposers. However, it may ask the Recipient to do so for clarifications. Refer to A-1 above for guidance on the subsequent steps of the process.*

1. ***Post Review:*** *the Recipient may award the Contract upon completion of the technical and financial evaluation as reflected in the PER-CF-2. However, any doubts about the justification for the award should be raised by the Recipient with CDB before award signing. Recipients should ensure that all correspondence received from Proposers concerning evaluation has been considered. CDB does not finance Contracts that have not been procured in accordance with the Financing Agreement.*

1. *“Recipient” refers here to the entity which signed the Financing Agreement with CDB who may be represented by an implementing or executing agency, and which may also be called the “Client”.*  [↑](#footnote-ref-1)
2. *A Firm is defined in “Procurement Procedures for Projects Financed by CDB”* ***(Procedures),*** *January 2021.*  [↑](#footnote-ref-2)
3. *For any contract subject to Bank’s prior review, as detailed in the procurement plan, the evaluation report, including the detailed evaluation sheets of each committee member, must be submitted to CDB for its review and No Objection. NO must be received before the procuring entity proceeds to commence negotiations or award the contract.*  [↑](#footnote-ref-3)
4. <https://www.caribank.org/sites/default/files/publication-resources/220411%20Guidance%20Note%20for%20Evaluation%20of%20Consulting%20Services%20.pdf> [↑](#footnote-ref-4)
5. *The amount and type of information included here for the evaluation of the sole Proposal is based on the judgement of the Recipient (and input from CDB, where required). The results will determine the Recipients personnel involved and the level of effort required. Refer Annex I attached for some considerations.* [↑](#footnote-ref-5)
6. *For example, written requests to Firm for clarifications, minutes of negotiation meetings, etc.* [↑](#footnote-ref-6)
7. *The evaluation criteria shall reflect either the Recipient’s request for a full technical Proposal****(FTP)*** *or simplified technical Proposal* ***(STP****) and a lump sum or time-based contract.* [↑](#footnote-ref-7)
8. *See Procedures, Paragraphs 5.04-5.07 and 8.02-8.09 and Annex I.* [↑](#footnote-ref-8)
9. *Refer to SRFP ITC Clause 13 that describes “Clarifications” and “Amendments”. Where CDB prior NO is required then this must be received before the issue of an Amendment to the Firm.* [↑](#footnote-ref-9)
10. *CDB NO required where applicable for validity extensions - Procedures, Annex 2 paragraph 5(b).*  [↑](#footnote-ref-10)
11. *Price information to be shown here depends on the pricing basis of either lump sum or time based.* [↑](#footnote-ref-11)
12. *All adjustments should be explained in detail.* [↑](#footnote-ref-12)
13. *Sum of the prices in Items 7–10 in the Proposal currency(ies), unless changed as part of negotiations. Where prices are quoted in more than one currency, add, as a footnote, the percentage of the total/Proposed Award of each currency.* [↑](#footnote-ref-13)
14. *Procedures, Paragraph 8.19 states that CQS – is used for “…small value assignments for which the need for issuing an RFP and preparing and evaluating competitive Proposals is not justified…”. The CDB’s current value threshold for CQS use is USD100,000. However, where justified, this ceiling can be increased with CDB’s NO.*  [↑](#footnote-ref-14)
15. *The evaluation process of the EOI is detailed in the Firms – Expression of Interest (EOI) – Evaluation Report – summarised as FE-ER. Where CDB’s prior NO was required for the Recipient’s selected Firm and to issue an RFP, this was achieved through the CDB’s NO of the FE-ER.*  [↑](#footnote-ref-15)
16. *Refer Procedures Paragraphs 8.31 to 8.35.* [↑](#footnote-ref-16)
17. *DS for Consulting Services has no price limit. Consequently, CDB’s SRFP and Contract – either large or simplified (where less than USD150K) and time-based or lump sum, used as appropriate.* [↑](#footnote-ref-17)
18. *For examples (refer Procedures, Paragraph 8.22) where financial negotiations may be informed by recent contracts with the Firm e.g. where the Firm was recently contracted for similar services and unit rates and fees were already determined under that competitive process and still deemed applicable.*  [↑](#footnote-ref-18)
19. *The RFP shall define the currency limitations or options for the Proposal. Proposers can price their services using up to three (3) fully convertible currencies plus the local currency in the country of the Recipient. For national processes, this can be restricted to national currency.*  [↑](#footnote-ref-19)