

Chapter VI

Evaluating Proposals

A. Responsibility

156. The evaluation of consultants' proposals is undertaken by:

- the borrower's CSC, for consulting services funded by loans and delegated TA;
- a CSC convened by ADB, for consulting services funded by TA grants when the estimated contract value is more than \$600,000; or
- the user division, for consulting services funded by TA grants when the estimated contract value is \$600,000 or less.

The process is undertaken through three steps:

- evaluating the technical proposals;
- evaluating the financial proposals; and
- ranking the firms, followed by an invitation to the highest ranked firm for contract negotiations.

These steps are described in this chapter.

B. Evaluating Technical Proposals

1. Preparing for Evaluation

157. All the RFP documents are important to the selection process. It is worthwhile for any project officer of either the EA or ADB involved in the selection procedure to read them through in detail and to note some of the specific clauses, especially in the section on Instructions to Consultants. Of particular note are the sections on

- participation of national consultants;
- participation of government employees;
- conditions for the employment of former ADB employees and ADB spouses under ADB-recruited contracts;
- content and format for the technical proposal;
- content and format for biodata;
- requirement for a staffing schedule and a work plan;
- content, format, and rules pertaining to the financial proposal;

- procedure for technical evaluation, including the rules governing nonresponsive proposals; and
- procedure for proposal opening and financial verification, including the rules for rejection.

2. Tools Used for Evaluation

158. Four basic tools are used during the technical evaluation process:

- the proposals themselves,
- a personnel evaluation sheet (Figure 4 in Chapter V),
- a summary evaluation sheet (Figure 5 in Chapter V), and
- a scoring table.

159. ADB devised the scoring table to ensure consistency in evaluations. Its use in the evaluation of proposals is obligatory. The scoring table divides evaluations into six categories as shown in Table 7. The rating definitions are as shown in Table 8.

Category	Percentage
Excellent	100%
Very Good	90%
Above Average	80%
Average	70%
Below Average	50%
Noncomplying	0%

Category	Percentage	Definition
Excellent	100%	The proposal substantially exceeds the subcriteria requirements.
Very Good	90%	The proposal exceeds the subcriteria requirements.
Above Average	80%	The proposal fully meets the subcriteria requirements.
Average	70%	The proposal adequately meets the subcriteria requirements, but there are minor deficiencies.
Below Average	50%	The proposal has significant deficiencies against the subcriteria requirements that will probably impact negatively on the implementation of the assignment.
Noncomplying	0%	The proposal either does not comply with the subcriteria requirements or does not provide enough information to allow a higher rating. For example, nominating an expert who is a national of a non-ADB member country is noncomplying.

160. There are reasons for using the scoring sheet and these standardized scores:

- They provide the evaluators with a shared definition of the ratings, making evaluation easier and more comparable.
- They reduce scoring inconsistencies and discretion.
- They require the evaluators to justify their evaluations based on a common definition of ratings, thereby discouraging any intentionally biased evaluators.
- They make evaluations more transparent and fair.

3. Evaluating Personnel

161. Since personnel make up between 500 and 700 points of an FTP, 700 points of an STP, and 900 points of a BTP, many evaluators prefer to evaluate the personnel from each firm first. This will give a good idea of the strengths and weaknesses of the various firms. Other factors (qualification of the proposer, approach, and methodology) can then be used to distinguish between firms that are close in terms of personnel ranking.

a. Rating Each Factor

162. Each expert must be evaluated separately using the three factors in the personnel evaluation sheet and the rating levels in the scoring table. The basis for assessing the experts' ratings is the biodata of individual experts contained in the curriculum vitae (CV) form, which is an integral part of each proposal. An example of a standard ADB CV form (included in the RFP) is shown in Appendix 3.

163. The main consideration in evaluating personnel is their project-related experience. (normally accounting for 60–70% of an individual evaluation). This is shown in Section 12 of the standard ADB CV form. The experience shown should be judged against the tasks assigned in the left-hand column of that section. The nature and duration of the expert's experience in each example given should be carefully considered and an appropriate rating given from the scoring table (from noncomplying to excellent).

164. The next most important factor to consider for international consultants is country or regional experience. Extensive experience in the country in which the assignment will take place is, of course, desirable. If an expert does not have this exposure, experience in a neighboring country with similar geographic, institutional, and cultural characteristics will also count but, of course, not for the maximum number of points. An equivalent category for national consultants would be exposure to and experience with international organizations and working with an international team.

165. The importance of general qualifications is somewhat variable. Some project officers find it important that their consultants have either a PhD or Master's degree for the task that they need to perform. On the other hand, practical experience may count to a greater extent, and the requirement for a particular academic qualification or type of academic qualification may be made less stringent. Flexibility in assessing general qualification requirements should also take into account the different educational systems around the world. In addition, an assessment of general qualifications should include not only academic qualifications, but also the items such as membership in professional societies, language proficiency, and general work experience listed in Sections 6, 9, and 10 of the standard ADB CV form.

b. Calculating Weighted Rating and Overall Rating

166. After an expert is rated for each of the above factors (within the range "excellent" to "noncomplying" from the scoring table), the appropriate percentage is placed in the rating category of the personnel evaluation sheet. This is then multiplied by the weight given for each factor at the time the evaluation criteria were formulated. The result is a weighted rating. The weighted ratings for each subcriterion are then totaled, resulting in an overall rating for each expert.

167. An example of such a calculation is shown in Table 9. The total overall individual rating in this case is 85.5. This value should be placed in the summary evaluation sheet as the expert's rating. To facilitate this process, the personnel evaluation sheets and the summary evaluation sheet available on the ADB website (www.adb.org/Consulting/all-methods/TAs/EV-FTP-TA.xls) are programmed and linked so that the score for personnel evaluation is calculated automatically and then transferred directly to the summary evaluation sheet.

Table 9: Example of the Rating of an Individual Expert for the Personnel Evaluation Sheet			
Factor	General Qualifications (A)	Project-Related Experience (B)	Overseas/Country Experience (C)
Weight (decided at the time of short-listing)	20	65	15
Rating (decided by the evaluator, in %)	Excellent = 100	Above average = 80	Very good = 90
Weighted Rating (Weight X Rating/100)	20.0	52.0	13.5
Overall Individual Rating (A+B+C) = 20.0 + 52.0 + 13.5 = 85.5			

Note: Should the position being evaluated be that of a team leader, the proposed candidate would be evaluated twice—once for the technical position to be held and once for the team leader position.

4. Evaluating Other Factors

168. Other factors that need to be evaluated to complete the summary evaluation sheet include the qualification of the proposer (for FTPs), the approach and methodology (for FTPs and STPs), and the staffing schedule and work plan (for FTPs, STPs, and BTPs).

169. The qualifications of the proposer are determined based on the list of projects provided in the proposal chapter “Experience of the Firm.” In determining the rating for these projects (in terms of experience in similar projects and similar countries), care should be taken to determine the exact role played by the firm in the projects listed. In some cases, firms may have played a major role in project implementation and management; in others, they may merely have provided some staff. It should be clear that the experience is that of the firm and not of the experts (whose own experience is listed later in the biodata).

170. In terms of the approach and methodology,³¹ the following may be considered:

- ❑ **Understanding the Objectives** – What is the extent to which the consultant’s technical approach responds to the objectives indicated in the TOR? Does the proposal respond to all the TOR objectives, or does it fail to address some requirements?
- ❑ **Quality of Methodology** – Is the consultant’s proposed approach complete, covering all the TOR requirements? Is it logical? Is the methodology specifically tailored to the assignment? Is the proposed methodology flexible enough so that it can be easily modified, if necessary, during the assignment?
- ❑ **Innovativeness** – Does the consultant propose in detail ways to improve the implementation of the assignment without substantially changing the TOR requirements? Are the consultant’s approaches, methodologies, and knowledge state-of-the-art?
- ❑ **Work Plan** – The work plan is a bar chart showing the timing of the major activities described in the methodology and the major milestones (i.e., meetings and reports). Does the work plan adequately describe all the important activities? Is the timing of the activities appropriate and is the sequence logical, such that the outputs can be delivered when required? Are the interrelationships among the various activities appropriate and consistent with the proposed methodology?

³¹ The work plan and staffing schedule for BTPs are also covered in this section.

- Staffing Schedule (including organization chart)** – Is the format of the staffing schedule in accordance with ADB’s standard, showing the inputs of all nominated international and national experts on a quarter-monthly and monthly basis? Are the timing and duration of experts’ inputs appropriate for the proposed methodology and the activities shown on the work plan? Is the balance between the time allocations in the field and in the home office appropriate? Does the organization chart clearly show the lines of responsibility and the links among the three parties involved in the assignment: ADB, the EA, and the consultant? How many trips to the country of operations are scheduled for each expert, and is this number appropriate in terms of economy and efficiency? If the proposal is for a joint venture or an association, what is the respective role of each member, and how are the responsibilities allocated? Which is the lead firm, and how well qualified is it for the role? Does the staffing represent this responsibility?
- Counterpart Facilities** – The counterpart facilities are the consultants’ assessment of the support facilities required from the EA to implement the assignment, for example, office accommodation, local transportation, and counterpart staff support. How complete and reasonable are the consultants’ requirements? Do they reflect a good understanding of local conditions? How do they compare with the allowances made in the consultancy budget?
- Presentation of the Proposal** – Is the proposal intellectually sound, technically sound, and logical? Is it easy to read, well written, well referenced, well organized, complete, and convincing?

Each of these factors needs to be assessed versus the scoring criteria, and a rating (0–100 based on the scoring sheet) placed in the summary evaluation sheet.

5. Technical Ranking of Firms

171. The final ranking of the firms is achieved by

- applying the weights of the evaluation criteria to the individual ratings to achieve a final score for each criterion,
- totaling the final score for each criterion to get a final score for the proposal as a whole, and
- ranking the proposals in terms of highest score to lowest score.

The results of the scoring for one firm will look like Table 10. This process is carried out for each firm using the summary evaluation sheet. Firms are then ranked (first, second, third, etc.) based on their scores, and the technical evaluation is complete. (For an example of a completed summary evaluation sheet, see Figure 6.)

Table 10: Summary Evaluation Sheet for Full Technical Proposals (One Firm Only)			
Evaluation Criteria	Maximum Weight (set at the time of short-listing)	Firm's Name	
		Rating (based on the evaluation score) (%)	Score^a (maximum weight X rating)
I. Qualifications of Proposer	150		123
a. Experience in similar projects	70	90	63
b. Experience in similar geographic areas	50	90	45
c. Additional relevant subcriteria	30	50	15
II. Approach and Methodology	300		281
a. Understanding of objectives	40	100	40
b. Quality of methodology	80	90	72
c. Innovativeness	40	100	40
d. Work program	70	90	63
e. Personnel schedule	30	100	30
f. Counterpart facilities	20	90	18
g. Proposal presentation	20	90	18
III. Personnel (Area of Expertise)	550		465
International Consultants	400		345
a. Team leadership	50	89.4	45
b. Road engineer/team leader	80	87.5	70
c. Transport economist	90	88.3	79
d. Environment specialist	80	87.1	70
e. Social/poverty specialist	100	81.6	82
National Consultants	150		120
a. Road engineer	40	81.7	33
b. Transport economist	40	79.2	32
c. Environment specialist	35	78.1	27
d. Social/Poverty specialist	35	80.6	28
TOTAL	1,000		869
Ranking			

^aRounded

Figure 6: Sample Completed Summary Evaluation Sheet

ASIAN DEVELOPMENT BANK														CONFIDENTIAL	
SUMMARY EVALUATION SHEET FOR FULL TECHNICAL PROPOSALS															
[ALL SELECTION METHODS]															
TA No.-Country: Title															
EVALUATION CRITERIA	Max. Weight	FIRM A		FIRM B		FIRM C		FIRM D		FIRM E		FIRM F			
		Rating	Score	Rating	Score	Rating	Score	Rating	Score	Rating	Score	Rating	Score		
I. Qualifications of Proposer	70		65		65		65		56				65		
a. Experience in similar projects	50	90	45	90	45	90	45	80	40				90	45	
b. Experience in similar geographic areas	20	100	20	100	20	100	20	80	16				100	20	
II. Approach and Methodology	230		183		208		195		159					179	
a. Understanding of objectives	30	80	24	90	27	90	27	70	21	d e c l i n e d			80	24	
b. Quality of methodology	100	80	80	100	100	90	90	70	70					70	70
c. Innovativeness/comments on TOR	40	80	32	80	32	80	32	70	28					80	32
d. Work program	20	80	16	70	14	90	18	80	16					90	18
e. Personnel schedule	20	80	16	90	18	80	16	50	10					90	18
f. Counterpart personnel & facilities	10	70	7	80	8	70	7	70	7					90	9
g. Proposal presentation	10	80	8	90	9	50	5	70	7					80	8
III. Personnel (Areas of Expertise)	700		558.76		597.16		617.4		556.86				80	576.37	
International Consultants	420		330		355		375		332					339	
a. Team leadership *	50	74	37	75	38	91	46	84	42				75	38	
b. Water Resources Management Specialist/TL	130	74	96	81	105	97	126	78	101				75	98	
c. Water Management Associations Specialist	90	78	70	84	76	89	80	78	70				84	76	
d. Integrated Water Resources Planner	40	79	32	91	36	89	36	84	34				84	34	
e. Institutional Development Advisor	25	91	23	99	25	70	18	75	19				84	21	
f. River Engineer (Morphology)	15	91	14	89	13	91	14	70	11				100	15	
g. Agriculture Economist	20	84	17	81	16	78	16	86	17				78	16	
h. Environmental Specialist	15	99	15	87	13	70	11	71	11				83	12	
i. Resettlement Specialist	15	83	12	97	15	79	12	86	13				95	14	
j. Quality Control Specialist	20	73	15	89	18	91	18	73	15				84	17	
National Consultants	280		229		243		243		225					237	
a. Water Resources Specialist/Deputy TL	45	84	38	90	41	90	41	74	33				82	37	
b. Participatory Water Mgt. Specialist (IWMP)	7	82	6	90	6	72	5	80	6				90	6	
c. Water Management Association Specialist	40	74	30	90	36	90	36	72	29				90	36	
d. Water Resources Planner	10	82	8	74	7	90	9	80	8				90	9	
e. Institutional Advisor	15	97	15	84	13	74	11	84	13				82	12	
f. Hydrologist	5	82	4	90	5	90	5	70	4				82	4	
g. Design Engineer	5	90	5	84	4	90	5	72	4				82	4	
h. Agriculture Extension Specialist	20	74	15	82	16	88	18	90	18				80	16	
i. Fishery Development Specialist	20	84	17	82	16	90	18	82	16				90	18	
j. Agriculture Economist	8	74	6	82	7	82	7	82	7				74	6	
k. Gender and Poverty Specialist	15	82	12	90	14	90	14	84	13				90	14	
l. Environmental Specialist	15	90	14	90	14	82	12	84	13				82	12	
m. Resettlement Specialist	15	91	14	72	11	90	14	90	14				91	14	
n. Quality Control Specialist (WMA)	10	72	7	90	9	84	8	82	8				82	8	
o. Quality Control Specialist (Infrastructure)	15	72	11	90	14	72	11	82	12				82	12	
p O & M Specialist	25	84	21	90	23	90	23	82	21				82	21	
q. Financial Management Advisor	10	82	8	90	9	90	9	90	9				80	8	
TOTAL	1000		807		870		877		772					820	
Rating: Excellent - 100% Very Good - 90% Above Average - 80% Average - 70% Below Average - 50% Noncomplying - 0% Score: Maximum Weight x Rating / 100 Note: Interband ratings are not allowed in application of the above rating scale. For example, only a score of 90% or 80% can be given, not 85%, 87%, etc. However, for III. Personnel, figures in the rating column may result in interband ratings derived from the "Total Score" column of the Personnel Evaluation Sheet.															
Criteria Approved by:				Evaluation Done by:				Date Evaluated:							
CHAIRPERSON				CHAIRPERSON											

6. Reaching a Consensus at a CSC Meeting

172. The evaluation exercise described above illustrates how an individual evaluator would undertake the evaluation process. If a formal or informal CSC meeting³² is to be held, each evaluator should follow this process prior to the meeting. At the CSC meeting, the scoring and ranking of all evaluators will need to be consolidated. This is achieved through a process of consensus. The same general steps are followed, but in this case, each evaluator explains his or her reasons for the rating given in the personnel sheets and the summary evaluation sheet. A consensus is reached and a value is placed in a master personnel evaluation and summary evaluation sheet. Minutes are kept to record major issues resolved (for example, why a particular rating was given to a particular individual) and the reasons for the overall rating of each firm. This latter point is important, since various government authorities, ADB, or short-listed consulting firms themselves may query the ratings.

At this point, if the selection method is QBS, the selection process is complete, pending negotiation of a financial proposal during contract negotiations.

For consultancies in which the selection is done by the borrower, and prior review is required by the procurement plan, the results of the evaluation are first sent to ADB for clearance. Once this is received, the first-ranked firm is invited for negotiations.

For consultancies recruited directly by ADB, the highest-scoring firm will be informed of its status and invited for negotiations.

For QCBS, LCS, and FBS proposals, other steps to follow are outlined below.

7. Identifying Firms that Rate Below and Above 750 Points

173. At the end of the evaluation process, those firms that scored fewer than 750 points are identified. For consultancies for which the selection is done by the EA and prior review is required by the procurement plan, the result of the evaluation and the names of firms scoring 750 points and above are sent to ADB at this point for clearance. This normally comprises the second submission during

³² A formal CSC meeting by the borrower's CSC is required for all loan-funded and delegated TA grant funded consulting services, while a formal CSC meeting is required within ADB for TA grant-funded consulting services with estimated contracts more than \$600,000. For TA-grant funded contracts of \$600,000 or less the user division may decide to hold an informal, internal CSC meeting to evaluate proposals.

the recruitment process. Documents required for submission include

- the summary evaluation sheet highlighting any proposal that scored below 750 points,
- a personnel evaluation sheet for each proposal,
- comments on the strengths and weaknesses of each proposal, and
- minutes of the evaluation meeting.

Financial evaluation continues after clearance has been received.

174. The EA (in the case of loans) or COSO (in the case of TA grants) informs firms scoring below 750 points that their proposals have been unsuccessful and their financial proposals are then returned unopened. At the same time, firms scoring 750 points and above are informed not only of this but also of the date and time of the opening of financial proposals. This is normally at least 2 weeks after the notification date to allow any consultants who wish to send a representative to the proposal opening to do so.

C. Evaluating Financial Proposals

1. Public Opening of Financial Proposals

175. Financial proposals for proposals that score 750 points and above in the technical evaluation are opened publicly. Those attending should sign an attendance form, and the following procedure should be used:

- The score of each technical proposal that met the minimum mark of 750 is read aloud.
- Each financial proposal is inspected to confirm that it has remained sealed and unopened.
- Each financial proposal is opened, and the names of each qualified consultant along with the total price shown in the consultant's financial proposal are read aloud.
- A rate sheet is distributed that indicates the applicable currency exchange rate(s) as of the date of submission of the proposals, which will be used to compute US dollar equivalents during evaluation of the financial proposals.
- The likely schedule for contract negotiations and commencement of the assignment is announced.
- A written record, is made of the proposal opening, detailing the results.

176. After the opening, all the other information in the financial proposals is to be kept confidential. Whether they have attended the opening or not, all qualified firms are sent a letter informing them of the technical scores and total prices proposed by each qualified firm.

177. For borrower-recruited consultancies, the chairperson of the CSC or a representative thereof normally undertakes these steps. For ADB-recruited consultancies, a representative of COSO performs these steps.

2. Verification of Financial Proposals

178. The financial proposal submitted by the firm is referred to as the “gross financial proposal” (GFP). During the verification process, GFPs are first checked for compliance with the data sheet. Each GFP must include provisional sums and contingencies in the amounts specified on the data sheet, and the validity period of the proposals must accord with the validity period set down in the data sheet.

179. A review is then made to ensure that the figures provided in each GFP are consistent with the details of the corresponding technical proposal (e.g., staffing schedule inputs, number and duration of field trips, applicable per diems, etc.). The following are taken into account:

- If the inputs shown in the GFP for any expert do not match those shown on the staffing schedule in the technical proposal, the staffing schedule inputs shall prevail and adjustments will be made to the financial proposal accordingly.
- If an expert included in the technical proposal is omitted from the GFP, then the cost of that expert is included in the firm’s financial proposal at the highest rate for that position from among all the financial proposals.
- In the case of TA, a minimum of person-months required is normally included in the data sheet. If the total international and/or national inputs shown on the staffing schedule are below those indicated in the data sheet, an adjustment will be made for the missing person-months using the remuneration rate shown in the GFP for individual international and/or national experts.
- The unit rates used for each expert will be fixed, and it is not possible to change these rates during contract negotiations.
- If any of the essential out-of-pocket expense items are not priced in the GFP, the consultant will be expected to bear this cost at its own expense during implementation of the contract.

- ❑ If the number of international trips and per diems calculated from the staffing schedule does not match the quantities for these items shown in the GFP, no adjustments will be made to the GFP inputs for the purpose of evaluation. However, no additional costs will be permitted for such omissions during contract negotiations.

Finally, a review is made for computational errors. The proposal amount is converted into US dollars using the exchange rate sheet issued on the date of the public opening of the financial proposals. The final amount is considered as the “gross evaluated financial proposal” (GEFP).

180. For FBS and LCS, the selection process stops at this point. Under FBS, the firm with the highest technical score and a GEFP within the budget³³ will be invited to negotiate. Under LCS, the firm with the lowest GEFP scoring 750 points and above will be invited to negotiate. If required by the procurement plan, submissions are made to ADB prior to invitations being issued. These will comprise the

- ❑ minutes of the public opening of financial proposals,
- ❑ financial evaluation report,
- ❑ rankings, and
- ❑ minutes of the financial evaluation meetings.

3. Determining the Financial Score for QCBS

181. For evaluations using QCBS, if the data sheet for the RFP indicates a **maximum** contract budget for the consulting services, GEFPs are expected to be within this budget. If the GEFP of any firm exceeds the budget, the proposal will be considered financially nonresponsive and will be allocated a financial score of zero. However, if the data sheet indicates an **estimated** budget, consultants will not be penalized for exceeding it and their financial proposals will be considered.

182. Once any nonresponsive financial proposals have been identified, the remaining GEFPs will be converted into “net evaluated financial proposals” (NEFPs). NEFPs include only variable cost items such as remuneration and out of pocket expenditures. Fixed cost items such as provisional sums and contingencies are not included. NEFPs are calculated by subtracting the provisional sums and contingencies (noncompetitive components) shown in the data sheet from the GEFPs.

³³ After adjustment for any oversight or errors.

183. The lowest NEFP is then given a maximum score of 1,000 points. This is then used as a basis to calculate the score of the other financial proposals. The financial score for each proposal is inversely proportional to its NEFP, that is, the higher the NEFP, the lower the financial score. The financial score is computed as follows:

Financial Score = NEFP of the lowest priced proposal divided by NEFP of the proposal under consideration, multiplied by 1,000

An example is shown below:

NEFP of lowest priced proposal = \$799,000

NEFP of second lowest priced proposal = \$850,000

Financial score of lowest NEFP = $\$799,000 / \$799,000 \times 1,000 = 1,000$

Financial score of second lowest priced NEFP
= $\$799,000 / \$850,000 \times 1,000 = 940$

Using this methodology, all proposals are given a financial score.

D. Ranking Proposals and Inviting for Contract Negotiations

184. Once the financial score for each qualifying technical proposal is calculated, the whole evaluation process can be completed. This is done by applying a weight to the technical score and a weight to the financial score (which together add up to 100%) and adding them together to achieve a final score. The normal weight used for the technical component is 80%. The normal weight for the financial component is 20%. However, the option to use ratios of either 70:30 or 90:10 exists, depending on the joint decision taken by the TA fact-finding mission or the loan appraisal mission and the borrower as outlined in the procurement plan.

185. A typical calculation for a proposal in which the technical score is 830 points and the financial score is 940 points is as follows:

Technical score: $830 \times 80\% = 664$

Financial score: $940 \times 20\% = 188$

Final score: technical score (664) + financial score (188) = **852**

(The final scores computed for each technical and each financial proposal are rounded to the nearest whole number.)

186. Once the final scores for each proposal have been calculated, they can be ranked from highest to lowest. In the event two or more proposals have the same scores in the final ranking of proposals, the proposal with the highest technical score will be ranked higher and the next highest technical score will be ranked lower. After the final ranking, the first-ranked consultant will be invited for contract negotiations.

187. In the case of EA-recruited consultancies, prior approval by ADB for inviting the first-ranked firm to negotiations may be required by the procurement plan. If so, the following documents are required:

- the minutes of the public opening of financial proposals,
- a financial verification report,
- the rankings, and
- the minutes of the financial evaluation meetings.

188. In the case of ADB recruitment, for contracts over \$600,000, COSO sends its evaluation report to CSC members for endorsement. Any CSC member who wishes to discuss the evaluation may request a CSC meeting. The user division within ADB informs the EA of the name of the first-ranked consultant prior to inviting the firm for negotiations. A representative of the EA is also normally invited to attend. The role of the representative will be as an observer and to confirm the support that the EA can provide during TA implementation. An appropriate amount of funding should be placed in the TA budget to accommodate the EA representative's attendance.

Self-Study Questionnaire – Chapter VI

1. **Q.** Who is responsible for evaluating consultants' proposals?
 - A. The borrower's CSC for consulting services funded by loans and delegated TA.
 - A CSC convened by ADB for consulting services funded by a TA grant when the estimated contract value is over \$600,000.
 - The user division for consulting services funded by a TA grant when the estimated contract value is \$600,000 or less.

2. **Q.** What are the four basic documents used for technical evaluation of proposals?
 - A. the proposals themselves,
 - a summary evaluation sheet,
 - a personnel evaluation sheet, and
 - a scoring table.

3. **Q.** What are the six scoring categories, and what percentage is attributed to each?
 - A. Excellent – 100%, Very Good – 90%, Above Average – 80%, Average – 70%, Below Average – 50%, and Noncomplying – 0%.

4. **Q.** In the proposals, where is information on the project-related experience of each expert documented?
 - A. In Section 12 of the standard ADB CV form.

5. **Q.** Why is evaluating the project-related experience of each expert particularly important?
 - A. The scoring allocation for personnel ranges from 500 to 900 points (depending on the type of proposal), and project-related experience accounts for 60–70% of this amount.

6. **Q.** How is the overall individual rating for each expert calculated?
 - A. The weight for each of the three factors (general qualifications, project-related experience, and overseas/country experience) is multiplied by the rating given for each factor to arrive at a weighted rating for each factor.
 - These are then added together to get an overall individual rating.

7. **Q.** Where is the overall individual rating recorded?
 - A. In the summary evaluation sheet under “personnel.”

8. **Q.** In evaluating approach and methodology, what factors should be assessed?
- A. the consultant’s understanding of the objectives,
 the quality of methodology,
 the degree of innovativeness,
 the quality of the work plan,
 the quality of the staffing schedule (including the organization chart),
 the requirement for counterpart facilities, and
 the proposal presentation.
9. **Q.** On the summary evaluation sheet, how is a firm’s score for each criterion derived?
- A. By multiplying the maximum rate (set at the time of short-listing) by the rating given by the evaluator.
10. **Q.** How is a firm’s total technical score derived?
- A. By adding up the scores for each criterion on the summary evaluation sheet.
11. **Q.** How are firms ranked?
- A. From highest to lowest depending on their total technical score.
12. **Q.** Once firms are ranked, the selection process is complete for the QBS system. What still needs to be done under the QCBS, FBS, and LCS systems?
- A. Firms rated below 750 points are identified and (after receiving clearance from ADB in the case of loan-funded consultancies) they are informed that they have not qualified.
 Financial proposals from the remaining firms are then opened and evaluated.
13. **Q.** What information is provided during the public opening of financial proposals?
- A. technical scores of firms scoring 750 points and above,
 total price of the financial proposals,
 rate sheet, and
 schedule for contract negotiations and the commencement of the assignment.
14. **Q.** Is the financial proposal accepted outright?
- A. No, it is first checked for consistency with the data sheet and the technical proposal, and for arithmetical errors and converted into US dollars to arrive at a GEFP.

15. **Q.** Under QCBS, how is the financial score for each firm determined?
- A. For assignments for which the data sheet in the RFP indicates a **maximum** budget, GEFPs exceeding this amount are considered financially nonresponsive and are given a financial score of zero. For assignments where the data sheet indicates an **estimated** budget, GEFPs that exceed this amount will still be evaluated.
- Once any nonresponsive proposals have been identified, the financial scores for the remaining financial proposals are calculated. This is equal to the lowest priced NEFP divided by the NEFP of the financial proposal under consideration, multiplied by 1,000.
16. **Q.** Under QCBS, how are proposals finally ranked?
- A. For each proposal the technical score is multiplied by a weighting (normally 80%), the financial score is multiplied by another weighting (normally 20%), and the two are added together.
- The firms are then ranked from the highest to the lowest score, based on the combined ratings.
17. **Q.** Are other ratios possible?
- A. Yes. If considered appropriate, ratios of 70:30 or 90:10 can be used if earlier agreed upon in the procurement plan or the TA Board paper.
18. **Q.** After firms are ranked, can the highest ranked firm be invited for contract negotiations?
- A. Yes, although prior review by ADB of the selection may be needed for some loan-funded consultancies and delegated TA if required in the procurement plan.

