

# Project Administration Instructions

PAI 2.02, Part E  
Revised in August 2009  
Page 1 of 15

---

## RECRUITING CONSULTING FIRMS PART E: FOR LOAN/GRANT PROJECTS AND DELEGATED TA GRANTS, AND EA-ADMINISTERED TRUST FUNDS

### A. Introduction

1. This part of project administration instruction (PAI) 2.02 provides policies and procedures for recruiting consulting firms for assignments under Asian Development Bank (ADB)-financed loan projects. Also read PAI 2.01, which provides general guidelines on recruiting consultants, and the other parts of PAI 2.02, which provide further guidelines on recruiting consulting firms.

### B. Policies

2. Borrowers normally recruit and supervise the consultants for ADB-financed loan projects. The same procedures are followed for projects funded by Asian Development Fund grants (as opposed to technical assistance [TA] grants funded from the Technical Assistance Special Fund, Japan Special Fund, and other trust funds – for which the procedures under PAI 2.02, Part D and PAI 2.03, Part C apply).

3. Borrowers must comply with ADB's requirements and follow ADB's procedures. The policies and main procedures are set out in the *Guidelines on the Use of Consultants by Asian Development Bank and Its Borrowers (Guidelines)* and are similar to ADB's procedures for recruiting consulting firms for TA (see PAI 2.02, Part D). The relevant financing agreement states the roles and responsibilities of the borrower, ADB, and any other parties involved and the procedures they will follow. Section 47 of the *Operations Manual J2/BP* provides more information. If a borrower does not select the consultants in accordance with the *Guidelines* and the relevant financing agreement, ADB does not finance the consulting assignment under the loan or grant. In these cases ADB will declare misprocurement, and usually cancels the financing. In appropriate cases, ADB may permit reissuing the request for proposals (RFP) after declaring misprocurement.

4. During loan appraisal, loan inception, and each subsequent mission, the user division officer and other mission members are expected to explain and clarify ADB's procedures to the borrower, especially the executing agency (EA). The country coordination and regional cooperation divisions and the regional and resident missions may also explain and clarify ADB's requirements from time to time.

5. When recruiting consultants with ADB funds, borrowers are expected to promptly recruit consultants who will provide high-quality services. The normal means of selection is through competitive bidding among qualified firms. PAI 2.02, Part A provides more information on the approved selection methods. In carrying out the selection, while ensuring that quality considerations are paramount, borrowers should, whenever possible, short list consulting firms from different geographic regions in order to spread the opportunities to work on consulting assignments among ADB's member countries. Borrowers may specifically recruit national consultants from their countries, when national consultants are qualified for the assignments.

6. All the parties under ADB-financed consulting services contracts must observe the highest ethical standards. If ADB determines that representatives of a borrower, a consultant, or a beneficiary engaged in corrupt, fraudulent, collusive, or coercive practices during consultant selection or the execution of a

contract, ADB will take the appropriate steps set out in paragraph 1.23 of the *Guidelines*. Staff should refer allegations of corrupt, fraudulent, collusive, or coercive practices to the Office of the General Auditor, Integrity Division.

### **C. EA Capacity Assessment**

7. ADB requires that an assessment of an EA's capacity to undertake the recruitment envisaged under the project be undertaken during processing. The purposes of this capacity assessment are to

- identify the capacity, procurement, and organizational constraints that will hinder effective project implementation, and agree upon an action plan with the EA to address these constraints;
- determine the overall recruitment risk and put in place appropriate review and supervision processes and thresholds to mitigate those risks; and
- to the maximum extent possible and sensible, ensure that recruitment is undertaken by the regular line units within the EA, agreeing upon action plan measures to strengthen and support these units when necessary, thereby ensuring that EA capacity is built beyond the project's lifecycle.

As the assessment is in part a tool to manage risk, the primary responsibility for the assessment is with ADB. The EA and borrower must also be actively involved in the process, because they should own the resulting action plan. For a full description of conducting EA capacity assessment, refer to the Central Operations Services Office's (COSO) *Guide on Procurement Capacity Assessment*, (see COSO online, Procurement Capacity Assessment).

### **D. Procurement Plan**

8. EAs are required, prior to loan negotiations, to prepare an outline for the project and a detailed plan covering the first 18 months of procurement activity. The procurement plan (see COSO online, Procurement Plan) will be annexed to the minutes of loan negotiations. Within 1 year after the date of loan effectiveness, the EA should submit a revised procurement plan to ADB for approval that captures all ongoing procurement and that planned for the following 18 months. The procurement plan should be updated annually for the duration of the project.

9. The purposes of the procurement are to

- provide a single point of reference for the oversight and supervision of recruitment,
- create a tool that allows for process and review thresholds to be changed if necessary over the lifetime of a project,
- focus the EA on the need to plan and manage recruitment,
- provide a synopsis of the recruitment opportunities to providers of consulting services, and
- increase levels of transparency.

10. Preparation of the procurement plan is expected to increase borrower ownership, including borrower participation in determining the consultancy requirements as well as producing and endorsing the terms of reference (TOR), and to provide more focus on the identification of national consultants. The procurement plan should detail the prior review, post review, and supervision arrangements initially

determined through the capacity assessment. The EA (or ADB) may propose changes to these arrangements to reflect changes in capacity subject to the approval of ADB.

11. The procurement plan should detail, as a minimum, a brief description of the consulting packages, selection method, types of technical proposal, budget for each package, outline TOR when possible, the positions to be held by national versus international experts, a definition of prior review and/or post review, and recruitment schedules. However, for sector projects, multitranche financing programs, and other projects that include subprojects to be finalized during project implementation, the procurement plan need only provide indicative consulting packages and threshold values. The procurement plan may be updated during the course of implementation. For a full description of the procurement planning process, refer to COSO's *Procurement Plan Guide*, (see COSO online, Procurement Plan).

#### **E. Deciding Whether ADB Will Help Select the Consultant**

12. ADB's policy is to develop the capacity of new EAs. When requested, ADB will provide staff to help the EA with consultant selection. ADB staff assisting in the selection process may attend the selection process as observers.

13. On other occasions, ADB may be requested to undertake the selection process itself in place of the EA. When the borrower requests ADB in writing to take responsibility for selecting a consultant, the user division consults COSO and submits the request to the head of the user department for approval. The borrower must provide adequate justification for such a request and explain why such requested ADB assistance is necessary. If this is done after the loan is approved, COSO informs the Board of the change in the implementation arrangements in the quarterly portfolio update. In all such cases, ADB normally takes responsibility only for selecting the consultant. The EA retains responsibility for negotiating a contract with the consultant and supervising the consultant's services.

14. ADB's proposed participation in recruitment should be set out in the procurement plan and the report and recommendation of the President (RRP).

#### **F. Participation of National Consultants**

15. When qualified national consultants are available, the EA's procurement plan may define positions for national consultants from the project country.

16. When the user division officer is helping the EA to prepare its procurement plan, the officer discusses the availability and qualifications of national consultants with the EA and relevant local organizations and checks the information in the Consultant Management System (CMS), ADB's data on consulting firms and individual consultants.

17. When the user division officer and the EA agree that national consulting firms can handle some of the positions, the user division officer may assist the EA in defining which positions are appropriate for international and national consultants and in deciding whether the national consultants will be recruited separately or be selected in association with an international firm.

18. Borrowers may elect to finance the costs of assignments defined for national consultants from their own resources as part of the borrowers' contribution. However, when ADB provides local cost

financing under a loan, the borrower may also use these funds to finance part or all of the assignments identified for national consultants. In assisting the EA to formulate the procurement plan, the user division officer may also assist the EA with the preparation of the budget for international and national consultants for incorporation in the procurement plan.

#### **G. Selection Methods**

19. EAs use six methods to select consulting firms, as outlined in full in PAI 2.02, Part A:

- quality- and cost-based selection (QCBS), which is ADB's preferred selection method;
- quality-based selection (QBS);
- fixed-budget selection (FBS);
- least-cost selection (LCS);
- consultants' qualifications selection; and
- single-source selection, which is used in exceptional cases when not using a competitive selection method is justified.

The proposed selection method for each assignment is included in the procurement plan. If the EA will use a method other than QCBS, this should be adequately justified in the RRP. The procedures to be followed for loan/grant-funded consulting services using the six selection methods are outlined in Appendix 2.

#### **H. Types of Technical Proposals**

20. EAs use three types of technical proposals to select consulting firms as described in detail in PAI 2.02, Part C:

- Full technical proposals are one of the default types for contract budgets over \$1,000,000. They may also be used for smaller contracts if considered necessary and sound justification is presented in the procurement plan.
- Simplified technical proposals are the default type when the contract budget is more than \$600,000 and equal to or less than \$1,000,000. With adequate justification in the procurement plan and the RRP they may also be used when the contract budget is more than \$1,000,000.
- Biodata technical proposals are the default type when the contract budget is \$600,000 or less but may be used for contracts of higher amounts if adequate justification is provided in the procurement plan and the RRP.

The user division officer states the proposed type of technical proposal in the RRP. If proposing that the EA use a type of proposal other than the default, the user division officer explains why.

#### **I. Advance Contracting**

21. To engage the consultants without delay, the EA shall use advance contracting as normal procedure provided (i) MRM or management approves the further processing of the project; (ii) the terms of reference and budget for the assignment are sufficiently well-framed to permit consultants to submit informed expressions of interest (EOIs) and, if shortlisted, technical and financial proposals; and (iii) COSO has endorsed the Project Procurement Plan relating to the recruitment of consultants. This means

that, provided the recruitment advertisement has been posted and expressions of interest (EOIs) received, the EA may draft a short list of consultants, request proposals, and evaluate them. However, the EA may not sign a contract with a firm before the financing agreement is effective, unless Management has approved retroactive financing. The user division officer should advise the EA that advance contracting is the normal procedure, and that ADB's support of advance contracting does not commit ADB to approve the loan project or to finance the recruitment costs.

22. The EA should start contract negotiations with the selected firm as soon as the project is approved by the Board when effectivity of the financing agreement is expected in the immediate or near future. If retroactive financing has not been approved for the project, the contract should not be signed until the financing agreement becomes effective.

#### **J. Advertising the Consulting Assignments**

23. The user division posts a notice describing each consulting assignment in the *Business Opportunities* section of ADB's website before short-listing. The minimum posting time for each assignment is 30 days. The website includes a link to a standard expression of interest (EOI) form for loans that firms can download, fill out, and send directly to the EA.

24. The EA may, in addition, advertise in local newspapers and international trade publications. In order to do this, a standard template on consultant recruitment notice is provided by ADB to the EA at the time of appraisal. This template contains an address (preferably including an email address) at the EA to which interested firms can write to obtain a standard EOI form.

#### **K. Consultants Expressing Interest**

25. To ensure that all data required to assess firms for the short list are obtained at the required level of detail, EAs are required to request EOIs in standard EOI form. As a guide, a sample standard EOI form is available on ADB's website.<sup>1</sup> The standard EOI form may be submitted in hard or soft (electronic) copy. Thus all firms will be assessed for short-listing on the basis of uniform documents containing the same type of information. National regulation and/or the EA may require additional information including such items as company registration, tax reference numbers, etc., to be included at the EOI stage. In such cases, information can be included as an additional appendix to the sample standard EOI form.

#### **L. Joint Ventures and Associations Between or Among Consultants**

26. EAs receive EOIs from individual consulting firms and from groups of firms. Consulting firms may join together with each other to complement their respective areas of expertise, or for other reasons. This collaborative effort can take the form of a joint venture or an association. In a joint venture, all members are jointly and severally liable under a contract entered into with the EA. Under an association or consortium which is not a joint venture, the consulting firms that are members are not jointly or severally liable to the EA, but are required to enter into an agreement or exchange letters of association on terms and conditions that are mutually agreed. The lead firm in an association or consortium is liable to the EA and accordingly contracts directly with the EA.

---

<sup>1</sup> <http://www.adb.org/Consulting/toolkit-template.asp>

27. When expressing interest, (i) an association must nominate one firm as the lead firm and this firm interacts directly with ADB as the sole formal representative of the association; and (ii) a joint venture must nominate one firm as the lead or managing joint venture partner. The qualifications of all firms participating in a joint venture or an association are assessed during short-listing, and if circumstances so justify, the experience and qualification of the lead firm or managing joint venture partner may be given more weight. To determine the nationality of the joint venture or association for the purpose of short-listing, ADB uses the nationality of the lead firm/managing partner of the joint venture or association. In the absence of exceptional circumstances, if more than one EOI is submitted by an international JV partner or associate firm, the most qualified EOI will be selected for short-listing and the less qualified EOIs will be disregarded.

28. The qualifications and experience of proposed subconsultants (either individual experts or firms) will not be considered in determining whether a firm is eligible for shortlisting. Therefore, proposed subconsultants should not be identified in the EOI<sup>2</sup>.

29. Shortlisted consultants may only submit one proposal. A national firm (which is not a lead firm) that is a JV partner or an associate firm included in a shortlist may, however, participate in more than one proposal. For purposes of this provision, a firm or entity is considered 'national' if it is incorporated or registered in the country in which the assignment is to be carried out. Once short-listed, a joint venture or association may take on additional non-shortlisted partners or associates to broaden its range of expertise and experience, but cannot drop or replace existing partners and/or associates in the absence of exceptional circumstances. ADB shall in its sole discretion assess whether such exceptional circumstances exist in any particular case based on written representation by the shortlisted firm concerned. Firms, joint ventures and associations (i.e. lead firms and each associate firm identified in the relevant EOI) that formally withdraw from a short-list are permitted to join as associates or JV partners in proposals of other shortlisted firms provided the relevant Request for Proposal (RFP) permits and on such terms and conditions as specified in the RFP.

#### **M. Preparing the Long List**

30. ADB may assist the EA in selecting a short list. It is the responsibility of the user division, consulting with COSO as necessary, to respond to (i) EA questions and queries throughout the consultant selection, recruitment and supervision process; and (ii) queries or complaints from consultants regarding EA handling of the consultant selection, recruitment and supervision process for loans, grants and delegated TA.

31. The EA normally includes all the qualified consultants that expressed interest on a long list. The EA may also ask the user division officer for additional qualified consulting firms from the CMS. The EA decides whether to include any of these consultants on the longlist and may also add other experienced consultants to the list.

32. The EA then evaluates those consultants on the long list. This may be done through a consultant selection committee (CSC) set up by the borrower and including staff of the EA, or by a CSC set up within the EA, depending on the procedure and regulations in the country concerned.

#### **N. Evaluating EOIs and Preparing the Short List**

---

<sup>2</sup> A 'subconsultant' is either an individual expert or a firm with whom a lead or associate firm or a joint venture, proposes to sub-contract part of the services during implementation of the assignment.

33. Four criteria are typically evaluated:

- Eligibility of the consulting entity
- Management competence (20%)
- Technical competence (60%)
- Geographic competence (20%)

The above weightings are indicative, actual weightings may be tailored to the scope of the assignment. The following paragraphs set out the approach for EOI short-listing evaluation that is strongly recommended, particularly for higher-value assignments<sup>3</sup>, Consultants' Qualifications Selection (CQS) and Indefinite Delivery Contracts (IDCs).

Appendix 8 is an EOI evaluation sheet. This applies a similar methodology to that used for evaluation of technical proposals. The sheet differentiates between evaluation of an EOI submitted by a single firm, an association or joint venture. Whereas overall weighting may be tailored to the assignment, an overall weighting norm of 65% for the lead firm and 35% for associates or partners is proposed for associations and joint ventures. Unless specified, the decision to opt for an association or a joint venture is a commercial decision taken by the firm.

34. Eligibility is a declaration by the firm, association or joint venture confirming: (i) an understanding of the terms of reference (TOR), (ii) no involvement by the firm, association or joint venture or any part-time or full-time experts employed, in preparing the TOR, (iii) an understanding that any involvement in preparing the TORs for any ensuing assignment will result in disqualification from short-listing and/or participation in such follow-on assignment. It is mandatory for the firm, association or joint venture to sign the declaration. No scores are assigned; this is a pass/fail criterion.

35. Management competence section (maximum of two pages) requires: (i) the firm, association or joint venture to designate senior management from the lead firm, who will assume overall responsibility for the consulting assignment, and to outline the relevant background and experience of senior management to the assignment's TOR, (ii) an association or joint venture to outline the rationale for, and benefits of, the collaboration to the assignment's TOR, (iii) an explanation by the firm, association or joint venture of the proposed management arrangement, covering contract supervision, client liaison, logistics, team management, etc., (iv) an explanation of the firm's, association's or joint venture's quality control procedures particularly in relation to the assignment, including performance monitoring, reporting, handling of complaints, replacement of non-performing experts etc. Evaluation should focus on the underlying sub-criteria:

Sub Criteria	Norm Weighting for Single Firm
Background and experience of senior management relevant to the TOR	10%
Proposed management coordination	5%
Proposed quality control	5%

<sup>3</sup> This applies to assignments over \$600,000, unless adequate justification for a higher threshold is provided based on EA capacity and project considerations.

For associations and joint ventures, of the total 20% weighting, 15% would be applied to the lead firm and 5% to the associates/partners.

36. Technical competence section (maximum of two pages, supported by a maximum of 10 project sheets) requires the firm, association or joint venture to summarize the relevance of its background and experience to the assignment's TOR. This will be supported by reference to past projects as illustrated by project sheets included under Appendix 1 of the EOI. The project sheets will need to define clearly the exact role (lead, associate, partner or providing one expert) of the firm, associates or partners on each nominated project. Evaluation should focus on the underlying sub-criteria:

<b>Sub Criteria</b>	<b>Norm Weighting for Single Firm</b>
Firm's specialization vis-à-vis the sectoral focus of the assignment	10%
Firm's experience vis à vis the assignment's TOR	30%
Number of similar projects undertaken where firm was lead partner	15%
Number of similar projects undertaken where firm was associate or JV partner	5%

For associations and joint ventures, of the total 60% weighting, 40% would be applied to the lead firm and 20% to the associates/partners

37. Geographic competence section (maximum of one page) requires the firm, association or joint venture to highlight its country/regional experience. This may include experience on assignments in different sectors or specializations to the assignment for which the EOI is being submitted. This section should demonstrate a history of working experience in the country/region in question and an appreciation of local cultural sensitivities, ability to manage multi-cultural teams, network and develop capacity of national /regional consultants as well as highlighting useful supporting features such as local representation, local offices, and local community initiatives. Evaluation should focus on the underlying sub-criteria:

<b>Sub Criteria</b>	<b>Norm Weighting for Single Firm</b>
Firm's country experience	10%
Firm's regional experience	5%
Permanent presence / local office	5%

For associations and joint ventures, of the total 20% weighting, 10% would be applied to the lead firm and 10% to the associates/partners.

38. To ensure a wide geographic spread for projects requiring international consulting input, the short list should contain firms from a broad range of ADB member countries. Short lists should not include more than two firms from any one country, and adequate justification should be given if two firms are proposed. In addition, there should be at least one firm from a developing member country (DMC), unless no qualified DMC firm has expressed interest or one cannot be identified from the CMS.

## O. Preparing the RFP

39. The EA next prepares the RFP documents in ADB's format. Templates for this are available on the ADB website. The information in the RFP includes the

- names of the short-listed consultants;
- selection method the EA will use;
- detailed TOR;
- estimates of the total international and national person-months and the costs; and the required expertise, data, facilities, services, and reports;
- type of technical proposal requested and instructions on how to prepare that type of proposal;
- evaluation criteria for the technical proposals;
- EA's budget for the assignment, including any provisional sums or contingencies;
- deadline for the EA to receive the proposals; and
- addresses of the EA and ADB to which the consultants must send copies of the proposals.

40. The RFP also explains the following:

- The successful consultant must disqualify itself, its affiliates, and its associates from participating in the project in any other capacity. For example, firms of independent consulting engineers are limited to the role of consulting engineers and must not also act as contractors or manufacturers.
- The EA may exclude a consultant if it is found to have a conflict of interest (*Guidelines* paragraphs 1.10-1.11) or if the EA determines that a consultant engaged in corrupt, fraudulent, collusive, or coercive practices (*Guidelines* paragraph 1.23).
- Firms that have expressed interest as a part of a joint venture or association will be short-listed as such, and all firms that indicated their participation are expected to be represented in the proposal. Additional firms may be included in the joint venture or association when the proposal is submitted (see Part L, paragraph 29).

41. The RFP also includes instructions on submitting financial proposals and other procedures that are specific to the selection method the EA will use. They include a data sheet, which, among other information, states the EA's budget for the assignment. For QCBS, this is either a maximum budget or an estimated budget<sup>4</sup>. A maximum budget is shown when costs are certain and it is unlikely that financial proposals will exceed this budget. An estimated budget is shown when cost estimates are not certain and it is possible that financial proposals may exceed it (see PAI 2.02, Part A, paragraph 12). When preparing the RFP, the EA should ascertain that all costs that may be included in the consultants' contract are included in the estimated contract budget published in the data sheet. These should include (besides consulting fees) per diems, travel costs, the costs of any vehicles or equipment specifically associated with the consultancy, and any special items (for example the cost of recruiting nongovernment organizations or providing training). Any fixed costs such as provisional sums or contingencies should be clearly identified.

---

<sup>4</sup> For QBS, the budget specified in the Data Sheet is an estimate.

42. For QCBS in which the data sheet indicates a maximum budget and for FBS, the RFP will clearly state that financial proposals must be within this budget; otherwise the financial proposal will be considered nonresponsive and will not be awarded any points during the financial evaluation. For QCBS in which the data sheet indicates an estimated budget, firms will not be penalized if the financial proposal exceeds the budget.

**P. Reviewing the EA's Short-listing Documents and Request for Proposals**

43. If the EA is required to submit its short-listing documents to ADB for approval, the EA submits its documents in ADB's standard format, updated from the most recent version available on ADB's website or provided by the ADB user division officer. The user division reviews the EA's short-listing criteria and short list, to make sure that the criteria are reasonable and rational relative to the scope of work, the TOR, and the budget available and that all the firms are technically qualified and have a reasonable geographic spread.

44. The ADB user division also reviews the RFP, paying particular attention to

- TOR and background information provided to ensure that they are in line with the project scope and consultant duties spelled out in the RFP and loan agreement;
- EA's budget for the assignment to ensure a realistic level of remuneration, per diem rates, and out-of-pocket expenditures; relevant and adequate provisional sums; and adequate contingencies;
- selection method, the type of technical proposal, and whether these are in line with the recommendations in the procurement plan;
- validity and appropriateness of the criteria for evaluating the technical proposals,
- changes made to the draft contract if any (which must be clearly identified by the EA and user division); and
- proposed timing for consultant recruitment illustrated in the CRAM frame.

45. Once the documents are received, the user division reviews them, identifies any issues and then sends its comments to COSO for further review. COSO then completes the review and offers comments for transmittal to the EA within a reasonable time. If necessary, the user division or COSO may consult the Office of the General Counsel (OGC) on key issues. If there are outstanding issues, COSO or the user division may also request a CSC meeting to review the documents. The user division informs the EA of any deficiencies, shortcomings, or gaps in the documents and requests them to be revised accordingly. Once the documents are in order, the user division informs the EA of its approval and provides clearance for the EA to proceed with the issuance of the RFP.

46. The user division staff concerned should ensure that all documentation listed in the relevant checklist is in order and in conformity with ADB's standard templates, and that the user division assessments and recommendations in connection with review of the EA's short-listing, technical and financial evaluation have been undertaken in accordance with applicable ADB procedures and guidelines. It is the responsibility of the user division to identify issues of concern or potential concern to the relevant COSO officer at the time of, or prior to, submission of the relevant checklist. In addition to checking the completeness and consistency of the relevant checklist submitted and the assessments and recommendations made by the user division, COSO will undertake a detailed review of all documents submitted by the EA.

47. Based on the review done by the user division and COSO, COSO completes a checklist (see Appendix 4) to document the main areas of review and concerned COSO director signs the checklist for record.

**Q. Requesting Proposals**

48. The EA then sends RFPs to the consultants on the short list. The consultants acknowledge receiving the RFPs and any notices from the EA of extensions to the deadline for receiving proposals. The consultants also advise whether they intend to submit proposals. If there are any queries from the consultants, the EA must provide all the short-listed consultants with the same information without disclosing the source of the query.

**R. Evaluating the Technical Proposals**

49. After receiving the consultants' proposals, the EA rejects any it receives after the stated deadline. The EA then establishes a CSC, which evaluates the technical proposals using the evaluation criteria approved by ADB (see section N). The CSC prepares minutes of its evaluation meeting and a report on its evaluation, describing the strengths and weaknesses of each proposal.

**S. Reviewing the EA's Technical Evaluation Documents**

50. If the EA's procurement plan requires it to submit its technical evaluation documents to ADB for approval, the EA submits its documents in ADB's standard format available on the ADB website or provided by the user division officer. The documents include

- a summary evaluation sheet highlighting any proposal that scored less than 750 points out of 1,000,
- a personnel evaluation sheet for each proposal,
- comments on the strengths and weaknesses of each proposal, and
- minutes of the evaluation meeting(s).

51. ADB's user division reviews the documents and sends the documents and its comments to COSO for further review. COSO then completes the review and offers comments for transmittal to the EA within a reasonable time. The user division informs the EA of any deficiencies, shortcomings, or gaps in the documents and requests them to be revised accordingly. Once the documents are in order, the user division informs the EA of its approval. If there are outstanding issues, COSO or the user division may request a CSC meeting to review the documents.

52. Based on the review done by the user division and COSO, COSO completes a checklist to document the main areas of review and the COSO director concerned signs the checklist (see Appendix 5) for record.

**T. Requesting and Evaluating the Financial Proposals**

53. The procedure for requesting and evaluating financial proposals varies depending on the selection method. PAI 2.02, Part A provides details.

#### **U. Reviewing the EA's Financial Evaluation and Overall Ranking Documents**

54. If the EA's procurement plan requires it to submit its financial evaluation and final ranking documents to ADB for approval, the EA submits its documents in ADB's standard format downloaded from ADB website or provided by the user division officer. The user division reviews the documents, provides comments, and identifies any issues to COSO for further review. COSO provides its comments within a reasonable time period. For bids under QCBS, FBS, and LCS, the documents should be carefully checked to ensure that inadvertent mistakes have not been made when adjusting the original financial bids to the evaluated financial price. A CSC may be formed to review the documents and resolve the issue. Prior to approval, the EA is informed of any deficiencies, shortcomings, or gaps in the documents and is requested to revise them accordingly. The user division informs the EA of ADB's approval once outstanding issues are resolved.

55. Based on the review done by the user division and COSO, COSO completes a checklist to document the main areas of review and concerned COSO director signs the checklist (see Appendix 6) for record.

#### **V. Negotiating the Contract**

56. The EA then writes to the first-ranked consultant and advises that it wishes to negotiate a contract. The EA normally conducts the negotiations face-to-face. The consultant must pay all its representative's costs to attend the negotiations. The letter

- invites the consultant to send a representative to the EA's offices, who will be prepared to discuss the consultant's proposal and has the authority to finalize and sign a contract;
- proposes a schedule and agenda;
- asks the consultant to confirm the availability of all the team members nominated in its technical proposal; and
- summarizes any issues identified during the evaluation that require clarification, any deficiencies to be corrected, any team members to be replaced, or any other corrective action to be taken.
- If there is likely to be a delay in negotiations, the letter may also request the consultant to extend the validity of its bid for a reasonable time until negotiations can be held.

57. The negotiations cover the TOR, the consultant's methodology and work plan, the team members and personnel schedule, the counterpart facilities the EA will provide, the financial terms, and the other terms and conditions in the contract. The procedure for negotiating the financial terms depends on the selection method (see PAI 2.02, Part A). The EA prepares minutes of the important points of agreement.

58. If the EA and the consultant cannot reach agreement, the EA may ask ADB's agreement to terminate the negotiations and start negotiations with the next-ranked consultant, in turn, until it reaches an agreement.

#### **W. Reviewing the EA's Draft Contract**

59. If the EA's procurement plan requires it to submit its draft negotiated contract and the minutes of the contract negotiations to ADB for approval, the EA submits them in ADB's standard format, provided by the user division officer. The user division reviews and approves them. The division

- makes sure that the negotiated terms and conditions are satisfactory;
- asks COSO, the Controller's Department (CTL), and OGC for comments, if necessary after identifying any issues of concern; and
- requests the EA to make changes or amendments as considered necessary.

60. Once the documents are considered to be in order, the user division advises the EA of ADB's approval.

#### **X. Finalizing the Contract**

61. After receiving ADB's approval, the EA signs the contract, obtains the consultant's signature, and submits a copy to ADB for its records. The EA also submits some information for ADB to publish on its website. This consists of

- names of the short-listed consultants who submitted proposals;
- scores of their technical proposals;
- prices in their financial proposals (for QCBS);
- overall ranking (for QCBS);
- name of the consultant selected; and
- cost, duration, and summary scope of the contract.

62. After completing the selection, it is the EA's responsibility to brief the short-listed consultants on the reasons for their ranking, when asked.

63. After receiving the signed contract, the user division checks that it is substantially the same as the draft negotiated contract approved earlier. The division sends copies of the signed contract to COSO, CTL, and OGC. The user division sends copies of all relevant communications to COSO.

#### **Y. Terminating a Contract**

64. When an EA proposes to terminate a contract with a consultant, it sends a recommendation to ADB. The user division consults COSO and OGC, decides whether termination is warranted, and advises the EA of the decision. When the division approves termination, the EA sends a written notice to the consultant, in accordance with the provisions in the contract.

#### **Z. Monitoring the Consultant Recruitment Process**

65. The EA and the user division use CRAM frames for loans/grants to monitor the activities in recruiting the consultant and to avoid delays. Indicative CRAM frames based on forecast scheduling of recruitment for consulting packages are included as an annex to the procurement plan. Appendix 3 is an example of a CRAM frame and a flow chart of the CRAM process.

66. CRAM identifies the main activities in the recruitment process, the time normally required for each activity, and target dates for completing each activity. The EA and user division staff responsible for completing each activity and for monitoring the recruitment process use CRAM to identify delays and to take prompt action to get the recruitment process back on schedule.

## **1. Creating a CRAM Frame**

67. During the loan fact-finding mission, the user division officer explains to the EA how to use the CRAM to monitor the recruitment process. The officer gives the EA a sample CRAM frame and discusses the consultant recruitment schedule, based on the normative days required for each activity shown in the CRAM frame. The officer asks the EA to assign a staff member who will be responsible for maintaining the CRAM and monitoring the recruitment process. The user division officer is usually the responsible ADB staff member.

68. When the EA schedules and advises ADB of the date of its CSC meeting to short-list consulting firms for an assignment, the user division creates a CRAM frame for the assignment by entering the following information into the system:

- loan number and name,
- contract budget,
- selection method,
- type of technical proposal,
- EA's name and contact person,
- loan supervising division,
- user division officer,
- EA and ADB staff responsible for maintaining the CRAM and monitoring the recruitment process,
- responsible COSO officer, and
- short-listing date.

69. When the user division enters the short-listing date into the CRAM frame, the system automatically generates a recruitment schedule, including the planned dates for each activity and the cumulative number of days since short-listing. The number of calendar days required for each activity is based on "norms" for each selection method and type of technical proposal. Appendix 3 shows the template of a CRAM frame.

## **2. Accessing the CRAM Frame**

70. Staff may access the CRAM frame in the Consulting Services Reference database in Lotus Notes. The procedure is as follows:

- Open Lotus Notes and click "file" > "Database" > "Open."
- Select "LNADBG1/ADB" from the list of servers.
- Select "Consulting Serv. Reference" from the list of databases.
- Select 5. "Loans Monitoring."

## **3. Monitoring the Recruitment Activities and Updating the CRAM Frame**

71. The user division sends a copy of the CRAM frame for the assignment to the EA. The EA's CSC short-listing meeting then discusses and confirms the CRAM schedule. If the EA is required to submit its CSC meeting documents to ADB for approval, the EA includes the CRAM frame.

72. If ADB approves the EA's technical evaluation and financial evaluation/overall ranking (if the EA uses QCBS), the user division sends the EA an updated CRAM frame.

73. The responsible EA staff member monitors the recruitment process and reports to the ADB user division officer the date when each activity is completed and the reason for any delays. The ADB user division officer enters the completion dates in column 6. Planned dates cannot be changed.

74. Columns 8 and 9 in the CRAM frame show the difference in days between the planned and actual dates for completing each activity, and the difference between the planned and actual days since short-listing. When an activity is completed later than the planned date, the ADB user division officer enters in column 11 an explanation and the action the EA and ADB need to take to get the recruitment back on schedule. The upper right corner of the CRAM frame shows the date the frame was last edited.

75. The CRAM frame shows different recruitment activities for each selection method and type of technical proposal.

76. COSO checks all CRAM frames daily to make sure they are up-to-date. When a planned activity is not achieved on schedule, COSO advises the responsible staff to take action.

77. COSO sends monthly reports on CRAM frames to the directors and country directors of the user divisions. The directors monitor the recruitment activities for all the loans/grants under their supervision and take appropriate action when necessary to overcome delays.

#### **4. Maintaining CRAM Records**

78. When the recruitment process is completed, the user division makes a hard copy of the CRAM frame and retains it in the project file.

79. COSO keeps completed CRAM frames in the CRAM database and evaluates them annually. If required, COSO proposes recommendations for streamlining the recruitment process.

80. COSO monitors the application of the CRAM and maintains the CRAM system. Staff should report any problems with the system to COSO.




### **Checklist of Actions by Fact-Finding Missions to Help EAs Recruit Consultants**

1. Explain ADB's procedures for recruiting consultants to the EA.
2. Give the EA the following standard documents:
  - CRAM schedule;
  - names of consultants from the CMS (if the borrower asks);
  - most current version of sample RFP, including the covering letter, background information, and TOR;
  - sample forms for evaluating consultants' technical and financial proposals, including the narrative evaluation criteria for technical proposals;
  - sample contracts for firms and individuals;
  - performance evaluation forms for consulting firms and individual consultants; and
  - Guidelines on the Use of Consultants by Asian Development Bank and Its Borrowers.*


The harmonized RFP for recruiting consulting firms for loan/grant projects is available on the ADB website.

3. Agree with the EA on the scope of the services required; the number of contracts; whether consulting firms, individual consultants, or both will be engaged under each contract; and the allocation of person-months to international and national consultants. Then agree on the procedures the EA will use to recruit the consultants, including the selection method and the type of technical proposal.
4. Help the EA to prepare the CRAM, TOR, and RFP.
5. Discuss any anticipated problems and what additional help the EA will need from ADB to engage the consultants.
6. If possible and if not already done, obtain the documents required in the EA's first submission to ADB for approval. These include the proposed
  - recruitment schedule;
  - short-listing criteria;
  - short list;
  - RFP, together with the detailed TOR and background information;
  - evaluation criteria for the technical proposals;
  - contract; and
  - format for evaluating the consultant's performance.






**RECRUITING CONSULTING FIRMS FOR LOANS USING CQS  
 (with maximum budget of \$200,000)**




<sup>1</sup> See CQS checklist for Loan/Grant project.

**RECRUITING CONSULTING FIRMS FOR LOANS USING SSS**





**USING CRAM FOR LOAN PROJECTS**





**REQUEST FOR APPROVAL OF THE EA'S SHORT-LISTING DOCUMENTS AND REQUEST FOR PROPOSALS**

**(FOR ALL LOANS USING CHECKLIST PROCEDURE)**

[date]

To: [name of director], Director, [COS1 or COS2]  
Through: [name of director], Director, [User division]  
From: *User Division Specialist, User Division*  
Subject: **[Loan No.-Country: Title]**  
- Review of the EA's Short-listing Documents and Request for Proposals

---

1. In accordance with PAI 2.02E, this request is submitted for approval by Director, [COS1 or COS2] of the above Loan's short-listing documents and Request for Proposals prepared by the EA.
2. The following documents are attached:
  - (i) Checklist with items 1 to 11 completed
  - (ii) EA's budget for the assignment
  - (iii) Refined long list of firms/organizations
  - (iv) Short-listing criteria
  - (v) Request for Proposals
  - (vi) Terms of Reference (TOR) and background information
  - (vii) Narrative Evaluation Criteria
  - (viii) Summary and personnel evaluation sheets
  - (ix) Short-listed firms/organizations
  - (x) Minutes of the EA's short-listing meeting(s)
3. We have reviewed the above documents and found them complete and in accordance to the guidelines. We also confirm that none of the firms short-listed or their associates contributed to the preparation of the TOR for the Loan or any of the EA's staff involved in the selection process was previously associated with any of the short-listed firms or their associates.

[date]

**Loan/Grant (Country) (No.): Title  
 Package/Component: \_\_\_\_\_**

1. Advance Action?  Yes  No

2. Advertisement in ADB website (30 days)  Yes  No

Date of Advertisement: \_\_\_\_\_

Comments (if any): \_\_\_\_\_

3. Date of Loan Approval: \_\_\_\_\_

4. Budget for this consulting services: US\$ \_\_\_\_\_ (indicate "Estimated" or "Maximum" Budget)

5. Executing Agency (EA): \_\_\_\_\_

6. Type of Technical Proposal:  BTP  STP  FTP

7. Method of Selection:  FBS  LCS  QBS  QCBS

8. The following short-listing criteria were adopted:

a) \_\_\_\_\_  
 \_\_\_\_\_

b) \_\_\_\_\_  
 \_\_\_\_\_

c) \_\_\_\_\_  
 \_\_\_\_\_

9. Proposed Short list:

	FIRM	COUNTRY OF INCORPORATION
1.		
2.		
3.		
4.		
5.		
6.		

(i) Six (6) firms with wide geographic spread (only 1 firm from any 1 member country, and at least 1 firm from developing member country).  Yes  No

---

Justification/s for proposed shortlist: \_\_\_\_\_  
\_\_\_\_\_

- (ii) Any of the short-listed firms in ADB sanction list?  Yes  No
- (iii) PER of the firms in the refined long list checked?  
(Attached as Appendix 1)  Yes  No
- (iv) Conflict of Interest: Any of the short-listed firms participated  
in the PPTA and prepared TOR for this package?  Yes  No

If yes, state the name of the firm & whether potential or actual conflict of interest exists.

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

- (v) Other comment/s on the short list: (Optional)

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

10. Draft Request for Proposal (RFP) Documents:

- (i) Data Sheet (Comments):  
a) \_\_\_\_\_  
b) \_\_\_\_\_
- (ii) Short-listing Criteria (Comments):  
a) \_\_\_\_\_  
b) \_\_\_\_\_
- (iii) Narrative Evaluation Criteria (Comments):  
a) \_\_\_\_\_  
b) \_\_\_\_\_
- (iv) Summary Evaluation Sheet (Comments):  
a) \_\_\_\_\_  
b) \_\_\_\_\_
- (v) Personnel Evaluation Sheet (Comments):  
a) \_\_\_\_\_  
b) \_\_\_\_\_
- (vi) Terms of Reference (Comments):  
a) \_\_\_\_\_  
b) \_\_\_\_\_
- (vii) Type of Contract to be used:  
 Time based  Lump-sum  Others (specify)

(viii) Other comments on the draft RFP:

a) \_\_\_\_\_  
b) \_\_\_\_\_

11. Checking of Conflict of Interest:

- (i) Conflict between consulting activities (1.11.a):  Yes  No
- (ii) Conflict among consulting assignments (1.11.b):  Yes  No
- (iii) Conflict with concern COSO/User Division Specialists (1.11.c):  Yes  No

If yes, state relationship & whether potential or actual conflict of interest exists.

\_\_\_\_\_

12. COSO/User Division Specialists endorsed the proposed short list and draft RFP  Yes  No

If "NO", state conditions for endorsement by ADB:

\_\_\_\_\_

13. The User Division will send an updated CRAM sheet to the EA for its monitoring of the recruitment activities.

14. The User Division will inform the EA that COSO will post the short list in the ADB website with the following information:

- the names of the short-listed firms;
- the name of the EA and its contact details listed in LFIS/GFIS ALS704 under the EA Loan Address section; and
- the RFP date.

15. The User Division will convey the above decisions and recommendations to the EA.

\_\_\_\_\_  
User Division Specialist

\_\_\_\_\_  
COSO Specialist

\_\_\_\_\_  
Director, COS1/COS2

Distribution:

Director (User Division/RM) / (User Division Specialist)  
Monitoring & Statistics Unit (MSU)  
File II

**REQUEST FOR APPROVAL OF THE EA'S TECHNICAL EVALUATION DOCUMENTS**

**(FOR ALL LOANS USING CHECKLIST PROCEDURE)**

[date]

To: Director, [COS1 or COS2]  
Through: Director, [User division]  
From: *User Division Specialist, User Division*  
Subject: **[Loan No.-Country: Title]**  
- Review of the EA's Technical Evaluation Documents

---

1. In accordance with PAI 2.02E, this request is submitted for approval by Director, [COS1 or COS2] of the above Loan's technical evaluation documents prepared by the EA.
2. The following documents are attached:
  - (xi) Checklist with items 1 to 7 to be completed
  - (xii) Summary evaluation sheet highlighting any proposal that scored less than 750 points out of 1,000
  - (xiii) Personnel evaluation sheet for each proposal
  - (xiv) Comments on the strengths and weaknesses of each proposal
  - (xv) Minutes of the EA's evaluation meeting(s)
3. We have reviewed the above documents and found them complete and in accordance to the guidelines. We also confirm that none of the EA's staff involved in the technical evaluation process was previously associated with any of the short-listed firms or their associates.

[date]

**Loan/Grant (Country) (No.): Title  
 Package/Component:** \_\_\_\_\_

1. Date of Short-listing: \_\_\_\_\_

2. Short-listed Firms:

	<b>FIRM</b>	<b>COUNTRY OF INCORPORATION</b>
1.		
2.		
3.		
4.		
5.		
6.		

3. Date of Issuance of the Request for Proposal (RFP): \_\_\_\_\_

4. Deadline for submission of technical proposals: \_\_\_\_\_

5. On \_\_\_\_\_, the EA evaluated the technical proposals received from the short-listed firms and submitted to ADB the results as follows:

<b>Firm</b>	<b>Score</b>

6. Conflict of Interest with concerned COSO/User Division Specialists  Yes  No

If yes, state whether potential or actual conflict of interest exists. \_\_\_\_\_

\_\_\_\_\_

7. COSO/User Division Specialists endorses the evaluation results  Yes  No

Comments: (If No) \_\_\_\_\_

\_\_\_\_\_

\_\_\_\_\_

8. **(For QCBS, LCS, FBS):** The User Division will advise the EA to proceed with the public opening of financial proposals. The EA should be reminded to return (unopened) the financial proposal/s of the firm/s that did not meet the minimum qualifying score of 750 points for technical proposal after the conclusion of the consultant selection process.

**(For QBS):** The User Division will advise the EA to invite the first ranked firm to prepare and submit its financial proposal for contract negotiations. In the event of failure of negotiation with the first ranked firm, ADB's clearance should be obtained before proceeding to contract negotiations with the second ranked firm, (or subsequent firms if it becomes necessary).

9. The User Division will send an updated CRAM sheet to the EA for its monitoring of the recruitment activities.
10. The User Division will convey the above decisions and recommendations to the EA.

\_\_\_\_\_  
User Division Specialist

\_\_\_\_\_  
COSO Specialist

\_\_\_\_\_  
Director, COS1/COS2

Distribution:

Director (User Division/RM) / (User Division Specialist)  
Monitoring & Statistics Unit (MSU)  
File II



**REQUEST FOR APPROVAL OF THE EA'S FINANCIAL EVALUATION DOCUMENTS USING  
CHECKLIST PROCEDURE**

**(FOR ALL LOANS USING CHECKLIST PROCEDURE)**

[date]

To: Director, [COS1 or COS2]  
Through: Director, [User division]  
From: *User Division Specialist, User Division*  
Subject: **[Loan No.-Country: Title]**  
- Review of the EA's Financial Evaluation and Overall Ranking Documents

---

1. In accordance with PAI 2.02E, this request is submitted for approval by Director, [COS1 or COS2] of the above Loan's financial evaluation and overall ranking documents prepared by the EA.
2. The following documents are attached:
  - a. Completed checklist (Items 1 to 7 to be filled out by User Division)
  - b. Financial evaluation sheet and overall ranking
  - c. Comments on the first-ranked proposal in case of any deficiency
  - d. Minutes of the EA's financial evaluation meeting(s)
  - e. Draft consultant's contract to be used during contract negotiations
3. We have reviewed the above documents and found them complete and in accordance to the guidelines. We also confirm that none of the EA's staff involved in the financial evaluation process was previously associated with any of the short-listed firms or their associates.

[date]

**Loan/Grant (Country) (No.): Title  
 Package/Component: \_\_\_\_\_**

1. Date of ADB's sending approval of the short list to EA: \_\_\_\_\_
2. Date of Issuance of the Request for Proposal (RFP): \_\_\_\_\_
3. Deadline for submission of technical proposals: \_\_\_\_\_
4. Date of ADB's endorsement of technical proposals evaluation report: \_\_\_\_\_
5. On \_\_\_\_\_, the EA submitted the result of their evaluation of the firm's financial proposals and final ranking as follows:

For QCBS

Rank	Firm	Technical Points (__%)	Financial Points (__%)	Overall Points

For FBS/LCS

Rank	Firm	Technical Score	Financial Proposal Price

6. Conflict of Interest with concerned COSO/User Division Specialists  Yes  No

If yes, state whether potential or actual conflict of interest exists. \_\_\_\_\_  
 \_\_\_\_\_  
 \_\_\_\_\_

7. COSO/User Division Specialists endorses the financial evaluation results and final ranking.  Yes  No

Comments: (If No) \_\_\_\_\_  
\_\_\_\_\_

8. The User Division will advise the EA to invite the first-ranked firm to contract negotiations.\* The draft negotiated contract following ADB's standard consultant's contract should be submitted for ADB's approval. In case of failure of negotiations with the first-ranked firm, ADB should be advised before the EA can negotiate a contract with the second-ranked firm.
9. The User Division will send an updated CRAM sheet to the EA for its monitoring of the recruitment activities.
10. The User Division will convey the above decisions and recommendations to the EA.

\_\_\_\_\_  
User Division Specialist

\_\_\_\_\_  
COSO Specialist

\_\_\_\_\_  
Director, COS1/COS2

Distribution:  
Director (User Division/RM) / (User Division Specialist)  
Monitoring & Statistics Unit (MSU)  
File II

---

\* For advance action, contract negotiations should only be scheduled if effectivity of the financing agreement is expected in the immediate or near future unless retroactive financing has been approved. See PAI 2.02E, para 22.



**CQS – Loan/Grant Project**

[date]

**Loan/Grant (Country) (No.): Title**  
**Package/Component:** \_\_\_\_\_

**1. Advertisement**

Advertisement in national newspaper, copy attached?  Yes  No

Advertisement in ADB website (30 days)?  Yes  No

Comments (if any): \_\_\_\_\_

**2. Implementation arrangements**

(i) Date of loan approval : \_\_\_\_\_

(ii) Executing Agency (EA) : \_\_\_\_\_

Contact Person : \_\_\_\_\_

Designation : \_\_\_\_\_

EA Agency : \_\_\_\_\_

Address : \_\_\_\_\_

Phone/Fax/Email : \_\_\_\_\_

(iii) Sources of financing : \_\_\_\_\_

(iv) Inputs (person months) : \_\_\_\_\_

International :

National :

(vii) Deadline for submission of : \_\_\_\_\_

EOIs : \_\_\_\_\_

**3. Budget**

Budget for consulting services (not exceeding US\$200,000) :

Justification in special case where budget exceeds US\$200,000

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

**4. Background Information and Terms of Reference for consultants**

Background Information and Terms of Reference attached  Yes  No

**5. Expression of Interest (EOI) and evaluation criteria:**

EOI template attached	<input type="checkbox"/>	Yes	<input type="checkbox"/>	No
-----------------------	--------------------------	-----	--------------------------	----

Criteria	Weighting (%)	Narrative criteria attached Yes/No
<b>Eligibility/Conflict of Interest</b>	Pass/Fail	
<b>Management Competence*</b>	X%	
<b>Technical Competence</b>	X%	
<b>Geographical Competence</b>	X%	
<b>Total</b>	100%	

**6. Evaluation of EOIs**

On \_\_\_\_\_, the EA evaluated the EOIs received and submitted to ADB the results as follows:

No.	Firm	EOI Score

**7. Checks on first ranked firm and associates or joint venture partners**

(i) Any of the firms (including associated firms or joint venture partners) in ADB sanction list?  Yes  No

(ii) PERs of the firms (including associated firms or joint venture partners) checked? (Attached as Appendix 1)  Yes  No

(iii) Conflict of Interest (see also below): Any of the firms participated in the PPTA or upstream assignment which included responsibility for preparation of the TOR for this package?  Yes  No

(iv) External ADB auditor included in the shortlist? If yes, obtain clearance from OAGF before proceeding.  Yes  No

If potential or actual conflict of interest exists, state details and the names of the firm:

-----  
 -----

**8. Request for Bio-data Technical Proposal (BTP)**

Request for BTP attached	<input type="checkbox"/>	Yes	<input type="checkbox"/>	No
--------------------------	--------------------------	-----	--------------------------	----

\* Including nomination and very brief background & experience of firm's director responsible for this assignment, and, if applicable, the rationale for proposed association/JV

**9. BTP Technical and Financial Proposal Evaluation Report**

BTP Technical and Financial Proposal Evaluation Report attached		Yes		No
---	--	-----	--	----

**10.** The User Division will advise the EA to invite the firm for negotiations. In the event of failure of negotiation with the firm submitting the first ranked EOI, and subsequently a BTP, ADB's clearance should be obtained before requesting the firm who submitted the second ranked EOI to submit a BTP.

**11.** The User Division will convey the above decisions and recommendations to the EA

\_\_\_\_\_  
**Signature and Date above Printed Name**  
User Division Specialist

\_\_\_\_\_  
**Signature and Date above Printed Name**  
COSO Specialist

\_\_\_\_\_  
Director, COS1/COS2

Distribution:  
Director (User Division/RM) / (User Division Specialist)  
Monitoring & Statistics Unit (MSU)  
File II



ASIAN DEVELOPMENT BANK EVALUATION SHEET FOR EXPRESSIONS OF INTEREST													
CONFIDENTIAL													
TA No. / Loan No.-Country: Title													
EVALUATION CRITERIA													
	Max. Weight	F1		F2		F3		F4		F5		F6	
		Rating	Score	Rating	Score	Rating	Score	Rating	Score	Rating	Score	Rating	Score
<b>I. Management Competence</b>													
a.	20												
Single Firm													
Quality of responsible senior management	10	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
Proposed Management Coordination	5	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
Proposed Quality Control	5	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
b.													
Association or Joint Venture	20	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
Lead Firm	15	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
Quality of responsible senior management of association or JV	5	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
Proposed Management Coordination	5	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
Proposed quality control	5	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
Associates or JV Partners	5	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
Contribution of association or JV partners to management	5	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
<b>II. Technical Competence</b>													
a.	60												
Single Firm													
Firm's specialisation vis à vis the sectoral focus of the assignment	10	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
Firm's experience vis à vis the assignments TOR	30	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
Number of similar projects undertaken where firm as lead partner	15	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
Number of similar projects undertaken where firm as sub-consultant	5	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
b.													
Association or Joint Venture	60	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
Lead Firm	40	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
Lead firm's specialisation vis à vis the sectoral focus of the assignment	5	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
Lead firm's experience vis à vis the assignment's TOR	10	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
Number of similar projects undertaken where firm as lead partner	20	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
Number of similar projects undertaken where firm as sub-consultant	5	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
Associates or JV Partners	20	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
Technical rationale for association or JV	5	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
Associates or JV partners experience vis à vis the assignment's TOR	15	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
<b>III. Geographic Competence</b>													
a.	20												
Single Firm													
Firm's country experience	10	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
Firm's regional experience	5	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
Permanent presence / local office	5	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
b.													
Association or Joint Venture	20	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
Lead Firm	10	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
Firm's country experience	4	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
Firm's regional experience	4	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
Permanent presence / local office	2	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
Associates or JV Partners	10	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
Associates or JV partner's country experience	4	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
Associates or JV partner's regional experience	4	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
Permanent presence / local office	2	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
<b>TOTAL (Single Firm)</b>													
<b>TOTAL (Association/Joint Venture)</b>		100	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
<b>Rating:</b>		Excellent - 100%	Very Good - 90%	Above Average - 80%	Average - 70%	Below Average - 50%	Non-complying - 0%						
<b>Score:</b>		Maximum Weight x Rating / 100											
<b>Note: Interband ratings are not allowed in application of the above rating scale. For example, only a rating of 90 or 80 can be given, not 85, 87, etc.</b>													
Criteria Approved by:		Date Approved:				Evaluation Done by:				Date Evaluated:			
Title		Title				Title				Title			