

Project Administration Instructions

PAI 2.05, Part A
Issued January 2008
Revised August 2009
Page 1 of 3

EVALUATING CONSULTANTS' PERFORMANCE PART A: CONSULTING FIRMS

A. Introduction

1. This project administration instruction (PAI) provides policies and procedures for evaluating consulting firms' performance. Also read PAI 2.04, Part A and PAI 5.11, which provide guidelines on administering technical assistance (TA), including handling consultants' performance problems; and PAI 6.08 (Appendix 2, para. 4), which provides guidelines on preparing TA completion reports.

B. Policy

2. After a consulting firm contracted by the Asian Development Bank (ADB) completes an assignment (upon submission of the final report), the user division evaluates the consultant's performance. This requirement applies to all the consulting firms ADB recruits for TA and staff consulting assignments.

C. Preparatory Actions

3. During contract negotiations with a consulting firm, the Central Operations Services Office (COSO) gives the consultant a copy of ADB's performance evaluation report (PER) form (see Appendix 1) and a post assignment questionnaire (PAQ) (see Appendix 2) for reference. Completion of the PAQ by the consultant shall be done through the ADB Consultant Management System (CMS) portal at the end of their assignment by accessing the URL link in the corresponding email notification. Thereupon, the completed PAQ will be automatically forwarded to COSO. The COSO officer chairing the negotiation explains the evaluation procedures to the consultant. When the contract negotiations are conducted through correspondence, a copy of the forms is sent via courier together with the signed contract. This is important, since it puts the evaluation in context and may include factors that will affect the overall rating.

D. Procedures for Evaluation

4. The CMS-PER enables the user division officer to commence online recording of the consultant's performance at anytime during the assignment period. The user division should complete the evaluation of the consultant's performance within 2 months from the date on which (i) the consultant submits the final report as scheduled in ADB's TA Information System (TAIS)¹; or (ii) or ADB terminates the consultant's contract. Any expert replaced during the assignment period because of unsatisfactory performance will require detailed evaluation within 2 months from the replacement date using the PER form for individual consultants. If the assignment will last 12 months or more, the consultant's performance should also be evaluated at the midpoint of the services. PERs not evaluated at the end of the 2-month period will be automatically classified as 'Not Rated'. Once a PER is classified as "Not Rated", the PER rating cannot be changed.

¹ The user division is required to ensure that TAIS is updated to reflect all current due dates for consultant reports and other deliverables.

5. At the expected date of the final report submission or at the midpoint of an assignment lasting for 12 months or more, the CMS-PER system sends an email message to the staff member shown as the user division officer in COSO's records. The message includes guidelines for completing the evaluation with a link to the PER URL. COSO also provides an electronic copy of the form in the "Consulting Services Reference" database in Lotus Notes and in the COSO portal in the intranet, and on the ADB website as reference documents (see Appendix 1). If the staff member who receives the email message is not the current user division officer, the staff member may reassign it to the officer concerned (the evaluator).

6. The evaluator, in preparing the report, seeks comments from other ADB staff who were involved in the implementation of the consultant's services and, if the assignment involves an executing agency (EA) in one of the ADB's developing member countries (DMCs), the evaluator seeks comments from the EA on the consultant's performance.

7. The evaluator completes the evaluation form by choosing one of five ratings (excellent, satisfactory, generally satisfactory, unsatisfactory, or not applicable) for each performance criterion. In doing so, the evaluator refers to the narrative descriptions of the performance criteria shown in Appendix 3. If some criteria do not apply accurately to the assignment, a 'not applicable' rating may be given.

8. The evaluator first evaluates the consultant's overall performance in the Firm/Organization Tab of the form (Appendix 1). All the factors that affected the overall performance, including the extent to which the consultant achieved the assignment's objectives, completed the terms of reference, and complied with its other contractual obligations; the experts' field performance and behavior; and the amount of assistance the EA provided are considered.

9. Next, the evaluator explains his/her ratings in the "Comments" column for each criterion of the form, particularly any ratings that are less than satisfactory (i.e. generally satisfactory, or unsatisfactory) or for a not applicable rating. The explanations are mandatory before the evaluator can proceed to the next step of the process. It is also important because, if ADB later finds the firm's overall performance to be unsatisfactory, it will use the PER to support any restrictions it imposes or other action it takes against the consultant.

10. Third, the evaluator evaluates each individual expert, international and national, in the Team Members Tab of the form. The evaluator has to evaluate the team leader and team members who made significant contributions. Any expert with unsatisfactory rating will require detailed evaluation using the PER form for individual consultants.

11. After the evaluator completes the PER form, it should be forwarded to the user division director for endorsement to complete the process. Unendorsed PERs will be classified as 'Not Rated' if the director objects to the rating given by the evaluator and fails to ensure that an amended PER form has been completed and re-submitted by the evaluator within 30 days of expiry of the applicable 2-month period. In cases where the director fails to endorse the PER rating given by the evaluator within the specified period, such rating will be deemed final and included for PER purposes. COSO will record cases where directors have failed to endorse or have objected to PER ratings and periodically update the user department head concerned. Completed PERs will be forwarded to COSO.

12. COSO reviews the PER and decides whether follow-up action with the consultant is needed. Follow-up action is always taken when the consultant's overall performance and/or any expert is rated unsatisfactory. When COSO decides to take follow-up action, the concerned COSO director, after consulting with the user division director, writes to the consultant listing the weaknesses identified in the PER and invites the consultant to comment. The consultant is given 21 days to reply in writing to COSO.

13. After COSO receives the consultant's reply, a special consultant selection committee (SCSC) meeting reviews the PER; the consultant's comments; and past PERs, if any. The SCSC is chaired by the concerned COSO director or a professional staff member from COSO representing him/her as chairperson, the concerned user director or the user division officer (evaluator) who coordinated the performance evaluation, and another user division director or his/her designated professional staff chosen from a roster that COSO maintains. The third member usually has a background in a similar technical area as the user division officer. If deemed necessary, the chairperson may invite a representative from the Office of the General Counsel to attend the SCSC meeting as an observer to provide legal advice, if required.

14. Depending on the circumstances, the SCSC may decide if the PER overall performance rating will stand or will be modified. If the overall performance rating of unsatisfactory is maintained, the SCSC will next decide whether ADB will exclude the consultant and/or any of the individual experts in the consultant's team from short-listings for ADB-financed assignments for a specified period effective from the date of the SCSC meeting. The SCSC's decision is final, and COSO advises the consultant in writing of the decision. If the SCSC decides to exclude the consultant and/or any of the individual experts from short-listings for ADB-financed assignments, the Principal Director, COSO signs the letter to the consultant. Otherwise, the concerned COSO director signs the letter.

15. COSO maintains the files on the consultant's and its experts' performance evaluation. When a consultant or any of its experts is proposed for a short list by an EA or ADB, or if a consultant or any of its experts is included in a winning firm's technical proposal, COSO confers its files on performance evaluation for the purpose of taking into account in the evaluation process the performance evaluation ratings of the consultant or its experts within the last five (5) years, as well as to determine whether or not the consultant or any of its experts is under a suspension to undertake a contract with ADB.

Part I. Consulting Entity PER Firm/Organization Tab

Consultant Management System

[Diagnose](#) [Home](#) [Logout](#) [Preferences](#)

Performance Evaluation of Consulting Entity

Current Status: _____ Last Update Date: _____

Name: _____ CMS Number: _____ [View Details](#)

Project Information

Project Name	Div/Office
Contract No	Duration
Period	

[▼ Hide Project Details](#)

Commencement	Variation Date
Termination	Contract Amount
FR Expected	Project Officer
Cancellation Date	Original Duration
Variation No.	

[▼ Hide Associate Firms](#)

Mainframe ID Number	CMS Number	Firm Name

Evaluation (End of Assignment)

TIP Ratings are Excellent (E), Satisfactory (S), Generally Satisfactory (GS), Unsatisfactory (U), or Not Applicable (NA). If you give a GS, U or NA rating, please include a corresponding comment. Not Rated (NR) is system generated.

Firm/Organization

Team Members

Executing Agency

Criteria	Rating					Comments
	E	S	GS	U	NA	
A. Technical						
1. Analysis of Background Data	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	
2. Appropriateness of Methodology	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	
3. Initiative, Flexibility, Innovation	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	
4. Design Solutions	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	
5. Performance on Procurement	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	
B. Economical and Financial						
1. Cost Estimates Reliability	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	
2. Economic Analysis	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	
3. Financial Analysis	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	
C. Project Specific						
1. Technology Transfer	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	
2. Training Functions	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	
3. Advisory Functions	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	
4. Institutional/Management Analysis	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	
D. Project Management						
1. Understanding of Procedures	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	
2. Adherence to Terms of References	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	
3. Compliance with Work Program	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	
4. Presentation of Results	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	
5. Quality of Results	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	
6. Personnel Stability	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	
7. Team Leadership	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	
8. Competence/Conduct of Experts	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	
9. Relations with Executing Agency	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	
10. Contract Administration	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	
OVERALL PERFORMANCE						
	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	

Firm/Organization

Team Members

Executing Agency

Part II. Consulting Entity PER Team Member Tab

Firm/Organization		Team Members	Executing Agency
International			
Previous 1-5 Next 5			
Details	Name	Position	Rating
			E S GS U NR
▼ Hide			○ ○ ○ ○ ○
	CMS No.	Firm	Source
	Nationality	Start Date	End Date
			Remarks
			Duration
▶ Show			○ ○ ○ ○ ○
▶ Show			○ ○ ○ ○ ○
▶ Show			○ ○ ○ ○ ○
▶ Show			○ ○ ○ ○ ○
National			
Previous 1-5 Next 5			
Details	Name	Position	Rating
			E S GS U NR
▶ Show			○ ○ ○ ○ ○
▶ Show			○ ○ ○ ○ ○
▶ Show			○ ○ ○ ○ ○
▶ Show			○ ○ ○ ○ ○
▶ Show			○ ○ ○ ○ ○
Firm/Organization		Team Members	Executing Agency

Part III. Consulting Entity PER Executing Agency Tab

Firm/Organization		Team Members	Executing Agency
Executing Agency Information			
Agency Name	<input type="text"/>	State/Region	<input type="text"/>
Street Address	<input type="text"/>	Country	<input type="text"/>
City/Town	<input type="text"/>	Postal Code	<input type="text"/>
Principal EA Officer	Name <input type="text"/>	Designation	<input type="text"/>
Narrative Comments			
1. Timely supply of all data requirements			
<input type="text"/>			
2. Capability and enthusiasm of counterpart staff			
<input type="text"/>			
3. Capability and performance of supporting staff			
<input type="text"/>			
4. Transport arrangements			
<input type="text"/>			
5. Office accommodation and facilities			
<input type="text"/>			
6. Communication arrangements			
<input type="text"/>			
7. Reaction and response time to consultant's requests			
<input type="text"/>			
8. Supply of equipment			
<input type="text"/>			
Firm/Organization		Team Members	Executing Agency

Part IV. Consulting Entity PER Final Section

Evaluator Endorser	Date Evaluated Date Endorsed
-----------------------	---------------------------------

Further Team Member Evaluation

TIP If a Team Member is replaced due to Unsatisfactory Performance please email the PER Administrator at cosoper@adb.org to request for creation of Individual PER for your evaluation.

Comments

TIP When returning or reassigning this PER, please include a corresponding workflow comment.

[▶ Process History](#)

[Diagnostics](#) | [Home](#) | [Logout](#) | [Preferences](#)

Copyright (c) 2006, Oracle. All rights reserved.

ADB Consultant Management System [Home](#) [Logout](#) [Preferences](#) [Diagnostics](#)

[Notification](#) [Profile Management](#) [PAQ](#)

Post Assignment Questionnaire
Current Status: [] Last Update Date: []
NOTE: Save your data every 15 minutes to avoid losing your changes.

Name	CMS Number
------	------------

Project Information

Project Name	
Contract Number	Dw/Office
Position	Category
Period	Duration

I. Background Information
 TIP If you answered "inadequate" in any of the following items, please elaborate in the box provided.

1. Supplied by ADB Adequate Inadequate

2. Available Locally Adequate Inadequate

3. What other preparatory action do you think may have been possible or helpful in this case?

II. Support Received During Implementation
 TIP If you answered "inadequate" in any of the following items, please elaborate in the box provided.

1. Access to Information Adequate Inadequate Not Applicable

2. Counterpart Staff

a. Training Adequate Inadequate Not Applicable

b. Experience Adequate Inadequate Not Applicable

c. Time spent Adequate Inadequate Not Applicable

3. Decision-making by Local Authorities Adequate Inadequate Not Applicable

4. Guidance from ADB Staff Adequate Inadequate Not Applicable

5. Office accommodation Adequate Inadequate Not Applicable

6. Transport facilities Adequate Inadequate Not Applicable

7. Communications Adequate Inadequate Not Applicable

III. Clarity of Terms of Reference and Over all Objectives of the Assignment
 TIP If you answered "Needed further elaboration", please elaborate in the box provided.

Was very clear Was sufficient Needed further elaboration

IV. Other actions, if taken, that may have facilitated the assignment

V. General Comments (if any)

Workflow Comments
 TIP When returning this PAQ, please include a corresponding workflow comment.

No results found.

[Show Process History](#)

NARRATIVE DESCRIPTIONS OF THE PERFORMANCE EVALUATION CRITERIA

A. Technical

1. Analysis of Background Data

Did the consultant collect all the relevant background data, organize them properly, and analyze them with sufficient depth? Did the consultant consider all the available data, or did it omit or overlook some? Did the consultant competently investigate all the necessary issues and produce usable results? Did the consultant establish the integrity of the data it assembled? Were the consultant's assumptions realistic and satisfactory?

2. Appropriateness of Methodology

Was the consultant's methodology or proposed methodology appropriate or too sophisticated? Did the methodology recognize the local people's abilities and standards?

3. Initiative, Flexibility, Innovation

Did the consultant demonstrate initiative when dealing with problems and flexible methods of obtaining data and analyzing incomplete data? Give a higher rating if the consultant showed innovation in carrying out the assignment, analyzing data that were not readily available, simplifying the design, increasing the project's benefits, or reducing the costs.

4. Design Solutions

Did the consultant's design solutions show a proper appreciation of the methods, materials, and equipment available to, and used by, local contractors? Consider the technical competence of the contractors.

5. Performance on Procurement

Were the consultant's tender documents simple and comprehensive? Were the specifications adequate and fair to all the prospective bidders? Were the evaluation criteria appropriate for thorough and equitable bid evaluations?

B. Economic and Financial

1. Cost Estimates Reliability

Were the consultant's cost data accurate and comprehensive? Did the consultant identify and state the local allowances, charges, and taxes? Were the costs estimated or actual? Did the consultant state the sources and dates of the data?

2. Economic Analysis

Was the consultant's economic analysis comprehensive and was the standard satisfactory? Did the consultant properly assess all the benefit and cost streams and include all the relevant items?

3. Financial Analysis

Assess the quality and completeness of the consultant's analysis. Did the consultant include all the investment and operating charges? Did the financial analysis develop any questions for the economic analysis? If the consultant studied tariffs and prepared recommendations, were they soundly based?

C. Project Specific

1. Technology Transfer

Did the consultant effectively transfer all the required technology, including any required manuals, hardware, and software, to the counterpart staff and executing agency? Did the consultant fully explain all the methodologies, and was the transfer untied?

2. Training Functions

Did the consultant fully train the counterpart staff as required in the terms of reference? Did the consultant assess and evaluate the training to gauge its success? Were the counterpart staff fully competent and capable of operating any system or program the consultant transferred?

3. Advisory Functions

Was the consultant's advice practical, appropriate and effective? Did the executing agency accept it?

4. Institutional/Management Analysis

Did the consultant adequately consider all the relevant factors, including local protocols and sensitivities, and develop practical solutions to problems? Give a lower rating if the consultant only adapted practices from elsewhere.

D. Project Management

1. Understanding of Procedures

Did the consultant adequately understand ADB's and the executing agency's procedures? Did it handle all the correspondence, reports, claims, and other procedural matters in a timely manner?

2. Adherence to Terms of Reference

Did the consultant fully comply with all of the terms of reference or only with some of them?

3. Compliance with Work Program

Did the consultant complete all the tasks and achieve all the deadlines in the work program? Did the consultant give sound reasons for any deviations? Give a lower rating for erratic programming.

4. Presentation of Results

Were the consultant's reports written in clear, succinct English and free of jargon? Were they grammatically and mathematically correct? Were they adequately organized and properly indexed?

5. Quality of Reports

Were the consultant's reports comprehensive, logical, and persuasive? Were the reports useful, e.g., for a project preparatory TA assignment, did the final report enable ADB staff to proceed directly to project appraisal?

6. Personnel Stability

Did the consultant give adequate reasons for personnel changes, such as long-term illness or death?

7. Team Leadership

Was the team leader's leadership effective? Was the team cohesive, cooperative, and productive?

8. Competence/Conduct of Experts

Summarize your evaluations of the experts in Part III of the form. You may omit less important team members if you are not familiar with them.

9. Relations with Executing Agency

Were the consultant's relations with the executing agency cordial and cooperative, resulting in good working arrangements and supply of data, frank exchanges of views, and open discussions of sensitive issues?

10. Contract Administration

Did the consultant ask for too many variations or variations that were too expensive? Did the consultant justify its requests for contract variations? Give a lower rating if the consultant, rather than ADB, proposed to vary the work plan.