

# Project Administration Instructions

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

---

## EVALUATING CONSULTANTS' PERFORMANCE PART B: INDIVIDUAL CONSULTANTS

### A. Introduction

1. This project administration instruction (PAI) provides policies and procedures for evaluating individual consultants' performance. Also read PAI 2.04, Part A and PAI 5.11, which provide guidelines on administering technical assistance (TA) projects, 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 an individual consultant contracted by Asian Development Bank (ADB) completes an assignment (contract termination date), the user division evaluates the consultant's performance. This requirement applies to all the individual consultants ADB recruits for TA, staff, training, and resource person assignments.

### C. Post Assignment Questionnaire

3. Completion of the Post Assignment Questionnaire (PAQ) (see Appendix 1) 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.

### D. Procedures for Evaluations by ADB

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 evaluation of the consultant's performance within 2 months from the contract termination date or from the date ADB terminates the consultant's contract. If the assignment will last 12 months or more, the consultant's performance is also 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.

5. At contract termination or cancellation date 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 who originally requested COSO to recruit the consultant. 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 document (see Appendix 2) If the staff member who receives the email message is not the current user division officer, the staff member may reassign it to the concerned officer (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. If the assignment is under a TA with an executing agency (EA), the evaluator seeks comments from the EA on the consultant's performance.

7. The evaluator completes the PER form by choosing one of five ratings (excellent, satisfactory, generally satisfactory, unsatisfactory, or not applicable) for each performance criterion. In so doing, 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. In cases when there is an additional criterion to be included, the evaluator may specify such under the "Others" criterion section.

8. 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) and not applicable. 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 consultant'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.

9. 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 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.

10. COSO reviews the PER and decides whether follow-up action with the consultant is needed. Follow-up action is always needed when the consultant's overall performance 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.

11. After COSO receives the consultant's reply, a special consultant selection committee (SCSC) meeting reviews the PER; the consultant's comments; past PERs, if any; terms of reference for the assignment and consultant's report, if applicable; and the consultant's CV. 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 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.

12. Depending on the circumstances, the SCSC may decide that the 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 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 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.

13. COSO records the consultant's performance in a file. COSO checks these files if the consultant is proposed for a short list or is included in a winning firm's technical proposal.



ADB Consultant Management System

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

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
<b>Project Information</b>	
Project Name	
Contract Number	Div/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 Overall 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](#)

ADB

Consultant Management System

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

---

**Performance Evaluation of Individual Consultant**

Current Status: \_\_\_\_\_ Last Update Date: \_\_\_\_\_

Name: \_\_\_\_\_

**Project Information**

Project Name: \_\_\_\_\_

Contract No: \_\_\_\_\_

Position: \_\_\_\_\_

Period: \_\_\_\_\_

**Hide Project Details**

Commencement: \_\_\_\_\_

Termination: \_\_\_\_\_

Cancellation Date: \_\_\_\_\_

Contract Amount: \_\_\_\_\_

CMS Number: \_\_\_\_\_

[View Details](#)

Div/Office: \_\_\_\_\_

Category: \_\_\_\_\_

Duration: \_\_\_\_\_

Variation No: \_\_\_\_\_

Variation Date: \_\_\_\_\_

Project Officer: \_\_\_\_\_

Original Duration: \_\_\_\_\_

---

**Evaluation (End of Assignment)**

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

Criteria	Rating					Comments
	E	S	GS	U	N/A	
1. Practical knowledge of and experience in the field concerned	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	
2. Ability to adapt knowledge and experience to assigned tasks	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	
3. Initiative	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	
4. Productivity	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	
5. Ability to work with others	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	
6. Adherence to Bank's and Executing Agency's working regulations	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	
7. Quality of work completed	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	
8. Others	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	
<b>OVERALL PERFORMANCE</b>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<b>Overall Comments</b>

Evaluator: \_\_\_\_\_ Date Evaluated: \_\_\_\_\_

---

**Comments**

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

No results found.

[Show Process History](#)

---

Copyright (c) 2009, Oracle. All rights reserved.

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

---

## **NARRATIVE DESCRIPTIONS OF THE PERFORMANCE EVALUATION CRITERIA**

### **1. Practical Knowledge of and Experience in the Field Concerned**

Did the consultant demonstrate practical knowledge and experience in the claimed areas of expertise? Were gaps apparent in the consultant's knowledge, or did the consultant lack experience in one or more areas? Did the consultant demonstrate a professional appreciation of the problems that arose?

### **2. Ability to Adapt Knowledge and Experience to Assigned Tasks**

Did the consultant thoroughly investigate, understand, analyze, and report on all the aspects of the assignment? Were the ADB staff involved confident that the consultant would competently complete the assignment?

### **3. Initiative**

Did the consultant propose any sound innovations? Was the consultant's method of searching for data practical? Did the consultant need more or less assistance than usual with the arrangements?

### **4. Productivity**

Did the consultant complete all the tasks in the terms of reference? Were the consultant's tables, calculations, and other written outputs complete?

### **5. Ability to Work with Others**

Did the consultant maintain cordial relations with ADB staff and counterpart officials? While on mission, did the consultant work cooperatively with the group? Did the consultant respect the local culture?

### **6. Adherence to ADB's and Executing Agency's Working Regulations**

Did the consultant work within ADB's and the executing agency's normal procedures and regulations?

### **7. Quality of Work Completed**

Assess whether the quality of the consultant's outputs was fully satisfactory. Was the consultant's report or contribution to the team's report well organized, clearly and simply written, without jargon? Did the consultant present his/her conclusions logically and convincingly, with adequate references? Were the consultant's inputs and outputs complete, covering all the requirements in the terms of reference? Did the consultant's report cover all the issues raised?