## Narrative Evaluation Criteria (NEC) for the Evaluation of Technical Proposals for ADB-Administered Selections (TAs/SCs and RFP issued via CMS)

### Request for Proposal (RFP)

To engage a consultant for consulting services, an RFP is issued inviting shortlisted firms to submit proposals.
- The RFP includes the terms of reference (TOR), evaluation sheets (SES/PES) and specifies the type of technical proposal (full (FTP), simplified (STP), or biodata (BTP)) to be submitted.
- For the firm’s reference, the NEC may also be included in the RFP to be issued. The User Unit is warned however, that a very detailed NEC will allow firms to calculate their ratings/scores and open ADB to complaints.

### Consultant Selection Committee (CSC)

A CSC is created to evaluate the proposals submitted by the shortlisted firms. CSC members are normally composed of 1-2 staff from ADB user unit and/or PPFD staff, for TA Projects (refer to SI Glossary and para 30 of the Staff Instructions for ADB Administered Selections).

### Narrative Evaluation Criteria (NEC)

To assist the CSC members in evaluating proposals and in preparing their own ratings and scores for discussion in the CSC meeting, an NEC based on the standard model / template is prepared.
- NEC must be consistent with the Summary Evaluation Sheet (SES) and Personnel Evaluation Sheet (PES).
- NEC should be open to facilitate discussions in the CSC meeting to arrive at a CSC's consensus score based on the ratings prepared by each member and does not intend to be a mechanical process.

### Technical Proposal Evaluation by the CSC

Technical evaluation must only be based on the submitted technical proposals vis-à-vis the TOR and other RFP requirements, applying evaluation criteria indicated in the NEC and SES/PES.
1. Each CSC member with his professional background will evaluate proposals and prepare individual ratings/scores prior to the CSC meeting.
2. In the CSC meeting, each member presents his ratings, discusses the justification, and decides the consensus rating for each criterion so that the CSC, not any individual, will be accountable for the evaluation result.
3. The CSC result includes the technical scores of each proposal together with the CSC minutes that depicts CSC’s findings on strengths and weaknesses of each proposal.

### Detailed NEC

Detailed NEC that intends to result to a unique rating regardless of the evaluator is discouraged as it may:
- have special rules that give undue advantage to a consultant, leading to a biased and questionable process
- introduce additional criteria/requirements that are not communicated to the consultants through the TOR
- be too ambitious or lax because it was prepared without knowing the quality of incoming proposals
- weakens the technical evaluation process

### Averaging

CSC rating by a simple arithmetic averaging is strongly discouraged. Instead, CSC’s rating must be the members’ consensus as a result of discussion, supported with notes in the minutes and corresponding justification.

### Page Limits

Refer to issued RFP for page limits. Deducting points from the expert’s rating or firm’s total score per page in excess of the limit is strongly discouraged. Penalty for excess pages can be applied by giving a low score under the criterion on “Proposal Presentation”. Points allocated for Proposal Presentation in the SES can also be increased.

### Pass/Fail Criteria

Pass/Fail rules in the NEC are not acceptable.
- Technical evaluation of proposals for a consulting service applies a different approach from the pass/fail-based qualifying process under procurement.
- Zero rating for experts in SES must follow “Disqualification of an Expert” section in the RFP.
- NEC should guide CSC members to rate the value of the proposal by applying, for example, a rating in a “below average” range (1 – 69%) instead of mechanically applying a pass/fail rule with zero rating.
- Non-Key Experts – are not assessed during Technical Proposal evaluation and may be considered by ADB on a pass/fail basis

### Applicable Guidelines

- **Pass/Fail Criteria**
  - Technical evaluation of proposals for a consulting service applies a different approach from the pass/fail-based qualifying process under procurement.
  - Zero rating for experts in SES must follow “Disqualification of an Expert” section in the RFP.
  - NEC should guide CSC members to rate the value of the proposal by applying, for example, a rating in a “below average” range (1 – 69%) instead of mechanically applying a pass/fail rule with zero rating.
  - Non-Key Experts – are not assessed during Technical Proposal evaluation and may be considered by ADB on a pass/fail basis

---

1. **Further Information**
   - **Applicable Guidelines** -- check concept note approval date
     - on or after 1 July 2017 – [ADB Procurement Policy](https://www.adb.org/documents/procurement/policies-and-guidelines) and [Staff Instructions (SI) on ADB-administered procurement consulting services](https://www.adb.org/documents/procurement/staff-instructions)
Model Narrative Evaluation Criteria (NEC) for Evaluation of Full Technical Proposals (FTP)

Note: points/max. weight allocations must be consistent with the Summary and Personnel Evaluation Sheets (SES/PES).
Criteria can be adapted, and points re-allocated to suit TOR and selection requirements.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Criteria</th>
<th>Factors to Consider</th>
<th>Points / Max. Weight</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>I Qualifications of Proposer</td>
<td></td>
<td>Generally 100 - 200 points</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>A Experience in Similar Projects (TECH-6)</td>
<td>• Extent and depth of experience of the firm and its associates in the same or similar type of projects. • The criteria should spell out clearly the project characteristics applicable. • Each reference project included in the technical proposal is to be judged against the criteria established. • The scoring method recommended is to be based on the combination of number of relevant reference projects, length and depth of the involvement of consulting entity in the relevant projects.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>B Experience in Similar Geographical Areas (TECH-6)</td>
<td>• Extent of experience in the project country or the geographical region taking in consideration elements such as population size, economic development stage and other social factors.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>C Other Factors (optional)</td>
<td>• Management experience: consistency of senior management and involvement of key experts in past and proposed projects. • Check if senior management and key experts proposed for the present project are the same as in reference projects.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

II Approach and Methodology

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Criteria</th>
<th>Factors to Consider</th>
<th>Points / Max. Weight</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>A Understanding of Objectives (TECH-1)</td>
<td>• General understanding of the project requirements. • Coverage of principal components as requested in TOR.</td>
<td>• General understanding • Components coverage • Review of existing publications/ reports Ability to demonstrate up-to-date knowledge and understanding of requirements of the project</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>B Quality of Methodology and Risk Management Approach (TECH-1)</td>
<td>• The degree of which the presented written methodology / approach addresses the requirements of the TOR and the purpose of the assignment.</td>
<td>• Assessment of the inter-relationship of work program and methodology write-up combined with adequate identification of project risks. • Ability to demonstrate up-to-date knowledge and understanding of requirements of the project. • A consistent relationship is to be given maximum points.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>C Innovativeness/Comments on Terms of Reference (TECH-7)</td>
<td>• Practical suggestions, which could improve the quality of the project.</td>
<td>• Points will be given for workable suggestions proposed.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>D Work Program (TECH-1, 3 and 4)</td>
<td>• A work program showing graphical presentation of activities (bar chart). • An organization chart showing the relationship of the Consultant, the EA and other stakeholders should also be provided.</td>
<td>• Work program to be assessed on logical sequence of events. • Items and time schedule of deliverables should be evaluated based on TOR • The organization chart is to be assessed on the consultant's understanding of the relationship between project proponents and stakeholders</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Criteria</td>
<td>Factors to Consider</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>----</td>
<td>--------------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
<td>---------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
| E  | Personnel Schedule (TECH-1, 2 and 4)                                     | • Relationship between required person-months and proposed work program.  
  • Assessment may address phasing of activities of the work program and allocation and timing of expert's individual inputs.  
  • The balance between home-office time and field inputs / proposed number of trips should also be checked/ evaluated.  
  • Presentation should follow format of RFP TECH forms  
  • Check total proposed inputs versus estimated work requirements  
  • Review appropriateness of time allocated versus the task to be performed by the expert |                                                                                             |                      |
| F  | Counterpart Personnel and Facilities (TECH-8)                            | • Requirement for counterpart personnel, office space, transportation, equipment and services.  
  • Assessment of reasonableness and completeness of requirements and understanding of local conditions. |                                                                                             |                      |
| G  | Proposal Presentation                                                    | • Clarity and ease of assessment of the entire proposal (including material presentation).  
  • Adherence to page limits as specified in the RFP.  
  • If all items requested in the RFP are covered in a clear and easily understandable form and the proposal is assembled in a professional manner, maximum points are to be given.  
  • Proposals which exceed the page limits specified in the RFP can be given a below-average rating under this criterion. |                                                                                             |                      |
| III | Personnel                                                                | Provide a separate assessment per expert listed in the PES. Each expert is to be evaluated against the tasks assigned and criteria in the PES.  
  Generally 500 - 700 points.                                                                                                           |                      |

**Key International Experts/Consultants**

- General Qualifications  
  • academic and professional qualifications, evidence of continuous professional development  
  • number of years of general working experience  

1. If an expert is proposed by multiple consultants for the same position, evaluate the expert according to the CV provided. This may result in uniform rating for the said expert if the CVs are found the same in substance. Otherwise, different ratings shall apply if the CVs submitted by the consultants for the expert are different.  
  10%-20%

2. If there is more than one expert proposed by the consultant for one position, the lowest rating among the experts evaluated should be applied and reflected in the PES.  
  60%-70%

3. If an expert is found not meeting a level of certain requirement in TOR, non-complying rating (0%) by a pass/fail approach is not allowed; instead, assess the value of the expert for the assignment and rate the expert within a “below average” range (1 – 69%).  
  10%-20%

4. Zero/Non-Complying rating in SES must meet criteria for “Disqualification of an Expert” in the RFP.  
  10%-20%

5. If an expert is found to be sanctioned by ADB, continue evaluation of the expert and request the consultant to replace the expert when the consultant is invited to the negotiation.  
  Note: Firms and experts attempting to participate in ADB activities while sanctioned must be reported to ADB OAI for investigation.  
  60%-70%

**Key National Experts/Consultants**

- General Qualifications  
  • academic and professional qualifications, evidence of continuous professional development  
  • number of years of general working experience  

- Project Related Experience  
  • quality of project related experience based on relevant projects implemented  

- Overseas/Country Experience  
  • experience outside expert’s country including specific regional / country experience  

- Experience with International Organizations  
  • experience in working with international consulting firm or international organizations/ international agencies
# Model Narrative Evaluation Criteria (NEC) for Evaluation of Simplified Technical Proposals (STP)

Note: points/max. weight allocations must be consistent with the Summary and Personnel Evaluation Sheets (SES/PES)

Criteria can be adapted, and points re-allocated to suit TOR and selection requirements.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>I</th>
<th>Approach and Methodology</th>
<th>Factors to Consider</th>
<th>Points / Max. Weight</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>A</td>
<td>Methodology and Work Plan, including Risk Management Approach (TECH-1)</td>
<td>• The degree to which the presented approach matches the requirements of the TOR. To include o written methodology o organization chart o work program (bar chart) o assumptions made, and o recommendations for to minimize risk. • Assessment of the inter-relationship of methodology write-up, work program and risk management approach. • A consistent relationship is to be given maximum points. • Work program to be assessed on completeness and logical sequence of events. • Ability to demonstrate up-to-date knowledge and understanding of requirements of TOR.</td>
<td>Generally 300 points</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

| B | Personnel Schedule (TECH-1, 2 and 4) | • Relationship between required person-months and proposed work program. • Assessment may address phasing of activities of the work program and allocation and timing of expert’s individual inputs. • The balance between home-office time and field inputs / proposed number of trips should also be checked/ evaluated. • Presentation should follow format of RFP TECH forms • Check total proposed inputs versus estimated work requirements • Review appropriateness of time allocated versus the task to be performed by the expert | |

| C | Proposal Presentation | • Clarity and ease of assessment of the entire proposal (including material presentation) • Adherence to page limits as specified in the RFP. • If all items requested in the RFP are covered in a clear and easily understandable form and the proposal is assembled in a professional manner, maximum points are to be given. • Proposals which exceed the page limits specified in the RFP can be given a below-average rating under this criterion. | |

| II | Personnel | Provide a separate assessment per expert listed in the PES. Each expert is to be evaluated against the tasks assigned and criteria in the PES. | Generally 700 points |

## Key International Experts

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>General Qualifications</th>
<th>• academic and professional qualifications, evidence of continuous professional development • number of years of general working experience</th>
<th>1. If an expert is proposed by multiple consultants for the same position, evaluate the expert according to the CV provided. This may result in uniform rating for the said expert if the CVs are found the same in substance. Otherwise, different ratings shall apply if the CVs submitted by the consultants for the expert are different.</th>
<th>10%-20%</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Project Related Experience</td>
<td>• quality of project related experience based on relevant projects implemented</td>
<td>2. If there is more than one expert proposed by the consultant for one position, the lowest rating among the experts evaluated should be applied and reflected in the PES.</td>
<td>60%-70%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Overseas/Country Experience</td>
<td>• experience outside expert’s country including specific regional / country experience</td>
<td>3. If an expert is found not meeting a level of certain requirement in TOR, non-complying rating (0%) by a pass/fail approach is not allowed; instead, assess the value of the expert for the assignment and rate the expert within a “below average” range (1 – 69%).</td>
<td>10%-20%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

## Key National Experts

<p>| General Qualifications | • academic and professional qualifications, evidence of continuous professional development • number of years of general working experience | 1. If an expert is proposed by multiple consultants for the same position, evaluate the expert according to the CV provided. This may result in uniform rating for the said expert if the CVs are found the same in substance. Otherwise, different ratings shall apply if the CVs submitted by the consultants for the expert are different. | 10%-20% |</p>
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Criteria</th>
<th>Factors to Consider</th>
<th>Points / Max. Weight</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>
| Project Related Experience                   | • quality of project related experience based on relevant projects implemented     | 4. Zero/Non-Complying rating in SES must meet criteria for “Disqualification of an Expert” in the RFP.  
5. If an expert is found to be sanctioned by ADB, continue evaluation of the expert and request the consultant to replace the expert when the consultant is invited to the negotiation. Note: Firms and experts attempting to participate in ADB activities while sanctioned must be reported to ADB OAI for investigation. | 60%-70%               |
| Experience with International Organizations   | • experience in working with international consulting firm or international organizations/ international agencies | 10%-20%              |
Model Narrative Evaluation Criteria (NEC) for Evaluation of Biodata Technical Proposals (BTP)

Note: points/max. weight allocations must be consistent with the Summary and Personnel Evaluation Sheets (SES/PES)
Criteria can be adapted, and points re-allocated to suit TOR and selection requirements.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Criteria</th>
<th>Factors to Consider</th>
<th>Points / Max. Weight</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>I Personnel Schedule and Work Plan (TECH-1 to 4)</td>
<td>• Consistent relationship between proposed personnel inputs and work program. • Work program to be assessed on completeness and logical sequence of events. • Assessment may address phasing of activities of the work program and allocation and timing of expert’s individual inputs. • The balance between home-office time and field inputs / proposed number of trips should also be checked/ evaluated. • Presentation should follow format of RFP TECH forms • Check total proposed inputs versus estimated work requirements • Review appropriateness of time allocated versus the task to be performed by the expert</td>
<td>Generally 100 points</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>II Proposal Presentation</td>
<td>• Clarity and ease of assessment of the entire proposal (including material presentation) and Adherence to page limits as specified in the RFP. • If all items requested in the RFP are covered in a clear and easily understandable form and the proposal is assembled in a professional manner, maximum points are to be given. • Proposals which exceed the page limits specified in the RFP can be given a below-average rating under this criterion.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>III Personnel</td>
<td>Provide a separate assessment per expert listed in the PES. Each expert is to be evaluated against the tasks assigned and criteria in the PES.</td>
<td>Generally 900 points</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Key International Experts

| General Qualifications | • academic and professional qualifications, evidence of continuous professional development • number of years of general working experience | 1. If an expert is proposed by multiple consultants for the same position, evaluate the expert according to the CV provided. This may result in uniform rating for the said expert if the CVs are found the same in substance. Otherwise, different ratings shall apply if the CVs submitted by the consultants for the expert are different. 2. If there is more than one expert proposed by the consultant for one position, the lowest rating among the experts evaluated should be applied and reflected in the PES. 3. If an expert is found not meeting a level of certain requirement in TOR, non-complying rating (0%) by a pass/fail approach is not allowed; instead, assess the value of the expert for the assignment and rate the expert within a “below average” range (1 – 69%). 4. Zero/Non-Complying rating in SES must meet criteria for “Disqualification of an Expert” in the RFP. 5. If an expert is found to be sanctioned by ADB, continue evaluation of the expert and request the consultant to replace the expert when the consultant is invited to the negotiation. Note: Firms and experts attempting to participate in ADB activities while sanctioned must be reported to ADB OAI for investigation. | 10%-20% |
| Project Related Experience | • quality of project related experience based on relevant projects implemented | |
| Overseas/Country Experience | • experience outside expert’s country including specific regional / country experience | 60%-70% |

Key National Experts

| General Qualifications | • academic and professional qualifications, evidence of continuous professional development • number of years of general working experience | 10%-20% |
| Project Related Experience | • quality of project related experience based on relevant projects implemented | |
| Experience with International Organizations | • experience in working with international consulting firm or international organizations/international agencies | 60%-70% |