



# **Guidelines on the Evaluation of Technical and Financial Proposals and Preparation of Evaluation Reports**

## **Selection and Employment of Consultant**

Public Procurement Regulatory Authority  
P.O. Box 49,  
Dar es Salaam.

May, 2014

## Preface

Consultants employed by public authorities are selected and employed according to the Public Procurement Regulations, 2013 – Government Notice No. 466 of 2013 (hereinafter referred to the “Regulations”). The Regulations specify the procuring entities’ obligations to submit reports to the tender board during the selection process:

- a) a technical evaluation report subject to prior review by the tender board, such as the tender board’s approval prior to opening the financial proposals; or
- b) the combined technical/financial evaluation report;

This document sets out the format of a sample evaluation report. It is provided to procuring entities to facilitate the evaluation of consultants’ proposals and the subsequent review of these proposals by the tender boards.. The evaluation must be in accordance with the criteria spelt out in the Request for Proposals and carried out by qualified evaluators. The Request for Proposals should be prepared in accordance with the Regulations 287.

The evaluation report includes nine sections:

- Section I: Appointment of Committees for the Selection and Employment of Consultants;
- Section II: Evaluation of Technical Proposals
- Section III: Format of the Technical Evaluation Report – Text
- Section IV: Technical Evaluation Report – Forms;
- Section V: Price competition for consultant selection: acceptable methods in appropriate circumstances.
- Section VI: Evaluation of financial proposals
- Section VII: Financial Evaluation Report – Award recommendations – text
- Section VIII: Financial Evaluation Report – Forms;
- Section IX: Annexes:
  - Annex I: Individual Evaluation;
  - Annex II: Information Data Monitoring;
  - Annex III: Minutes of the Public Opening of the Technical and Financial Proposals;
  - Annex IV: Copy of the Request for Proposals;
  - Annex V: Miscellaneous Annexes – Ad Hoc.
  - Annex VI: Proposal Evaluation checklist
  - Annex VII: Personal Covenant for Members of the Evaluation Committee
  - Annex VIII: Personal Covenant for members the tender board

The report can be used for all methods of selection described in the Regulations. Though it mainly addresses Quality – and Cost – Based Selection, each section contains a note indicating the data and forms that are to be provided for the other methods of selection. For complex, specialized assignments, procuring entities may wish to obtain assistance from consultants to evaluate proposals.

Users of this sample evaluation report are invited to submit comments on their experience with the document to:

Chief Executive Officer  
Public Procurement Regulatory Authority,  
P.O. Box 49,  
Dar es Salaam

**Tel: 2121236/7, 2133466**

**Fax: 2121238**

**e-mail: [ceo@ppra.go.tz](mailto:ceo@ppra.go.tz)**

Link to Website: <http://www.ppra.go.tz>

# CONSULTANT EVALUATION REPORT

**Project Name** [*insert: project name*]

**Project Identification number:** (*insert: project identification number if any*)

**Procuring Entity:** (*insert: name of procuring entity*)

**Title of Consulting Services** [*insert: title*]

**Date of Submission** [*insert: date*]

## Contents

Section I:	Appointment of Committees for the Selection and Employment of Consultants .....	1
Section II:	Evaluation of Technical Proposals .....	4
Section III:	Format of the Technical Evaluation Report .....	11
Section IV:	Technical Evaluation Report – Forms .....	13
Form IVA.	Technical Evaluation – Basic Data .....	14
Form IVB.	Evaluation Summary .....	18
Form IVC.	Individual Evaluations – Comparison .....	19
Section V:	Price competition for consultant selection: Acceptable methods In appropriate circumstances .....	20
Section VI:	Evaluation of Financial Proposals .....	25
Section VII.	Financial Evaluation Report – Award Recommendation – Test .....	28
Section VIII.	Financial Evaluation Report – Award Recommendation – Forms .....	29
	Form VIIIA.Financial Evaluation – Basic Data .....	30
	Form VIIIB. Adjustments – Currency Conversion – Evaluated Prices .....	32
	Form VIIIC.QCBS – combined Technical/Financial Evaluation – Award Recommendation .....	33
	Form VIID: Fixed – Budget and Least-Cost Selection Award Recommendation .....	34
Section IX.	Annexes .....	35
	Annex I(i). Individual Evaluations .....	36
	Annex I(ii) Individual Evaluations – Key Personnel .....	37
	Annex II Information Data Monitoring.....	38
	Annex III Minutes of Public Opening of Financial Proposals .....	39
	Annex IV. Request for Proposals .....	40
	Annex V. Miscellaneous Annexes – Ad Hoc .....	41
	Annex VI: Proposal Evaluation Checklist .....	42
	Annex VII: Personal Covenant for Members of the Evaluation Committee .....	46
	Annex VIII: Personal Covenant for member of tender board .....	47

## **Section I: Appointment of Committees for the Selection and Employment of Consultants**

1. **Committee**
  - 1.1 For each engagement of consultants, the accounting officer or chief executive officer concerned shall appoint the following committees, to act in accordance with the Regulations:-
    - a) Evaluation committee
    - b) Negotiation team
  - 1.2 Every committee shall have an expert or a person qualified in the subject matter of the services to be provided
  - 1.3 Proposals shall be evaluate by an evaluation team consisting minimum of five (5) members for Technical Proposal evaluation and minimum of three (3) for Financial Proposal; all of whom are technically knowledgeable in the legal, technical, financing and economic analyses to be performed by the consultant.
  - 1.4 A summary of the qualifications and abridged curriculum vitae of each of the evaluation and negotiation committee members should be made part of the evaluation report and where appropriate the records of the selection process.
2. **Committee Composition**
  - 2.1 The committees set up under paragraph 1 above shall consist minimum of five (5) members for Technical Proposal evaluation and minimum of three (3) for Financial Proposal who are specialists or qualified persons in the field of particular consultancy services to be called for. Non – public officers may be appointed as committee members.

In the event that the chairperson is unable to perform the duties, the accounting officer or chief executive officer shall appoint another person with the necessary qualifications to act as the chairperson.
  - 2.2 The chairperson should be fully acquainted with the evaluation procedures and should become familiar with the contents of all proposals during the evaluation process. The chairperson shall manage the evaluation committee and the evaluation process.

2.3 In the absence of the chairperson at any meeting, the other members present shall appoint one of them to act as chairperson. The acting chairperson shall report their deliberations or findings to the committee chairperson appointed by the accounting or chief executive officer concerned

**3. Quorum**

The quorum for any meeting of the committees set up under paragraph 2 shall be as follows:-

- a) For the proposal evaluation committee, the quorum shall be all the member of the evaluation committee,
- b) The negotiations committee shall be composed of a chairperson, legal expert and an expert in the field of the assignment. All the three shall form the quorum.

**4. Proposal opening**

4.1 The technical proposals shall be opened in public immediately by the appropriate tender board after the closing time for submission of proposals.

4.2 The proposals shall be numbered serially and the last one endorsed with "and last".

4.3 The financial proposals shall remain sealed and shall be deposited with the secretary of the appropriate tender board until they are opened publicly.

4.4 Any proposal received after the closing time for submission of proposals shall be returned unopened.

4.5 The secretary of the tender board shall prepare minutes of the opening ceremony giving all the details of the opening. The minutes shall be signed by chairman and the secretary of the opening ceremony.

4.6 The signed minutes of the opening ceremony may be provided on request to consultants who submitted proposals.

**5. Duties of the Evaluation committee**

The duties of the evaluation committee shall be the following:-

- a) To establish and agree on the detailed evaluation criteria;
- b) Study, analyse, evaluate and rank all technical proposals;
- c) Prepare and submit the number of copies of the report required by the accounting officer or chief executive officer or the approving authority or other authority;

- d) Study, analyse evaluated and rank all financial proposals; and
  - e) Prepare and submit the number of copies of the combined evaluation report on the technical and financial proposal required by the tender board.
6. **Duties of the negotiations Committee**
- 6.1 The negotiations committee appointed under paragraph 1 above shall, on behalf of the procuring entity negotiate with the recommended consultants regarding the consultant's proposal in accordance with Section 76 of the Public Procurement Act No. 9 of 2011 and Regulations 308 of the Public Procurement Regulations, 2013 Government Notice No. 466 of 2013.
  - 6.2 Negotiations normally involve a great deal of detail work. The negotiators should go through the entire text of the main contract paragraph - by - paragraph. All blanks in the contract form should be filled in. The legal department should be asked to review all modifications to the draft contract and terms of reference before completion of the negotiations.
7. **Disclosure of the names of the firms to the committees**
- 7.1 After the committees have been formed in accordance with paragraph 2 of these Guidelines, the names of the consultants or firms on the shortlist and those who have submitted the proposals shall be disclosed to the member at the appropriate time.
  - 7.2 The committee members shall be given sufficient time to go through the list of the consultants and each one of them will decide whether or not his/her participation in the process will have conflict of interest.
8. **Disability of member of the committee on account of interest in contracts**
- 8.1 If a member of a committee appointed in accordance with paragraph 2 has any pecuniary interest, direct or indirect in any of the consultants/firms or in the contract, proposed contract or other matter, shall as soon as practicable, disclose the fact and shall not take part in the evaluation, consideration or discussion on any question with respect to it.
  - 8.2 A committee member shall disclose his/ her interest in accordance with Regulation 7 of the Public Procurement Regulations, 2013.



- 8.3 Each committee member shall individual, sign a declaration form (See Annex VII) to indicate whether or not he/she has any pecuniary interest in any of the firms and an undertaking not to disclose to unauthorized parties not related to the evaluation any information related to the proposals or the firms. The declaration shall be made part of the report.
- 8.4 The accounting officer or chief executive officer of the procuring entity and the secretary of the tender board shall cause to be recorded in a book or other document to be kept for the purposes, particulars of any disclosure made under Regulation 7. The committee members shall also sign a declaration form.

## **Section II: Evaluation of technical proposals**

- 9. Evaluation Procedure**
- 9.1** The evaluation of the technical proposals shall be carried out as follows:-
- a) Examination of the admissibility and administrative conformity of the proposals; and
  - b) Examination of technical conformity, in particular, compliance with conditions laid down in the request for proposals, to the draft contract, and the terms of reference. Proposals found not to conform, following this examination, shall be rejected and excluded from further consideration.
- 10. Marking system**
- 10.1** The evaluation committee first meets to receive copies of proposals (every member should have a complete set) and work sheets
- 10.2** All technical proposals are marked on a merit point system or scores system specified in the request for proposals. To avoid misunderstanding, the chairperson should ensure the evaluation committee members understand and agree on the marking system before detailed proposal evaluation begins.
- 10.3** The chairperson should encourage consistency in applying the marking system. This is particularly important where price will be a selection factor and where absolute marks, not ranking, are thus taken in consideration in the evaluation's second stage.

- 11. Evaluation of technical quality of the proposal**
- 11.1 The proposals, which pass the examination indicated in paragraph 9 above, should normally be evaluated in detail. The technical proposals should always be evaluated solely on quality aspects that are examined before opening the financial proposals or before price negotiation. The evaluation shall be carried out on the basis of the system of grading described in the request for proposals.
- 11.2 To avoid collusion, each member of the evaluation committee should independently evaluate the technical proposal(s) by applying agreed evaluation sub - criteria based on the evaluation criteria of the letter of invitation/request for proposals.
- 11.3 It is necessary for the evaluation committee to provide feed back on the comments and observations of the terms of reference made by each firm or association or joint venture, indicating if it has any implications for evaluation at this and the subsequent stages especially, at financial evaluation and negotiations.
- 11.4 After carrying out the individual evaluations, committee members shall average the evaluation results and reach a consensus on the ranking between committee members. It is a balance of views guided by clear evaluation criteria and allocation of carefully weighted points/marks. It cannot be stressed enough that a good balance of committee members should be sought, with all members of equal or near equal status, to reach consensus on which technical proposal is best qualified to meet the objectives of the assignment.
- 11.5 The evaluation criteria are related to the following main criteria and sub - categories:-
- a) **Qualifications and experience**
- i) experience in similar projects;
  - ii) experience in similar areas and conditions;
  - iii) capacity of consultants to carry out the assignment;
  - iv) specialization;
  - v) Reference from clients, banks, etc;
  - vi) Organization and management;
  - vii) Qualify assurance programmes; and
  - viii) Legal disputes

**b) Proposed methodology and works plan**

- i) Understanding of the objectives of the assignment;
- ii) Responsiveness to the Terms of Reference;
- iii) Innovativeness;
- iv) Quality and clarity;
- v) Efficiency in resource utilization;
- vi) Technology;
- vii) Flexibility and adaptability;
- viii) Timeliness of outputs;
- ix) Reliability and sustainability; and
- x) Efficiency in transfer of skills.

**c) Quality of proposed staff**

- i) General qualifications;
- ii) Age;
- iii) Education level;
- iv) Experience in similar assignments;
- v) Publications on relevant subjects;
- vi) Specialization;
- vii) Language capability;
- viii) Professional experience and status;
- ix) Training experience; and
- x) Career attainment.

**d) The extent of participation by nationals among key staff in the performance of the assignment**

**e) Knowledge of the country (Tanzania)**

- 12. Points given to main evaluation criteria.**      12.1      As specified under Regulation 299(3) and Regulation 299(4) of the Public Procurement Regulations, 2013 – Government Notice No. 466 of 2013 the relative importance of the sub-criteria rated out of one hundred will vary with the type of services to be performed and as a guide, the following relative merit points may be specified in the Request for Proposals and used in the evaluation process.

<b>Points given to main evaluation criteria</b>							
<b>Type of assignment</b>	<b>Firm's general experience, reputation and experience in similar assignments</b>	<b>Understanding of the Terms of Reference, Methodology and work plan</b>	<b>Qualifications of Key Personnel</b>	<b>Local Firms participation</b>	<b>Participation by national experts</b>	<b>Knowledge of the country</b>	<b>Total</b>
Technical Assistance and training	5 - 15	25 -40	55 - 60	5 - 15	5 - 10	5 - 10	100
Pre-investments and feasibility studies	10 - 15	30 - 40	45 -60	5 - 15	5 - 10	5 - 10	100
Engineering /design	10 - 15	25 - 40	45 - 60	10 - 15	5 - 10	5 - 10	100
Implementation and supervision	10 - 15	25 -40	45 - 60	10 - 15	5 - 10	5 - 10	100

- 13. Clarification of proposals**
- 13.1** Sometimes during the evaluation process, procuring entities may wish to seek some clarification from one or more of the proposing consultants. Although this is an accepted procedure in tendering for goods and works contracts, it should normally be avoided in consultant selection for the following reasons:-
- a) any contact with one proposing consulting firm during the evaluation process raises doubts in the other firm's minds as to the fairness of the procedure,
  - b) in discussions with one firm other aspects of the assignment may be raised which will not have been shared with other firms and may put this one firm at an advantage (or disadvantage),
- 13.2** Where clarification can not be avoided, the clarification sought should not lead to change in the proposal or to completing the proposal with documents or information that were initially lacking.
- 14. Grading of the technical proposals**
- 14.1** After evaluation of the technical proposals, the evaluation committee shall grade and rank the technical proposals in accordance with the scores obtained. The proposals may be classified in categories either as in paragraph 14.1(1) or paragraph 14.1(2) or paragraph 14.1(3).

### **1. Evaluation based on Technical Quality**

In the selection procedure based solely on technical quality, the firm which has submitted the best technically acceptable proposal shall be the first to be invited for negotiation. The envelope containing the financial proposal shall be opened in the firm's presence and its contents examined. If no agreement is reached, then the consultant whose technical proposal is ranked the second lowest shall be invited for negotiation. The exercise may continue until an agreement is reached with one of the firms whose technical proposals are considered satisfactory and retained.

### **2. Combined Technical Quality and Price consideration**

The technical proposals considered satisfactory (scoring above a specified threshold say 70%) are classified by order of merit and the corresponding financial proposals are opened.

### 3. Evaluation based on comparability of technical proposals and least cost consideration

- a) Firms whose technical proposal are in the highest category of scores
  - i) category 1 : Very good: Above:85%
  - ii) category II : Good : 75% – 85%
  - iii) category III : Adequate: 60 –75%
  - iv) category IV : Inadequate : less than 60%

Proposals classified as “inadequate” shall be excused from further consideration. Some categories may cover only one proposal or none at all.

The envelopes marked “Financial Proposal” relating only to the proposals in the highest category resulting from the evaluation shall be opened. The lowest offer shall be chosen on condition that it can be covered with the financial resources available for the project.

If this condition is not met the same procedure shall be followed for the next – best category of proposals and for the category immediately below that if necessary. Category IV (inadequate) shall be excluded from Consideration.

- (b) Firms whose technical proposals are retained as the most acceptable “the best ranked consultants” shall be those consultants whose respective scores are not more than 10% below the highest technical score, and whose scores are above the minimum standard of technical qualification acceptable.

#### 15. Report for the tender board

- 15.1 A brief report on the evaluation process and results should be prepared for the tender board, which ultimately chooses the firms whose financial proposals are to be opened and evaluated. If the firms are to be evaluated using technical criteria only then the firm scoring the highest points should be invited for negotiations.
- 15.2 The report should indicate the principal items or areas to be discussed with the firm during negotiations.

- |     |   |      |  |
|-----|---|------|--|
| 16. | <b>Tender board's review of the technical evaluation report</b> | 16.1 | Where the objectivity of the evaluation process has been called into question as a result of either the tender board's review of the recommended proposal or a complaint from one of the invited firms, then the procuring entity must review the evaluation report and all the proposals. If this causes the procuring entity to believe that the evaluation has been carried out improperly, then the cause of action is:- <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>(a) To ask for re-evaluation with a new evaluation committee; or</li> <li>(b) Refuse to approve the evaluation process.</li> </ul> |
|     |   | 16.2 | The above assumes the perception of misconduct in carrying out the evaluation. A tender board's view that one proposal is better than the other is no grounds for initiating anything but reconsideration by the procuring entity of the application of the evaluation criteria.   |

**Section III: Format of the Technical Evaluation Report – Text<sup>1</sup>**

- |     |  |      |   |
|-----|--|------|---|
| 17. | <b>Background</b>  | 17.1 | Include a brief description, context, scope, and objectives of the services. Use about a quarter of a page.   |
| 18. | <b>The selection process (prior to technical evaluation)</b> | 18.1 | Elaborate on information provided in Form IIA.<br><br>Describe briefly the selection process, beginning with the advertising (if required), the establishment of the shortlist, expressions of interest, and withdrawals of firms before proposal submission. Describe major events that may have affected the timing (delays, complaints from consultants, key correspondence with the tender board, request for proposals (RFP), extension of proposal submission date, and so on). Use about one-half to one page. |
| 19. | <b>Technical evaluation</b>                                  | 19.1 | Describe briefly the meetings and actions taken by the evaluation committee: formation of a technical evaluation team, outside assistance, evaluation guidelines, justification of sub criteria and associated weightings as indicated in the standard request for proposals; relevant correspondence with the tender board; and compliance of evaluation with RFP.   |

---

<sup>1</sup> Section III applies to Quality and Cost Based Selection (QCBS), Quality Based Selection (Quality Based), Fixed Budget Selection ( Fixed-Budget) and Least Cost Selection (Least-Cost). Provide appropriate information in the case of selection based on Qualifications (Qualifications) and Single Source Selection (SS).

- 19.2 Present results of the technical evaluation: scores and the award recommendation.
- 19.3 Highlight strengths and weaknesses of each proposal (most important part of the report).
- a) Strengths:
- Experience in very similar projects in the United Republic of Tanzania; quality of the methodology, providing a clear understanding of the scope of the assignment; strengths of the local partner; and experience of proposed staff in similar assignments.
- b) Weaknesses:
- Of a particular component of the proposal; of a lack of experience in the United Republic of Tanzania; of a low level of participation by the local partner; of a lack of practical experience (experience in studies rather than in implementation); of staff experience compared to the firm's experience; of a key staff (e.g., the team leader); of a lack of responsiveness; and of disqualifications (conflict of interest etc)
- 19.4 Comment on individual evaluators' scores (discrepancies).
- 19.5 Items requiring further negotiations. Use up to three pages.



## **Section IV: Technical Evaluation Report - Forms<sup>2</sup>**

---

- Form IVA. Technical Evaluation - Basic Data
- Form IVB. Evaluation Summary - Technical Scores/Ranking
- Form IVC. Individual Evaluations - Comparison (Average Scores)

---

<sup>2</sup> Section IV applies to Quality - and cost-Based Selection (QCBS), Quality-Based Selection (Quality-Based), Fixed-Budget Selection (Fixed -Budget), and Least-Cost Selection (Least-Cost). Supply appropriate data in cases of Selection Based on Qualifications (Qualifications) and Single-Source Selection (Single-Source) in Form IVA.

**Form IVA: Technical Evaluation – Basic Data**

---

1. Name of Project \_\_\_\_\_
2. Client:
- (b) name \_\_\_\_\_
- (c) address, phone, facsimile \_\_\_\_\_  
\_\_\_\_\_  
\_\_\_\_\_
3. Type of assignment (pre-investment, preparation, or implementation), and brief description of sources \_\_\_\_\_  
\_\_\_\_\_  
\_\_\_\_\_
4. Method of selection.<sup>3</sup> QCBS \_\_\_\_\_ Quality-Based \_\_\_\_\_
5. Prior review thresholds: TZS. \_\_\_\_\_
6. Request for expressions of interest<sup>4</sup>:
- (a) Publication of the General Procurement Notice<sup>5</sup> \_\_\_\_\_
- (b) Publication in national newspaper(s) Yes \_\_\_\_\_ No \_\_\_\_\_
- (c) number of responses \_\_\_\_\_
7. Shortlist:
- (a) name/nationality of Firms/associations (mark Domestic firms and firms that had expressed interest)
1. \_\_\_\_\_
2. \_\_\_\_\_
3. \_\_\_\_\_
4. \_\_\_\_\_
5. \_\_\_\_\_
6. \_\_\_\_\_

---

<sup>3</sup> See Regulations

<sup>4</sup> Required for large contracts (see Regulations).

<sup>5</sup> Indicate whether expressions of interest advertised in Web or hardcopy edition

- b) Submission to the tender board for approval Date \_\_\_\_\_
- c) Tender board approval Date \_\_\_\_\_
8. Request for Proposals:
- a) Submission to the tender board for approval Date \_\_\_\_\_
- b) Tender board approval Date \_\_\_\_\_
- c) Issuance to Consultants Date \_\_\_\_\_
9. Amendments and clarifications to the RFP (describe) \_\_\_\_\_  
\_\_\_\_\_
10. Contract:
- a) Public Procurement Authority  
Simple Yes \_\_\_\_\_ No \_\_\_\_\_  
Time-Based Price adjustment: Yes \_\_\_\_\_ No \_\_\_\_\_
- b) Public Procurement Authority  
Lump Sum Yes \_\_\_\_\_ No \_\_\_\_\_  
Price adjustment: Yes \_\_\_\_\_ No \_\_\_\_\_
- c) Public Procurement Authority  
Complex Yes \_\_\_\_\_ No \_\_\_\_\_  
Time-Based Price adjustment: Yes \_\_\_\_\_ No \_\_\_\_\_
- d) Other (describe) \_\_\_\_\_  
\_\_\_\_\_
11. Pre-proposal conference: Yes \_\_\_\_\_ No \_\_\_\_\_
- a) minutes issued Yes \_\_\_\_\_ No \_\_\_\_\_
12. Proposal submission:
- a) two envelopes (technical and financial proposals) Yes \_\_\_\_\_
- b) one envelope (technical) Yes \_\_\_\_\_
- c) original submission Date \_\_\_\_\_ Time \_\_\_\_\_
- d) extensions(s) Date \_\_\_\_\_ Time \_\_\_\_\_
13. Submission of Financial Proposal Location \_\_\_\_\_
14. Opening of Technical Proposal by tender board Date \_\_\_\_\_ Time \_\_\_\_\_
15. Number of proposals submitted \_\_\_\_\_
16. Evaluation committee<sup>6</sup>:  
Members' names and titles  
(Technical Proposal minimum 5) 1. \_\_\_\_\_  
(Financial Proposal minimum 3) 2. \_\_\_\_\_  
3. \_\_\_\_\_

4. \_\_\_\_\_  
5. \_\_\_\_\_

17. Proposal validity period (days):

- a) original expiration date Date \_\_\_\_\_ Time \_\_\_\_\_
- b) extension(s), if any Date \_\_\_\_\_ Time \_\_\_\_\_

1.8 Evaluation Criteria/subcriteria<sup>7</sup>:

- a) Consultants' experience
  - (i) \_\_\_\_\_ Weight \_\_\_\_\_
  - (ii) \_\_\_\_\_ Weight \_\_\_\_\_
  
- b) Methodology
  - (i) \_\_\_\_\_ Weight \_\_\_\_\_
  - (ii) \_\_\_\_\_ Weight \_\_\_\_\_
  
- c) Key staff
  - (i) individual(s)
    - (A) \_\_\_\_\_ Weight \_\_\_\_\_
    - (B) \_\_\_\_\_ Weight \_\_\_\_\_
    - (C) \_\_\_\_\_ Weight \_\_\_\_\_
  
  - (ii) group(s)
    - (A) \_\_\_\_\_ Weight \_\_\_\_\_
    - (B) \_\_\_\_\_ Weight \_\_\_\_\_
    - (C) \_\_\_\_\_ Weight \_\_\_\_\_
  
- d) Training (optional)
  - (i) \_\_\_\_\_ Weight \_\_\_\_\_
  - (ii) \_\_\_\_\_ Weight \_\_\_\_\_
  
- e) local input (optional)
  - (i) \_\_\_\_\_ Weight \_\_\_\_\_
  - (ii) \_\_\_\_\_ Weight \_\_\_\_\_

---

6 It is important that evaluators be qualified.

7 Maximum of three sub-criteria per criterion.

19. Technical scores by Consultant      Minimum qualifying score \_\_

<b>Consultants' names</b>	<b>Technical scores</b>
1.	
2.	
3.	
4.	

20 Evaluation report:

(a) submission to the tender board  
for approval

Date \_\_\_\_\_

**Form IVB: Evaluation Summary**

---

**Technical Scores/Ranking**

<i>Consultants' names</i>	<i>[insert name of Consultant 1]</i>	<i>[Insert name of Consultant 2]</i>	<i>[Insert name of Consultant 3]</i>	<i>[Insert name of Consultant 4], etc</i>
<b>Criteria</b>	<b>Scores</b>	<b>Scores</b>	<b>Scores</b>	<b>Scores</b>
Experience				
Methodology				
Proposed staff				
Training				
Local input				
<b>Total score<sup>a</sup></b>				
<b>Rank</b>				

a. Proposals scoring below the minimum qualifying score of [number] points have been rejected.

**Form IVC: Individual Evaluations - Comparison**

<i>Consultants' Names</i>	<i>[Insert name of Consultant 1]</i>	<i>[Insert name of Consultant 2]</i>	<i>[Insert name of Consultant 3]</i>	<i>[Insert name of Consultant 4],etc</i>
Criteria Experience	A B C AV <sup>a</sup> D			
Methodology				
Key staff				
Training				
Local input				
<b>Total</b>				

a. A, B, C, and D = scores given by evaluators; AV = average score, see Annex I(i).

**Note:**

*Please see the Preface.*

*Financial proposals must not be opened* before the approval of the appropriate tender board on the technical evaluation. The technical evaluation (technical scores in particular) cannot be changed following the opening of the financial proposals.

**Section V: Price competition for consultant selection acceptable methods in appropriate circumstances**

<p><b>20. Selection Consideration</b></p>	<p><b>20.1</b> Quality considerations should be foremost in the selection and employment of consultants, but the use of price as another selection factor is accepted by the Public Procurement Regulatory Authority under certain well defined conditions which should be strictly observed. The purpose of these guidelines is to show, in those cases where it has been agreed that price is an appropriate criterion and how it can be evaluated.</p> <p><b>20.2</b> The use of price even as a minor element, offers the entire strategy of proposal presentation by the consultant. Nothing that follows should therefore, be interpreted as relaxing the insistence on quality as the only factor in the majority of cases. Where there are insuperable budget constraints, there is always the possibility of stating the budget in the Letter of Invitation as a ceiling for core proposals. Under such circumstances, consultants can still suggest extension to their core work plan and attempt to justify them, but price does not enter into the evaluation process which generally considers the core proposal only.</p> <p><b>20.3</b> Where price is an accepted factor, in no case may the evaluated price include local duties or taxes or any form of financial preference for domestic of “most favored nation” consultants. Equally, the price considered must be the total net contract value and not any individual unit rates or multipliers.</p>
<p><b>21. Acceptable methods of evaluation of proposals</b></p>	<p><b>21.1 There are six acceptable ways to use price, and they fall into three main categories. They are:-</b></p> <p>a) Weighting of technical and financial proposals to reach a combined value:</p> <p>i) Marks proportional to the lowest responsive proposal;</p> <p>ii) Marks proportional to percentage variation from lowest responsive proposal</p> <p>b) Equivalent price calculation, using bonuses for quality points</p>



	<p>c) Lowest cost among highest quality bracket</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>i) the “high bracket” based on percentage variations from top firm</li> <li>ii) the “high bracket” based on number of firms within high scores</li> <li>iii) the “high bracket” being all firms above a minimum threshold.</li> </ul> <p>It should be noted that there are other, non-acceptable methods, including variations of the first and last categories and that the precise application of the methodology is critical for an equitable evaluation.</p> <p>21.2 Unless the methodology is defined with precision in the Request for Proposals, the use of price, far from compensating for the subjectivity of the technical evaluation, adds a component of discretion, which can lead to abuse. The definition may be arbitrary but the resulting application is fair and discourages corruption</p> <p>21.3 All cases where price is to be taken into account must use a “two envelope” system with the technical proposal and price proposal in separate sealed envelopes. The price proposal is only opened after the technical proposal has been fully evaluated including, where necessary, agreement of higher authorities and tender boards and external clearance of the evaluation report until the time comes for these to be opened. Also, both the actual use of price and methodology must be cleared in advance with the tender board. The request for clearance should give a justification for the use of price based on the nature of the assignment, the budget and the likelihood and nature of any follow - up assignment.</p> <p>21.4 Familiarity with all methods is recommended since procuring entities are not all equally aware of the full implications of the various systems. One important element of the Public Procurement Regulatory Authority intervention is therefore, the training of procuring entities in the recognition of appropriate procurement practice.</p>
<p><b>22. Details of acceptable methods</b></p>	<p><b>22.1 <i>Marks proportional to lowest responsive proposal.</i></b></p> <p>In this method, there is a predetermined trade of between technical quality and price giving a weight, for example, of 90 percent to the former and 10 percent to the latter. The method of calculating the marks for</p>

	<p>the financial proposal is to take the lowest offered price as the numerator and the price of the proposal being evaluated as the denominator, giving a value of 1 to the lowest price and proportionate fractions for more expensive offers.</p> <p><b>22.2 <i>Marks proportional to percentage variations from lowest responsive proposal</i></b></p> <p>The second method in paragraph 21. 1(a) above is to use the inverse ratio - 100 percent more cost gets 100 percent less marks. This increases the impact of price (in the previous method, a proposal which cost twice as much as the lowest scores 0.5, in this method it scores 0). This is more rarely used and where it is proposed by the procuring entity, the weight given to price should be reduced accordingly. This method shall only be used on the prior written approval of the Public Procurement Regulatory Authority.</p> <p>In this method, the marks accorded to each firm are arrived at by subtracting the perfect score (100 per cent) the percentage by which each proposal exceeds the lowest price.</p> <p><b>22.3 <i>Equivalent price calculation, using bonuses for quality points</i></b></p> <p>The “cost equivalent” method attempts to evaluate quality in terms of cost impact on the project as a whole, using a rough and ready value engineering approach. The problem in this case, is arriving at a reasonable assessment of that impact. Because of the arbitrariness of the cost penalty, this is a difficult system to use in practice and should not be used.</p> <p><b>22.4 <i>Lowest cost among highest quality bracket</i></b></p> <p>The three “high - bracket” systems [paragraph ....] work as follows:-</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>a) The price proposals of all firms within a specified percent of the top firm are opened, and the lowest price firm is selected.</li> <li>b) The price proposal of say the top firm is opened, and the lowest price firm is selected.</li> <li>c) The lowest price firm above a minimum threshold (say 75 percent) is selected. This subsystem is only acceptable where the quality of the firms is sufficiently comparable, and the</li> </ol>
--	--

	<p>output can be very clearly defined, e.g. the production of final designs or a statutory audit. It then becomes equivalent of pure price competition among responsive firms</p>
<p><b>23. Implications for negotiations</b></p>	<p><b>23.1</b> Where price is used as a selection criterion, the process becomes similar to normal goods and works procurement, with resultant severe limitations on the acceptability of price negotiations. From theoretical point of view, the firm having won on price at least partially, there is no justification in asking for the price to be reduced. From the practical point of view, the consultant has no incentive to make concessions since the procuring entity has equally no incentive to make (and the public authority should not finance) an approach to the second ranked firm.</p> <p><b>23.2</b> It should be noted that many of the advantages of price competition can be obtained simply by specifying the budget in the Request for Proposals as stated in Regulation 262 of the Public Procurement (Regulations, 2013 – Government Notice No. 446 of 2013 and then selections on quality only. Firms tend, under such circumstances, to prepare their prices as much as possible in order to be able to submit a comprehensive, well staffed work proposal within the set limit.</p>
<p><b>24. Unacceptable methods</b></p>	<p><b>24.1</b> This section illustrates various unacceptable ways in which price can be taken into account in the selection of consultants. The objective is to enable procuring entities and approving authorities recognize such methods and make reasoned objections to them. The methodologies discussed are the following:-</p> <p>a) Weighting:</p> <p style="padding-left: 40px;">i) Marks allocated from 0 to 100 for highest and lowest price, with interpolation for other prices</p> <p style="padding-left: 40px;">ii) Marks proportional to departure from average cost</p> <p>b) Lowest cost per quality point</p> <p><b>24.2</b> <i>Marks apportioned from 0 to 100 for highest and lowest offers, with interpolation for other prices</i></p> <p>This system has no theoretical justification</p> <p><b>24.3</b> <i>Marks proportionate to departure form average cost</i></p>

	<p>For this method, marks are deducted proportionately to divergence from the average, whether above or below it. The actual arithmetic varies from deduction the percentage variation directly from the total by a percentage proportional to the variation.</p> <p>A similar system is sometimes proposed for marking person-month content. The argument in both cases is the same. No variations of this method are acceptable. The theoretical objection is confirmed by actual experience.</p> <p><b>24.4</b> <i>Evaluation on basis of lowest cost per quality point.</i></p> <p>The arithmetic of this method is simple divide the price by the quality score – lowest cost being the winner. The inverse, giving largest number of quality points per unit cost, is also sometimes proposed.</p> <p>This is very close to pure price competition and assumes a straight line relationship between cost and quality. This is not acceptable.</p>
--	---

## Section VI: Evaluation of Financial Proposals

- |                          |   |
|--------------------------|---|
| 25. Evaluation Procedure | <p>25.1 The evaluation of the financial proposals shall be carried out as follows:-</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>a) Examination of the divisibility and administrative conformity of the proposals,</li> <li>b) Examination of the technical conformity, in particular, compliance with conditions laid down in the request for proposals, to the draft contract and the terms of reference</li> <li>c) Examination of conformity of the financial proposal to the technical proposal in terms of the main inputs of the services to be provided such as:- <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>i) key staff named in the financial proposal are not named in the technical proposal,</li> <li>ii) the technical proposal stated a different validity period than specified in the financial proposal,</li> <li>iii) financial proposed signed by a person different from the one who signed the technical proposal.</li> </ul> </li> </ul> |
|--------------------------|---|

d) Examination of the amount of sub-consultancy

PPA 2004 requirement with regarding subcontracting is that the cost of the sub-consultancy shall not exceed 25% and this can only be ascertained in the financial stage of evaluation. During the subsequent financial proposals evolution, care should be taken to ensure that the limit of 25% for subcontracting is observed by all firms that choose to subcontract and that for those in joint ventures; the intention to enter into legally binding joint venture agreement is demonstrated.

Proposals found not to conform, following this examination shall be rejected and excluded from further considerations.

26. Evaluation of the financial proposals

The proposals which pass the examination indicated under paragraph 25 above should normally be evaluated in detail. The logical steps to be followed in the evaluation of financial proposals may be summarized as follows:-

- a) Proposal are verified;
- b) Adjustments are made to correct arithmetic errors in the light of deviations or quantifiable reservations or possible benefits to certain public corporations
- c) Price variations applicable to the base prices are not taken into consideration at this stage
- d) for the purposes of evaluation, import duties and local taxes may be excluded if so specified in the request for proposals
- e) The different currencies of the financial proposals are then converted into a single currency (usually in Tanzania shillings) (or other commercial banks) for similar transactions provided that the date shall not be earlier than four weeks prior to the deadline for submission for proposals..
- f) The adjusted prices converted to a single currency of the consultants retained are thus obtained and used for the subsequent calculations or comparisons.
- g) The prices used in the financial evaluation are

those proposed by the consultants and which directly concern their services namely those that include personnel costs, reimbursable costs for foreign exchange and local currency expenses.

- h) On completion of the evaluation of proposals of combined report on the evaluation of technical and financial proposals comprising the evaluation forms together with the recommendations concerning the selection of the consultant shall be addressed to the tender board for review and approval irrespective of the selections procedure followed. The report shall have copies of the evaluated proposals attached to it.
- i) The tender board shall approval the evaluation report before the procuring entity invites the consultant to negotiate a contract in order to satisfy itself of the adequacy of the evaluation,
- j) Where the selection of the consultant is based only on technical criteria, the details of the adjustments and arithmetic corrections to prices are worked out during the negotiations but before an invitation is issued to the best ranked consultant to appear for negotiations. The procedures mentioned in paragraph 26.1(h) and 26.1(i) above must be followed.

26.2 The proposal with the lowest cost may be given a financial score of 100 and other proposals given financial scores that are inversely proportional to their prices. Alternatively, a directly proportional or other methodology may be used in allocating the marks for the cost. The methodology to be used shall be described in the request for proposals.

26.3 The formula for determining the financial scores is:-

- a) Either  $S_f = 100 \times F_m / F$  where

$S_f$  = the financial score

$F_m$  = the lowest price

$F$  = price of the proposal under consideration

- b) Or another proportional linear formula

27 Combined quality and

27.1 In the case of the quality and cost based selection, the total score shall be obtained by weighting the quality

cost  
evaluation

and cost scores and adding them.

27.2 The weightings for quality and cost are specified in the request for proposals.

27.3 The proposals will be ranked according to their combined technical (St) and financial (Sf) scores using the weights indicated in the request for proposals:-

$$S = St * T\% + Sf * P\%$$

Where:

T = Weight given to the technical proposal

P = Wight given to the financial proposal

$$T + P = 1$$

27.4 The firm achieving the highest combined technical and quality score will be invited for negotiations.

## Section VII: Financial Evaluation Report – Award Recommendation – Text<sup>8</sup>

---

*[The text will indicate:*

- a) any issues faced during the evaluation, such as difficulty in obtaining the exchange rates to convert the prices into the common currency used for evaluation purposes;*
- b) adjustments made to the prices of the proposal(s) (mainly to ensure consistency with the technical proposal) and determination of the evaluated price (does not apply to Quality-Based (quality-Based), Selection Based on Qualifications (Qualifications), and Single-Source Selection (Single-Source));*
- c) tax-related problems;*
- d) award recommendation; and*
- e) any other important information.*

Taxes may not be taken into account in the financial evaluation whereas reimbursable should be taken into account

---

<sup>8</sup> Applies to QCBS, Fixed-Budget, and Least-Cost. For Quality-Based, Qualifications, and Single-Source provide relevant information as indicated.



**Section VIII: Financial Evaluation Report – Award  
Recommendation – Forms<sup>9</sup>**

---

- Form VIIIA. Financial Evaluation – Basic Data
- Form VIIIB. Adjustments – Currency Conversion – Evaluated Prices
- Form VIIC. QCBS – Combined Technical/Financial Evaluation –  
Award Recommendation
- Form VIID. Fixed-Budget and Least-Cost Selection-Award  
Recommendation

---

<sup>9</sup> Applies to QCBS, Fixed-Budge, and Least-Cost. For Quality-Based, Qualifications, and Single-Source, provide relevant information as indicated.

**Form VIIIA: Financial Evaluation - Basic Data**

---

1. Tender board's approval to technical evaluation report (Quality-Based, Qualifications, Single-Source) Date \_\_\_\_\_
  
2. Public opening of financial proposals Date \_\_\_\_\_ Time \_\_\_\_\_
  - (a) Names and proposal prices (mark Consultants that attended public opening)
    1. \_\_\_\_\_
    2. \_\_\_\_\_
    3. \_\_\_\_\_
    4. \_\_\_\_\_
  
3. Evaluation committee: members' names and titles (if not the same as in the technical evaluation -)
 

\_\_\_\_\_

\_\_\_\_\_

\_\_\_\_\_
  
4. Methodology (formula) for evaluation of cost (QCBS only; cross as appropriate)
 

Weight inversely proportional to cost \_\_\_\_\_

Other \_\_\_\_\_
  
5. Submission of final technical/financial evaluation report to the tender board (Quality-Based, Qualifications, Single-Source) Date \_\_\_\_\_
  
6. QCBS
 

	Consultant' Name	Technical scores	Financial scores	Final scores
(a) Technical, financial and final scores (Quality-Based: technical scores only)	_____	_____	_____	_____
	_____	_____	_____	_____
	_____	_____	_____	_____

(b) Award recommendation \_\_\_\_\_
  
7. Fixed Budget and Least-Cost
 

	Consultant' Name	Technical scores	Proposal prices	Evaluated prices
(a) Technical scores, proposal and evaluated prices	_____	_____	_____	_____
	_____	_____	_____	_____
	_____	_____	_____	_____

(b) Award recommendation \_\_\_\_\_

(c) Fixed-Budget: best technical proposal within \_\_\_\_\_

the budget (evaluated price) Name \_\_\_\_\_

(d) Least-Cost: lowest  
evaluated price proposal  
above minimum qualifying Name \_\_\_\_\_  
score

**Form VIIIIB: Adjustments - Currency Conversion - Evaluated Prices<sup>10</sup>**

Consultant's Name	Proposal's prices <sup>a</sup>		Adjustment <sup>s</sup>	Evaluated	Conversion to currency of evaluation		Financial Scores <sup>d</sup>
	Currency	Amounts (1)			(2)	(3)=(1) + (2)	

- a. Comments, if any (e.g., exchange rates); three foreign currencies maximum, plus local currency.
- b. Arithmetical errors and omissions of items included in the technical proposals. Adjustments may be positive or negative.
- c. As per RFP.
- d. 100 points to the lowest evaluated proposal; other scores to be determined in accordance with provisions of RFP.
- e. Value of one currency unit in the common currency used for evaluation purposes, normally the local currency (e.g., 1 US\$ = Tshs. 1350). Indicate source as per RFP.

<sup>10</sup> For Quality-Based, Qualifications, and Single-Source, fill out up to column 3.

**Form VIIIIC: QCBS - Combined Technical/Financial Evaluation - Award Recommendation**

---

Consultant's names	Technical Evaluation			Financial Evaluation		Combined Evaluation	
	Technical Scores <sup>a</sup> S(t)	Weighted scores S(t) x T <sup>b</sup>	Technical Rank	Financial Scores <sup>c</sup> S(f)	Weighted Scores <sup>c</sup> S(f) x F <sup>d</sup>	Scores S(t) T + S(f) F	Rank
Award recommendation	To highest combined technical/financial ore. Consultant's name: _____						

- a. See Form IIB.
- b. T = As per RFP.
- c. See Form IVB.
- d. F = as per RFP

**Form VIIID: Fixed-Budget and Least-Cost Selection - Award Recommendation<sup>11</sup>**

---

Consultants' names	Fixed-Budget Selection		Least-Cost Selection	
	Technical scores <sup>a</sup>	Evaluated prices <sup>b</sup>	Technical scores	Evaluated prices
Award recommendation	To best technical score with evaluated price within budget. Consultant's name: _____		To lowest evaluated price above minimum qualifying score. Consultant's name: _____	

- a. See Form IIB.
- b. See Form IVB.

---

<sup>11</sup> Fill in appropriate part of form.

## Section IX: Annexes<sup>12</sup>

---

- Annex I. Individual Evaluations
  - Form IX Annex I (i). Individual Evaluation
  - Form IX Annex I (ii). Individual Evaluation- Key Personnel
- Annex II. Information Data Monitoring
- Annex III. Minutes of Public Opening of Financial Proposals
- Annex IV. Request for Proposals
- Annex V. Miscellaneous Annexes - Ad Hoc

<sup>12</sup> Annex I applies to Quality-Based, Fixed-Budget and Least-Cost. For Qualifications and Single-Source, it is replaced by a review of the strengths and weaknesses of the proposal, which may be amended by one or several evaluators

### Annex 1 (i): Individual Evaluations

Consultant's name: \_\_\_\_\_

Criteria/Sub-Criteria	Maximum Scores	Evaluators					Average Scores
		1	2	3	4	5	
Experience							
-							
-							
-							
Methodology							
-							
-							
-							
Key Staff							
-							
-							
-							
Transfer of Knowledge (Training <sup>a</sup> )							
-							
-							
-							
Participation by Nationals <sup>a</sup>							
-							
-							
-							
<b>Total</b>	<b>100</b>						

a. If specified in the RFP

1. Evaluator's Name: \_\_\_\_\_ Signature: \_\_\_\_\_ Date: \_\_\_\_\_
2. Evaluator's Name: \_\_\_\_\_ Signature: \_\_\_\_\_ Date: \_\_\_\_\_
3. Evaluator's Name: \_\_\_\_\_ Signature: \_\_\_\_\_ Date: \_\_\_\_\_
4. Evaluator's Name: \_\_\_\_\_ Signature: \_\_\_\_\_ Date: \_\_\_\_\_
5. Evaluator's Name: \_\_\_\_\_ Signature: \_\_\_\_\_ Date: \_\_\_\_\_



## Annex I (ii): Individual Evaluations - Key Personnel

---

Consultant's Name: \_\_\_\_\_

Key Staff Names <sup>a</sup>	Maximum Scores	General Qualifications ( ) <sup>b</sup>	Adequacy For the Assignment ( ) <sup>b</sup>	Experience In Region ( ) <sup>b</sup>	Total Marks (100)	Scores
<b>Total</b>						

- a. Sometimes evaluations are made by groups instead of individuals. Each group (e.g. financial group) has a weight. The group score is obtained by the weighted scores of the members of the group. For example, the score of a group of three individuals scoring a, b, and c would be  $ax + by + cz$  with x,y, and z representing the respective weights of the members ( $x + y + z = 1$ ) in this group.
- b. Maximum marks as per RFP

Name of Evaluator: \_\_\_\_\_ Signature: \_\_\_\_\_ Date: \_\_\_\_\_

## Annex II: Information Data Monitoring

---

- 5.1 Loan/credit/grant \_\_\_\_\_  
(a) number \_\_\_\_\_  
(b) date of effectiveness \_\_\_\_\_  
(c) closing date \_\_\_\_\_  
(i) original \_\_\_\_\_  
(ii) revised \_\_\_\_\_
- 5.2 General Procurement Notice  
(a) first issue date \_\_\_\_\_  
(b) latest update \_\_\_\_\_
- 5.3 Request for expressions of interest:  
(a) publication in *Gazette*  
(b) publication in national local newspaper(s) Date \_\_\_\_\_  
Name of newspaper(s) and date(s) \_\_\_\_\_  
\_\_\_\_\_  
\_\_\_\_\_
- 5.4 Did the use of price as a factor of selection change the final ranking?<sup>2</sup> Yes \_\_\_\_\_ No \_\_\_\_\_
- 5.5 Did the use of “local input” as a factor of selection change the technical ranking?<sup>3</sup> Yes \_\_\_\_\_ No \_\_\_\_\_

---

<sup>2</sup> Compare technical rank with rank in Form IVC.

<sup>3</sup> Figure out technical scores with and without “local input” (Form IIB).

**Annex III: Minutes of Public Opening of Technical and Financial Proposals<sup>4</sup>**

---

MINUTES

*[The minutes should indicate the names of the participants in the proposal opening session, the proposal prices, discounts, technical scores, and any details that the Client, at its discretion, may consider appropriate. All attendees must sign the Minutes.]*

---

<sup>4</sup> Annex III applies to QCBS, Fixed-Budget, and Least-Cost.

## **Annex IV: Request for Proposals<sup>16</sup>**

---

*[Relevant section of the Request for Proposal should be appended]*

---

<sup>16</sup> Annex IV applies to all selection procedures (The Standard Request for Proposals may be used for Qualifications and Single-Source, with appropriate modifications).

**Annex V: Miscellaneous Annexes - Ad Hoc**

---

## Annex VI: Proposal Evaluation Checklist

---

### 1. General factors

- a) Has the consultant responded with an appropriate technique or is he or she trying to fit the problem to favorite technique?
- b) What priority will this project receive from the consultant? How important will it be to his or her firm?
- c) Does the proposal meet the terms of reference and the intended scope of the study?
- d) How useful or capable implementation will the end product be?
- e) What degree of originality is present in the proposal?
- f) Are the submission of progress reports and presentation of interim briefings require? What progress reports and interim briefings are planned?
- g) What degree of direct consultant - client liaison is proposed? Does the consultant client relationship include a training component for the client's personnel? What type of training is proposed?
- h) Is the proposed content of progress reports in accordance with the requirements of the Client? Will progress reports contain a monthly statement of costs incurred, commitments and if necessary, a revised estimated of total costs?
- i) When the project is completed, how does the consultant intend to hand over the project?
- j) What degree of follow-up and/or debriefing is proposed? To whom do the relevant data belong and what happens to them when the project is completed?

### 2. Past performance

- a) Is the usual business of the consultant closely related to the proposed work?
- b) Does the references to past experience include activities specifically related to the requirements of the proposed study?
- c) Has the consultant been honored by professional societies because of his/her performance in a specific professional area?
- d) What reputation does the firm hold in the area of the proposed assignment?
- e) Has the firm worked for this client before, and if so, with what success?
- f) Are the statements of past performance worded so you can identify what work was actually performed?

- g) Are there aspects of past performance that indicate particular weaknesses or strengths?

### **3. Scope of Work**

- a) Has the proposal demonstrated an understanding of the problems to be solved?
- b) Is this assignment area new to the company?
- c) Has the consultant made an accurate assessment of the problem based on an interpretation of the requirements set forth in the work statement?
- d) Has the consultant presented an approach that will achieve the stated objectives?
- e) Is the proposed approach supported with justification of why it should achieve the objectives?
- f) Do you think the suggested approach will work?
- g) Has the consultant introduced unanticipated events which may result in a project overrun or an expanded scope of work?
- h) Does the proposal distinguish between the simpler and the more difficult performance requirements?
- i) Does the proposals convincingly show a depth of understanding of the problem?
- j) Are the technical problems clearly delineated or are they merely “parroted” from the request for proposals?
- k) Have the limits of the problem been specified to show that the proposed assignment will be restricted to an appropriate scope?
- l) Is these a concise but adequate review of literature? Is the literature review merely an annotated bibliography or is it a scholarly critique?
- m) Are the specific objectives of the proposal clearly stated? Are these goals realistic in view of time, equipment, budget and professional experience of the principal instigator?
- n) Is the proposal fully responsive to all written requirements and specifications?
- o) Are these any apparent discrepancies or omissions?
- p) Are the output clearly defined and presented?

### **4. Personnel**

- a) Is it clear which tasks in the assignment specific personnel will be assigned to and for what amount of time?

- b) Are the personnel assigned to specific tasks qualified by training and experience to perform the tasks successfully?
- c) Is there a clear organization chart depicting project management is there realistic apportionment of personnel level and time to specific tasks.
- d) What assurances are made concerning the availability of personnel proposed? Was a contingency plan requested if certain personnel become unavailable.
- e) Have enough time and personnel been included to provide adequate
- f) Does the success of the project depend, to a large degree, upon personnel not directly associated with the prospective firm?
- g) Do CVs related specific experience of personnel to the specific needs of this assignment?
- h) Does the proposal show the capabilities of the management to handle a project of the size contemplate?
- i) Is the position for the programmed manager in the overall organization and the limits of his/her authority and responsibility shown?
- j) Are the type, frequency and effectiveness of management controls and method for corrective action shown?
- l) Is the proposal dependent upon recruitment of key personnel?

## **5. Planning and management**

- a) Has the work schedule been specified clearly, and is it realistic in terms of time and money? Does it fit with available personnel?
- b) If time of performance is important and is a competitive evaluation factor, is the proposed schedule supported by the technical proposal?
- c) Is the planning realistic? Does it follow recognized and accepted procedures?
- d) Does the proposal show that the delivery schedule will be met and how it will be met?
- e) Are the various technical phases of the project detailed and realistically scheduled.
- f) Are effective review, evaluation and control provided at specific check points?
- g) Has the consultant allowed for all necessary clearances?



## 6. Facilities

- a) Are the facilities and equipment needed for successful completion of the study specified in the proposal?
- b) How does the consultant intend to access facilities not at the client's site?
- c) Does the use of facilities out side the client require a subcontract? If so, is the proposed subcontract specifically mentioned, along with an explanation of required qualifications?
- d) Is the planned use of facilities, such as printing, data processing etc realistic?
- e) If computer services are required, are these controls built into the processing so corrective action can be taken at intermittent points, if necessary?
- f) Is any government - furnished equipment required?
- g) Are the propose laboratory and test facilities adequate for the requirements of the technical scope of work?
- h) Are resources over - committed?

## 7. Cost

- a) Is the overall within range of your (the contracting agency's budget?
- b) What is the relationship between the cost figures and equivalent items in the technical proposal?
- c) Are the personnel costs reasonable according to the tasks to be performed?
- d) Are the appropriate personnel assigned to perform the appropriate tasks?
- e) Has expenditure been set aside for subcontracting requirements, such as data processing?
- f) Have costs for development of instruments, purchase of materials, such as scoring sheets etc been included?
- g) Does the travel seem reasonable when compared to the tasks to be accomplished?
- h) If consultants or experts are included, is their daily rate reasonable and within the proper financial range? Is the proposed time reasonable?
- i) Is an appropriate type of contract requested?
- j) Is the schedule of payment acceptable?
- k) Have appropriate procedures been used to estimate costs?

**Annex VII: Personal Covenant for Members of the Evaluation  
Committee**

---

**THE PUBLIC PROCUMENT ACT No. 9 OF 2011**

**PERSONAL COVENANT**

1. I ..... (full name of member) ..... (*designation of member*)  
of ..... (*name of institution*) being a Member of the Evaluation  
Committee for Tender No. .... of ..... for the  
..... (*description of services*) constituted under Section 40 of the Public  
Procurement Act, 2011 DO HEREBY state as follows:-
- a) That, I do not have any interest, pecuniary or otherwise, directly or  
indirectly in any of the consultants, firms, associations or joint ventures  
that have submitted expressions of interest / proposals for the above  
mentioned tender; that is to say:-
    - i) M/s .....
    - ii) M/s .....
    - iii) etc. ....
  - b) That, all knowledge, reports or any other materials not within the public  
domain which I may acquire from the evaluation process, by virtue of the  
performance of my duties as Member of the said Evaluation Committee,  
shall for all time and for all purposes be regarded by me as strictly  
confidential and I shall not divulge them to persons not officially  
concerned with this evaluation process.
  - c) That, as a Member of the Evaluation Committee shall at all times adhere  
fully with the terms and conditions contained in the Public Procurement  
Act 2011 and the Public Procurement Regulations, 2013 – Government  
Notice No. 446 of 2013.
  - d) That, the breach of this Covenant or any provisions of the Public  
Procurement Act, 2011 shall not preclude the institution of criminal  
proceedings pursuant to the Penal Code, the Prevention of Corruption  
Act, 1971 or any other written law against me.
2. Signed by the said ..... this ..... day of  
..... 20 .....

THE PUBLIC PROCURMENT ACT No. 9 OF 2011

PERSONAL COVENANT

3. I ..... (*full name of member*) ..... (*Designation of member*) of ..... (*name of institution from where the member comes from*) being a Member of the [Ministry / Regional/District etc] Tender Board of the ..... (*name of the institution for whom this selection is being done*) constituted under Section 31 of the Public Procurement Act, 2011 DO HEREBY state as follows:-

a) That, I do not have any interest, pecuniary or otherwise, directly or indirectly in any of the consultants, firms, associations or joint ventures that have submitted expressions of interest / proposals for the above mentioned tender; that is to say:-

- i) M/s .....
- ii) M/s .....
- iii) etc .....

b) That, all knowledge, reports or any other materials not within the public domain which I may acquire from the evaluation process, by virtue of the performance of my duties as Member of the said Evaluation Committee, shall for all time and for all purposes be regarded by me as strictly confidential and I shall not divulge them to persons not officially concerned with this evaluation process.

c) That, as a Member of the Evaluation Committee shall at all times adhere fully with the terms and conditions contained in the Public Procurement Act 2011 and the Public Procurement Regulations, 2013 - Government Notice No. 446 of 2013.

d) That, the breach of this Covenant or any provisions of the Public Procurement Act, 2011 shall not preclude the institution of criminal proceedings pursuant to the Penal Code, the Prevention of Corruption Act, 1971 or any other written law against me.

3. Signed by the said ..... this ..... day of ..... 20 .....