ISLAMIC DEVELOPMENT BANK

EVALUATION REPORT

FOR THE

SELECTION OF CONSULTANTS
UNDER
ISLAMIC DEVELOPMENT BANK FINANCING

March 2015

Information for Users

Consultants[1] employed by Member Countries (Beneficiaries) of the Islamic Development Bank (IDB) under IDB financing are hired according to the Guidelines for the use of Consultants (The Guidelines). In line with IDB's Procedures, the Beneficiaries' are required to submit certain reports to IDB during the selection process:

(i) a technical evaluation report;

(ii) a financial evaluation report;

(iii) a combined technical/financial report with a recommendation for the selected proposal.

This document sets out the format of the above reports. This format will be used by IDB Beneficiaries to facilitate the evaluation of consultants' proposals and the subsequent review of these proposals by IDB.

The evaluation must be in accordance with the criteria spelled out in the Request for Proposals (RFP) and carried out by qualified evaluators.

Financial proposals must not be opened before the Beneficiary has received no-objection from IDB regarding the technical evaluation unless otherwise agreed by the IDB.

The evaluation report includes five sections:

Section I. A Short Report Summarizing the Findings of the Technical Evaluation
Section II. Technical Evaluation Report—Forms
Section III. A Short Report Summarizing the Findings of the Financial Evaluation
Section IV. Financial Evaluation Report—Forms
Section V. Annexes:
- Annex I. Individual Evaluations
- Annex II. Information Data Monitoring
- Annex III. Minutes of the Public Opening of the Financial Proposals
- Annex IV. Copy of the Request for Proposals
- Annex V. Miscellaneous Annexes—Ad Hoc
- Annex VI. Explanation of the Quality and Cost Based Evaluation Procedure

The report should be used for the Quality- and Cost-Based Selection (QCBS) method.

[1] The term *Consultants* in this document refers to organizations and not individuals.

Following the IDB's no-objection to the combined technical and financial evaluation report, the Beneficiary invites the selected consultant to negotiate and finalize the contract. The draft contract, initialed page by page by both contracting parties, is then sent for no-objection to IDB. Following no-objection by IDB, the Beneficiary signs the contract with the selected consultant and sends a signed and conformed copy to IDB.

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

Project Procurement Division (PPR)
Operations Policy and Services Department (OPSD)
The Islamic Development Bank
P.O. Box 5925, Jeddah 21432
Kingdom of Saudi Arabia
ppr@isdb.org
www.isdb.org

CONSULTANT PROPOSAL EVALUATION REPORT

Country [insert: *name of country*]

Executing Agency [insert: *name*]

Project name [insert: *project name*]

IDB financing [insert: *IDB Financing number or Project Code*]

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

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

Contents

INFORMATION FOR USERS ..... A

SECTION I. TECHNICAL EVALUATION REPORT—TEXT 1

SECTION II. TECHNICAL EVALUATION REPORT—FORMS 2

FORM IIA. TECHNICAL EVALUATION - BASIC DATA 3
FORM IIB. EVALUATION SUMMARY 7
FORM IIC. INDIVIDUAL EVALUATIONS—COMPARISON 8

SECTION III. FINANCIAL EVALUATION REPORT — 10

AWARD RECOMMENDATION—TEXT 10

SECTION IV. FINANCIAL EVALUATION REPORT— 11

AWARD RECOMMENDATION—FORMS 11

FORM IVA. FINANCIAL EVALUATION—BASIC DATA 12
TECHNICAL, FINANCIAL AND FINAL SCORES 12
FORM IVB. ADJUSTMENTS—CURRENCY CONVERSION—EVALUATED PRICES 13
FORM IVC. QCBS—COMBINED TECHNICAL/FINANCIAL EVALUATION—AWARD RECOMMENDATION 14

SECTION V. ANNEXES 15

ANNEX I (I). INDIVIDUAL EVALUATIONS 16
ANNEX I (II) INDIVIDUAL EVALUATIONS—KEY PERSONNEL 17
ANNEX II. INFORMATION DATA MONITORING 18
ANNEX III. MINUTES OF PUBLIC OPENING OF FINANCIAL PROPOSALS 19
ANNEX IV. REQUEST FOR PROPOSALS 20
ANNEX V. MISCELLANEOUS ANNEXES—AD HOC 21
ANNEX VI. EXPLANATION OF THE QUALITY AND COST BASED EVALUATION PROCEDURE 22

Section I. Technical Evaluation Report—Text

1. Background

Include a brief description, context, scope, and objectives of the services. Use about a quarter of a page.

2. The Selection Process (Prior to Technical Evaluation)

Elaborate on information provided in Form IIA.

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 submissions and compliance to eligibility criteria in respect of administrative documents,. Describe major events that may have affected the timing (delays, complaints from consultants, key correspondence with IDB, Request for Proposals (RFP), extension of proposal submission date, and other pertinent aspects).

Use about one-half to one page.

3. Technical Evaluation

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 IDB; and compliance of evaluation with RFP.

Present results of the technical evaluation: scores and the award recommendation.

Highlight strengths and weaknesses of each proposal (most important part of the report).

(a) Strengths: Experience in very similar projects in the country; quality of the methodology, proving 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 country; 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 staffer (e.g., the team leader); of a lack of responsiveness; and of disqualifications (conflict of interest).

Comment on individual evaluators' scores (discrepancies).
List items requiring further negotiations.
Use up to three pages for this section.

Section II. Technical Evaluation Report—Forms

Form IIA. Technical Evaluation—Basic Data

Form IIB. Evaluation Summary—Technical Scores/Ranking

Form IIC. Individual Evaluations—Comparison (Average Scores)

Form IIA. Technical Evaluation - Basic Data

2.1 Name of Country:

2.2 Name of Project:

2.3 Executing Agency:

(i) Name:

(ii) Address:

(iii) Phone:

(iv) Facsimile:

(v) Email address:

2.4 Type of Assignment (pre-investment, preparation, or implementation), and brief description

2.5 Method of Selection: Quality and Cost Based (QCBS)

2.6 Shortlist: IDB Member Countries:
National Consultants only:
Non-Member Countries:

(i) Names/nationality of firms/associations (mark domestic firms and firms that had expressed interest)

1.
2.
3.
4.
5.
6.

(ii) Submission to IDB for no-objection (Dates):

(iii)IDB no-objection (Date):

2.7 Request for Proposals:

(i) Submission to IDB for no-objection (Date):

(ii) IDB no-objection (Date):

(iii) Issuance to Consultants (Date):

2.8 Amendments and clarifications to the RFP (describe):

2.9 Type of Contract:

(i) Time-Based:

(ii) Lump Sum:

Indicate if Price adjustment: Yes/No

2.10 Pre-proposal conference held: Yes (date)/No

Minutes issued: Yes/No/Date:

2.11 Proposal Submission:

(i) two envelopes (confirm: technical and financial proposals):

(ii) original submission (Date and time):

(iii) extension(s) (Date and time):

2.12 Location where Financial Proposals are kept in sealed form:

2.13 Opening of Technical Proposals by Selection Committee (Date and time):

2.14 List of Proposals submitted:
Number of Consultants who formally declined:
Number of Consultants who did not submit:
If joint-venture, was joint-venture agreement submitted with the proposals?

2.15 Evaluation Committee[2]:

Members' names and titles (normally three to five)

1.
2.
3.
4.
5.

2.16 Proposal validity period (days):

(i) original expiration date (Date and time):

(ii) extension(s), if any (Date and time):

[2] Evaluators should be experienced and technically qualified to evaluate proposals

2.17 Evaluation Criteria/Sub-criteria[3]:

Consultants' experience:	
(i)	Point:
(ii)	Point:
Methodology:	
(i)	Point:
(ii)	Point:
Key staff:	
(i)individual(s):	
(A)	Point:
(B)	Point:
(C)	Point:
(ii) group(s):	
(A)	Point:
(B)	Point:
(C)	Point:
Training (if included in RFP):	
(i)	Point:
(ii)	Point:
Local input (if included in RFP):	
(i)	Point:
(ii)	Point:

[3] Maximum of three sub-criteria per criterion.

2.18 Technical Scores per Consultant:
Minimum Qualifying Score:

Consultants' names	Technical scores
1. 2. 3. 4.	

2.19 Evaluation Report: Submission to IDB for no-objection (Date):

Form IIB. Evaluation Summary

Technical Scores/Ranking

Consultants' Names	*[Insert name of Consultant 1]*	*[Insert name of Consultant 2]*	*[Insert name of Consultant 3]*	*[Insert name of Consultant 4]*
Criteria	Scores	Scores	Scores	Scores
Experience				
Methodology				
Key staff				
Training (if included in RFP)				
Local input (if included in RFP)				
Total Score[a]				
Rank				

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

Form IIC. Individual Evaluations—Comparison

Consultants' Names	*[Insert name of Consultant 1]*	*[Insert name of Consultant 2]*	*[Insert name of Consultant 3]*	*[Insert name of Consultant 4]*
Criteria Experience	AV[a]			
Methodology				
Key staff				
Training				
Local input				
Total				

. AV = average score given by evaluators, see Annex I(i).

FINANCIAL PROPOSAL EVALUATION

NOTE:

Please see the Preface.

<u>Financial proposals must not be opened</u> before the Beneficiary has received no-objection. The Technical Evaluation (technical scores in particular) cannot be changed following the opening of the financial proposals.

Section III. Financial Evaluation Report — Award Recommendation—Text

[*The text will indicate:*

(i) 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;

(ii) adjustments made to the prices of the proposal(s) (mainly to ensure consistency with the technical proposal) and determination of the evaluated price;

(iii) tax-related problems;

(iv) award recommendation; and

(v) any other important information.

Taxes are not taken into account in the financial evaluation whereas reimbursables are.]

Section IV. Financial Evaluation Report—Award Recommendation—Forms

Form IVA. Financial Evaluation—Basic Data

Form IVB. Adjustments—Currency Conversion—Evaluated Prices

Form IVC. QCBS—Combined Technical/Financial Evaluation—Award Recommendation

Form IVA. Financial Evaluation—Basic Data

4.1 IDB's "no-objection" to Technical Evaluation Report (Date):

4.2 Public Opening of Financial Proposals (Date and time):

Names	Proposal Price	Attended
1.		
2.		
3.		
4.		

4.3 Evaluation Committee: members' names and titles:[4]

Name	Function
1.	
2.	
3.	
4.	
5.	

4.3 Methodology (formula) for evaluation of cost: Quality and Cost Based: lowest financial proposals (Fm) receives a financial score (Sf) of 100 points. The financial scores of the other financial proposals will be calculated as follows: Sf = 100xFm/F (F being the proposed price of the consultants)

Weight inversely proportional to cost: for example: technical proposal: 80 points; financial proposal: 20 points (financial proposal should not exceed 30 points)

4.5 Submission of final technical/financial evaluation report to the IDB (Date):

QCBS Scores and Award Recommendation 4.6

TECHNICAL, FINANCIAL AND FINAL SCORES

Consultant Name	**Technical Scores**	**Financial Scores**	**Final Score**

Award Recommendation:

[4] If they are different from the Technical Evaluation team.

Form IVB. Adjustments—Currency Conversion—Evaluated Prices

Consultants' Names	Proposals' prices[a]		Adjustments[b]	Evaluated price(s)	Conversion to currency of evaluation[c]		Financial scores[d]
	Currency	Amounts (1)	(2)	(3) = (1) + (2)	Exchange rate(s)[e] (4)	Proposals' prices (5) = (3)x(4)	(6)

a. Comments, if any (e.g., exchange rates); foreign currencies, 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 on the basis o the lowest evaluated proposal.(see Annex VI)
e. Value of one currency unit in the common currency used for evaluation purposes, normally the local currency Indicate source as per RFP.

Form IVC. QCBS—Combined Technical/Financial Evaluation—Award Recommendation

	Technical Evaluation			Financial Evaluation		Combined Evaluation	
Consultants' names	Technical scores[a] S(t)	Weighted scores S(t) × T[b]	Technical rank	Financial scores[c] S(f)	Weighted scores S(f) × F[d]	Scores S(t) T + S(f) F	Rank
Award recommendation	To highest combined technical/financial score. Consultant's name: _____						

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

Section V. Annexes

Annex I. Individual Evaluations

Form V Annex I(i). Individual Evaluations

Form V Annex I(ii). Individual Evaluations—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

Annex VI. Explanation of the Quality and Cost Based Evaluation Procedure

Annex I (i). Individual Evaluations

Consultant's Name: _____

Criteria/Sub-Criteria	Maximum Scores	Evaluators					Average Scores
		1	2	3	4	5	
Experience							
-							
-							
-							
-							
Methodology							
-							
-							
-							
-							
Key Staff							
-							
-							
-							
-							
Training (if included in RFP)							
-							
-							
-							
-							
Local Input (if included in RFP)							
-							
-							
-							
-							
Total	**100**						

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[a]	Maximum Scores	General Qualifications ( )[b]	Adequacy for the Assignment ( )[b]	Experience in Country ( )[b]	Total Marks (100)	Scores
Total						

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 IDB Financing/Grant

(a) Project Code:
(b) Date of effectiveness:
(c) Closing date for submission:
  (i) original:
  (ii) revised:

5.2 Did the use of price as a factor of selection change the final ranking?[5]

Yes _____ No _____

5.3 Did the use of "local input" as a factor of selection change the technical ranking?[6]

Yes _____ No _____

[5] Compare technical rank with rank in Form IVC.

[6] Figure out technical scores with and without "local input" (Form IIB).

Annex III. Minutes of Public Opening of Financial Proposals

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 Executing Agency, at its discretion, may consider appropriate.*

All attendees must sign the Minutes.]

Annex IV. Request for Proposals

Annex V. Miscellaneous Annexes—Ad Hoc

Annex VI. Explanation of the Quality and Cost Based Evaluation Procedure

Explanation of the Technical Proposal Evaluation Procedure. Using the criteria for the technical evaluation given in the RFP, the evaluation team gives each consultant proposal a technical score "St". the minimum technical score should be 70 but is often set at 75 to give greater relevance to technical quality. The criteria could be as follows:

	Criteria	**Score**	**Maximum Score**
1	Consultants experience relevant to the assignment (experience in same type of assignments, e.g. 5 similar assignments satisfactorily completed)		10
2	Methodology: Conformity with Terms of Reference, work plan and conception, division of work among team members, man-months estimate for each sub-task, duration, provision for logistical and equipment needs, etc.		20
3	Qualifications and competence of key staff (here sub-criteria may be given in the RFP for team leader, engineer, economist, financial analyst, which together should not exceed maximum points given for this criterion)		50
4	Training (transfer of technology to the executing agency if this is provided for in the RFP, method and contents of training proposed)		10
5	Input of local consultants: degree to which consultant, if from a foreign Member Country, proposes to use national consultants in its team		10
	Total Score (St)		100
	Minimum Technical Score is 70 points		

After the technical evaluation is completed, the Beneficiary sends the technical evaluation report and the associated Forms (i.e. Sections I and II, and Annexes I(i) and (ii)) to the IDB for review and no-objection. An explanatory note should be added to highlight the most important aspects of the technical evaluation.

Following the IDB's no-objection to the technical evaluation, the Beneficiary informs the consultants whose technical proposals did not pass the minimum score, that their financial proposals will be returned unopened. After no-objection from the IDB to the technical evaluation, the scores for the technical evaluation cannot be changed.

It is customary for many Member Countries to open the financial proposals in public for reasons of transparency in the evaluation procedure. Only the technical proposals which passed the minimum technical score (even though in the example below the minimum qualifying mark is 70 points, this usually 75 points) will be opened for financial evaluation. The executing agency invites the remaining consultants to attend the public opening of the financial proposals. A two week period is normally allowed for consultants to be present or send their representatives. The Executing Agency then prepares the financial Forms IVA and IVB.

Explanation of the Financial Evaluation Procedure. The financial evaluation is important, because the Executing Agency needs to verify if the consultant has committed the necessary budget to implement what is in its technical proposal. It also needs to verify if there are no computational errors in the cost figures, the number of man-months and the associated costs, and if the number of man-months is in accordance with the technical commitment. The differences would need to be monetarized and added to the financial proposal.

The lowest financial proposal thus calculated is "Fm" and gets a financial score "Sf" of 100 points. The financial scores "Sf" of the other proposals are proportional to Fm, and calculated with the following formula: Sf = 100 x Fm/F (F being the proposed price of the consultant).

On the basis of the results of the technical and financial evaluation, the Executing Agency prepares Form IVC for the combined technical and financial evaluation to arrive at the recommended selected proposal. An explanatory note should be added to highlight the most important aspects of the financial evaluation. The weighting of the quality and cost scores shall normally be T= 80 percent (.80) for the technical score and P = 20 percent (.20) for the financial score. In proposals for more complex assignments such as multidisciplinary feasibility or management studies, where the technical quality requires more weight, the weighting should be T = 90 percent (.90) and P = 10 percent (.10) respectively. In proposals for straightforward and standard assignments (audits, simple feasibility or design studies), the weighting may be T= 70 percent (.70) and P = 30 percent (.30), respectively, but in no case should the weighting of the financial proposals exceed 30 percent. The technical quality of proposals is very important and has an important impact on the project's execution, since the cost of the project is a multiple of the cost for the studies.

Explanation of the Combined Financial and Technical Evaluation. The combined score is obtained by attributing the technical weight T to the technical score (St) and the financial weight P to the financial score (Sf). The formula for the combined evaluation (S) is follows: S = St x T + Sf x P. This is calculated for each consultant proposal admitted to the financial evaluation.

An example of the calculation of the technical and financial evaluation and the final score is given in the following tables on the next page.

TECHNICAL EVALUATION

Summary of the technical evaluations

	Criteria	**Points**	**Consultant A**		**Consultant B**		**Consultant C**	
		"p"	**Score***	**St = Score x p/100**	**St = Score x p/100**	**St**	**Score***	**St = Score x p/100**
1.	Experience	10	80	8	90	9	70	7
2	Methodology	30	70	21	73	21.9	82	24.6
3	Key Staff							
a)	Team Leader	20	75	15	80	16	90	18
b)	Engineer	10	60	6	70	7	65	6.5
c)	Economist	10	80	8	70	7	80	8
d)	Financial Analyst	5	60	3	60	3	90	4.5
4	Training	5	50	2.5	50	2.5	70	3.5
5	Local input	10	70	7	80	8	90	9
	Total St	**100**		**70.5**		**74.4**		**81.1**
	Minimum Score: 70 points							

* = Individual score on the basis of "p" =100

COMBINED TECHNICAL AND FINANCIAL EVALUATION

Consultant	**Technical Score (St)**	**Technical Weight= .80 St x .80 =T**	**Costs in EUROs**	**Financial Score (Sf)**	**Financial weight = .20 Sf x .20 = P**	**Score total (S) = T + P**
A	70.5	56.40	9.000	86.6	17.32	73.72
B	74.4	59.52	8.000	97.5	19.5	79.02
C	81.1	64.8	7.800	100	20	84.8

Financial Score: Fm = 7.800 = Consultant C = 100

Sf Consultant A = 100 x Fm/F = 100 x (7800: 9000) = 86.6
Sf Consultant B = 100 x Fm/F = 100 x (7800: 8000) = 97.5

Consultant C receives the highest combined score and should be recommended for negotiations and contract award