

**Financial Proposals Evaluation Report Format and Selection of the Most Convenient Proposal Consulting Firms**

**Preface**

This document has been prepared based on the update of the Norms for the Application of the Procedures for Procurement of Goods, Works, Non-Consulting Services and Consulting Services with the Central American Bank for Economic Integration Resources (PRE-40-2021) and contains the standard guidelines for the preparation of the evaluation report of financial proposals of public competitions for the selection of consulting firms; it has been elaborated from the procedure indicated in the Standard Bidding document for International Public Competition (IPC).

This document is intended to guide the Executing Agencies in the process of evaluating the financial proposals received through an IPC subject to prior or post review by the Bank. In addition, it may be useful to the Executing Agencies, with the appropriate modifications, for the evaluation of proposals in accordance with the Procedures of National Public Competition (NPC).

**General Instructions**

1. The evaluation forms included in this document show step by step the procedure for evaluating proposals received through an IPC. In all cases, the bidding and evaluation procedures described in the Instructions to Consultants (ITCs) of the competition documents used must be followed.
2. The evaluation forms included in this document are based on the ITCs, as well as the Competition Data (CD) which conform to such instructions and provide specific information about the contracts.
3. The evaluation and the respective report do not have to be necessarily extensive. Financial Proposals for IPC procurement can be evaluated quickly and practically. The forms must accompany, without exception, the evaluation report, but may be modified to adjust it to the specific requirements of the competition documents. The report should include several annexes explaining the details of the assessment or specifically indicating the controversial expressions or figures that may be in the proposals. Extensive use of cross-references should be done as well as references to relevant clauses in the competition documents.
4. The contracting party must study these forms during the preparation of the project to properly estimate the managerial and administrative conditions necessary for the examination of the proposals. Bank staff is available to explain the procedures.
5. Texts marked in red and italics have the sole purpose of guiding the Contracting Party on the text that should appear in its place.

**Logo of the Contracting Party**



**Evaluation Report**

**Financial Proposals and**

**Selection of the Most Convenient Proposal**

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
| Contracting Party: |  |
| No. and Project Name: |  |
| Name of the competition process: |  |
| Process Number: |  |
| Selection Method | *Select one of the following options:**Quality and Cost Based Selection (QCBS)**Quality-based Selection (QBS)**Fixed Budget Selection (FBS)**Least Cost Base Selection (LCBS)* |
| Contract Type: | *Select one of the following options:**Lump Sum**Time worked* |
| Date of submission: | ***(Write the date of submission of the report)*** |
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*(Texts marked in red and italics have the sole purpose of guiding the Contracting Party on the text that should appear in its place)*

# Financial Proposals Evaluation Report

## Evaluation Report Presentation

The present report contains the results of the evaluation of the financial proposals submitted for the process of (*indicate name and No. process reference).*

This evaluation is strictly based on the provisions of the Standard Competition Document (SCD), the proposal(s) submitted and, when applicable, the verification of their content, in witness of which this report is presented.

The responsible for the evaluation are:

Member 1: *(Indicate the name, position and instance represented)*

Member 2: *(Indicate the name, position and instance represented)*

Member n: *(Indicate the name, position and instance represented)*

Coordinator: *(Indicate the name, position and instance represented)*

The previous members have been appointed by the Contracting Party and have signed the respective confidentiality agreements that are included in the Annexes.

## Background

The Central American Bank for Economic Integration (CABEI), as part of the services it provides to its beneficiary partner countries, has granted financing *(indicate whether it is total or partial)* for the procurement of the consulting service (*Indicate the name of the competition process),* within the framework of *(name of the operation for which CABEI has approved the resources)*.

The Technical Proposals Evaluation Report is the starting point of this report, and the results are summarized as follows:

|  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| **No.** | **Consulting Firm** | **Score obtained** | **Weighted Score** | **Continues to the Financial Proposal Evaluation** |
| 1 | *Indicate the legal name of the Consultant* | *Indicate obtained**score* | *Indicate weighted**score* | *(indicate yes or not)* |
| 2 |  |  |  |  |
| n |  |  |  |  |

This report received the Bank’s No Objection by  *(write the reference number of the No Objection)* on date *(indicate date).*

Considering the above, this evaluation is carried out in which the Contracting Party is responsible for the process, the evaluation of the financial proposals and the selection of the most convenient proposal, which will be in accordance with the criteria established in the SCD and the application of the procedures established in CABEI's Procurement Policy and its Application Norms.

##  Financial Proposals Evaluation

*(Below are several sections within which the Contracting Party must write a chronological description of the evaluation process of financial proposals.)*

Once the non-objection of the technical evaluation report was received, all consultants were informed of the results and invited to open the financial proposals, as follows:

|  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- |
| **No.** | **Consulting Firm** | **Communication reference**  | **Date of the communication** |
| 1 | *Indicate the legal name of the Consultant* |  |  |
| 2 |  |  |  |
| n |  |  |  |

The communications issued are included in the Annexes.

1. **Financial Proposals Opening**

The opening of the financial proposals was made on *(indicate day, month, year and time).*

The names of the consulting firms and the overall technical scores were read aloud, with the corresponding breakdown by criterion.

The envelopes of the financial proposals were then examined to confirm that these have remained closed and sealed.

The financial proposals were opened and to read and the total prices contained in the ECO-1 were recorded in the presence of those interested in attending, with the following detail:

|  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- |
| **No.** | **Consulting Firm** | **Amount of the Financial Proposal** **(before taxes)**  |
| 1 | *Indicate the legal name of the Consultant* |  |
| 2 |  |  |
| n |  |  |

The opening minutes is included in the Annexes.

1. **Verification of prices offered**

During the evaluation, the following relevant facts were recorded: *(Indicate any relevant observations of this stage, as well as requests for clarifications and their responses).*

As part of the evaluation, the information presented was reviewed, including the reasonableness of the prices, finding:

| **No.** | **Consulting Firm** | **Information presented and analysis** | **Clarifications or corrections** |
| --- | --- | --- | --- |
| 1 | *Indicate the legal name of the Consultant* | *Indicate:** *Description and analysis of the submitted Information, indicating the reasoning for requesting clarification (when clarification is requested)*
* *Folio number and characteristics of the information presented*
 | *If no clarification or correction has been required indicate "Not Applicable"* *If clarifications or corrections, were required indicate:* * *Description of the information or clarification requested.*
* *Description of the clarifications and/or corrections received, including the analysis thereof.*
* *Indicate whether the information provided complied with the requirements.*
 |
| 2 |  |  |  |
| n |  |  |  |

The verification of the amount of the financial proposal considered the provisions of ITC 27, 28 and 29.

*If arithmetic corrections are not required, indicate: No arithmetic corrections were required.*

*Otherwise indicate:*

*As a result of the verification, errors were found in the proposals of the following consulting Firms shown in the following table, which were corrected and communicated to the consultants and these were accepted by the consultants:*

| **No.** | **Consultant’s Identification**  | ***Amount (\*)*** | **Correction** | **Communication reference to the Consultant** | **Consultant’s acceptance** |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| 1 | *Indicate the legal name of the Consultant* |  |  |  | * *(insert note number and date of communication)*
* *(insert note number and date of communication)*
 |
| 2 |  |  |  |  |  |
| n |  |  |  |  |  |

(\*) Amount read at the opening of the financial proposals.

## Selection of the Most Convenient Proposal

1. **More convenient according to the selection method**

*(Select an option according to the selection method and delete the remaining ones.)*

***When the method is selection based on Quality and Cost***

For the selection of the most convenient proposal, the following shall be considered:

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
| WFP: Weighting of financial proposal | *Indicate factor according to ITC 30.1* |
| WTP: Weighting of the technical proposal | *Indicate factor according to ITC 30.1* |
| LFP: Lowest Financial Proposal | *According to C(ii) Above* |
| **No** | **Consulting Firm** | **Financial Proposal (\*)** | **Financial Score** | **Technical Score\*\*** | **Total Score** |
| 1 | *Indicate the legal name of the Consultant* | *Indicate amount* | *LFP x WFP**Financial Proposal* |  | *Technical score + Financial score* |
| 2 |  |  |  |  |  |
| n |  |  |  |  |  |

(\*) Amount of financial proposal after corrections when these have been made.

(\*\*) In accordance with paragraph B. According to the above analysis, the order of priority of the following proposals:

|  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- |
| **Priority order** | **Consulting Firm** | **Total score obtained** | **Nationality** |
| *1* | *Indicate the legal name of the consultant.* *Place them in descending order according to the total score obtained* | *Indicate score* | *Indicate the country of registration of the Consulting Firm* |
| *2* |  |  |  |
| *n* |  |  |  |

**Aspects to consider for contract negotiation**

*For each of the consulting firms include the aspects to be considered in the negotiation in case of being awarded the contract or indicate Not Applicable.*

***When the method is Quality-based Selection***

The order of priority of proposals is as follows:

|  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- |
| **Priority order** | **Consulting Firm** | **Total score obtained** | **Nationality** |
| *1* | *Indicate the legal name of the consultant.* *Place them in descending order according to the technical score obtained* | *Indicate score* | *Indicate the country of registration of the Consulting Firm* |
| *2* |  |  |  |
| *n* |  |  |  |

**Aspects to consider for contract negotiation**

*For each of the consulting firms include the aspects to be considered in the negotiation in case of being awarded the contract or indicate Not Applicable.*

***When the method is Fixed budget Selection***

The order of priority of proposals is as follows:

Amount of the established budget:

|  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- |
| **Priority order** | **Consulting Firm** | **Financial Proposal (\*)** | **Nationality** |
| *1* | *Indicate the legal name of the consultant* *In which the financial proposal does not exceed the budget* *Place them in descending order according to the technical evaluation score* | *Indicate amount* | *Indicate the country of registration of the Consulting Firm* |
| *2* |  |  |  |
| *n* |  |  |  |

(\*) Amount of financial proposal after corrections when these have been made

**Aspects to consider for contract negotiation**

*For each of the consulting firms include the aspects to be considered in the negotiation in case of being awarded the contract or indicate Not Applicable.*

***When the method is Least Cost Selection***

The order of priority of proposals is as follows:

Minimum Technical Score is: *Indicate minimum technical score in accordance with ITC 25.3.*

|  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- |
| **Priority order** | **Consulting Firm** | **Financial Proposal (\*)** | **Nationality** |
| *1* | *Indicate the legal name of the consultant**In which the technical proposal exceeds the minimum score established.* *Place them in descending order according to the amount of the financial proposal* | *Indicate amount* | *Indicate the country of registration of the Consulting Firm* |
| *2* |  |  |  |
| *n* |  |  |  |

(\*) Amount of financial proposal after corrections when these have been made.

**Aspects to consider for contract negotiation**

*For each of the consulting firms include the aspects to be considered in the negotiation in case of being awarded the contract or indicate Not Applicable.*

1. **Eligibility Verification**

It was verified that the proposal evaluated as the most convenient is not part of the List of Prohibited Counterparties or another list of ineligibility of CABEI, so the respective searches were carried out without finding a match. The search result is as follows:

| **Legal name of the Consulting Firm:** *Indicate the name of the Firm* |
| --- |
| **Listo of Counterparties** | **Coincidence** |
| 1. United Nations (UN) Consolidated List of Sanctions <https://scsanctions.un.org/search/>
 | *Indicate Yes / No* |
| 1. Consolidated list of persons, groups and entities subject to European Union (EU) financial sanctions – To gain access, a free account must be created within the EU platform

<https://webgate.ec.europa.eu/fsd/fsf#!/files>  | *Indicate Yes / No* |
| Consolidated list of individuals, groups and entities subject to World Bank (WB) sanctions <https://www.worldbank.org/en/projects-operations/procurement/debarred-firms>  | *Indicate Yes / No* |
| 1. Office of Foreign Assets Control (OFAC) Consolidated List:<https://sanctionssearch.ofac.treas.gov/>
 | *Indicate Yes / No* |
| “HM Treasury Consolidated List of Targets”<https://sanctionssearch.ofsi.hmtreasury.gov.uk/>  | *Indicate Yes / No* |
| 1. CABEI's list of prohibited counterparties
 | *Indicate Yes / No* |

## Recommendation

*(Select one of the two options)*

1. After carrying out a detailed analysis of the documentation related to the proposals submitted by the consultants, it is recommended to apply what is indicated in ITC 6.1 and to start the negotiation in which the consultant will be given the possibility to match the conditions of the proposal with the order of priority No.1 as follows:
2. Start the negotiation with *(indicate the name of the consultant, whose country of origin is ...)*, in case of not reaching a satisfactory negotiation, the negotiation will continue with:
3. *(indicate the name of the consultant, whose country of origin is ...)* in case of not reaching a satisfactory negotiation, negotiations will continue with:
4. *(indicate the name of the consultant, whose country of origin is ...)* in case of not reaching a satisfactory negotiation, negotiations will continue with:
5. *Continue up to 15% below the score achieved by the consultant with the order*

*(This option applies only in international processes, where the proposal whose priority order is No. 1 comes from a consultant originating in a non-CABEI member country and it is verified that there are proposals, within a range of up to 15% below the score presented by one or more consultants originating from CABEI partner countries. In all cases prior to the start of the negotiation, the eligibility of the consulting firm must be verified).*

1. After carrying out a detailed analysis of the documentation relating to the proposals submitted by the consultants, it is recommended to start the negotiation of the contract with *(indicate the name of the consultant, whose country of origin is...)*. The detail of the award is summarized below:

|  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- |
| **Consulting Firm** | **Total Score Obtained** | **Financial Proposal (\*)** |
| *Indicate the legal name of the consultant* | *Indicate score* | *Indicate amount* |

*(This option applies only in national processes or in international processes where the consultant of the most convenient proposal comes from a member country of the Bank).*

This report is signed *(indicate day/month/year).*

|  |  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| *Evaluator’s name**Position* |  |  | *Evaluator’s name**Position* |  | *Evaluator’s name**Position* |
| *Evaluator’s name**Position* |  |  | *Evaluator’s name**Position* |  | *Evaluator’s name**Position* |

*(The evaluators must sign the report)*

# Annexes of the Report

Annex No. 1. Appointment of evaluators and confidentiality agreements.

Annex No. 2. Copy of Technical Evaluation Report Non-Objection.

Annex No. 3. Copy of the communication of the technical results.

Annex No. 4. Minutes of Public Opening of the Financial Proposals.

Annex No. 5. Requests for clarification, correction to consultants and responses received during the evaluation of the proposals.