



INSTRUCTIONS GUIDE TO DEVELOP EVALUATION CRITERIA FOR TECHNICAL PROPOSALS OF CONSULTING FIRMS IN THE CONTEXT OF PROCUREMENTS FINANCED WITH CABEI RESOURCES

V e r s i o n 1

IN-CP-07-04

RISK MANAGEMENT

Public Once Approved

In accordance with the regulatory framework of the Access to Information Policy, this document will be disclosed on the Bank's external website after its approval.

Table of Contents

I. INTRODUCTION.....	3
II. OBJECTIVE.....	3
III. SCOPE.....	3
IV. ABBREVIATIONS AND TERMS.....	3
V. DEFINITIONS	3
VI. RELATED DOCUMENTS.....	4
VII. DEVELOPMENT.....	4
1. Steps to follow for the establishment of evaluation criteria	4
2. Extended Technical Proposals.....	4
3. Simplified Technical Proposals.....	12

I. INTRODUCTION

The Central American Bank for Economic Integration (CABEL) is an international multilateral development financial institution whose resources are invested, among others, in the non-financial public sector of the member countries, which in general, for the selection of consulting firms, use CABEL's Procurement Policy and its application norms.

As part of the application of CABEL's Procurement Policy, once the short list of consulting firms has been formed, they are invited to submit proposals which will be evaluated using evaluation criteria which has been included in Section IV of the Request for Proposals Document.

These evaluation criteria must be prepared by the Executing Agency, considering the nature of the services required and following the guidelines established in this guide.

II. OBJECTIVE

The purpose of this document is to layout the guidelines that the Executing Agency must follow to establish the criteria with which they will evaluate the technical proposals they receive in the competitions to select consulting firms for the development of a consultancy assignment.

III. SCOPE

This document must be used by borrowers/beneficiaries or implementing agencies for the proper management of procurements where the procurement methods established in CABEL's Procurement Policy Application Norms are applied in public sector operations that are financed by the Bank.

IV. ABBREVIATIONS AND TERMS

- CABEL: Central America Bank for Economic Integration.
- IPC: International Public Competition.
- NPC: National Public Competition.
- SCD: Standard Competition Document.
- ToR: Terms of Reference.
- EA: Executing Agency

V. DEFINITIONS

The definitions and interpretations are those found in the Procurement Policy Implementation Norms.

VI. RELATED DOCUMENTS

- Standard Document for International Public Competition (IPC).
- Standard Document for National Public Competition (NPC).
- Procurement Policy and its Application Norms.

VII. DEVELOPMENT

1. Steps to follow for the establishment of evaluation criteria

- 1.1.** In compliance with the Procurement Policy and Application Norms, the standard competition document (SCD) must indicate the evaluation criteria, minimum score required to qualify the proposals, comparison mechanism and method of selection of the consulting firm.
- 1.2.** The details of the criteria to be evaluated will be included in the competition document and will be developed according to the guidelines described in paragraphs 2 and 3.

2. Extended Technical Proposals

- 2.1.** This type of proposal is required when the complexity or magnitude of the study to be carried out requires a detailed analysis of the way in which the structure of the consulting firm responds to the requirements of the consultancy.
- 2.2.** Considering the above, the description and analysis related to the evaluation criteria shall include:

a. Specific Experience of the Firm

Score assigned: Between 0 - 10

In this criterion, the experience of the consulting firm in assignments similar to the Terms of Reference (ToR) contained in the SCD is evaluated, for which the characteristics of the studies that will be considered similar to the scope of the ToR must be indicated detailing the characteristics of the tasks carried out, number of studies and the period for which the experiences will be considered.

Examples of these criteria are:

Example 1:

Evaluation Criteria	Maximum Score	Assigned score	
Have carried out in the last 10 years at least 3 designs of sanitary sewer systems for populations of more than 10,000 inhabitants, including wastewater treatment plants.	5	Less than 3 designs	0
		From 3 to 5 designs	4
		More than 5 designs	5

Example 2:

Evaluation Criteria	Maximum Score	Assigned score	
Have carried out at least 3 supervisions of paved roads with asphalt concrete, which length is greater than 5 Km and / or which cost of the supervised work is greater than US\$ 10M.	5	Less than 3 supervisions	0
		From 3 to 5 supervisions	4
		More than 5 supervisions	5

For evaluation purposes, the information included in TEC-1 will be considered considering:

- i. Studies in which the firm has been formally contracted by a contracting party and when the firm is a Joint Venture (JV), those experiences where one of the members of a JV was formally contracted by a contracting party will be considered.
- ii. The work carried out by the proposed key personnel personally or through other consulting firms may not be considered as part of the relevant experience of the firm or members of the JV. However, this can be included in the resumes of the proposed key personnel.

The consulting firm must be prepared to demonstrate the experience declared by submitting copies of the respective documents and references, if requested by the Contracting Party.

b. Quality of the proposed methodology and work plan and their conformity with the ToR

Assigned score: Between 20 - 50

This criterion evaluates the methodological approach proposed by the firm to carry out the work requested in the ToR, as well as the work plan associated with the methodology.

- i. For the evaluation of the methodology, the following aspects will be considered, among others:

- The proposed methodology reflects a clear understanding of the expected results of the project and contributes to achieving the objective and scope of the Consultancy.
 - The methodology proposed by the consultant indicates the way in which the tasks will be carried out, the methods and techniques to be used.
 - The proposal includes the detailed breakdown of the outputs to be delivered, activities to be carried out as part of the preparation of each deliverable and each phase (which will be consistent with the Work Plan).
 - In the case of supervision of works, the evaluation of the approach to the environmental, social (including sexual exploitation and abuse - SEA - and gender violence - GV) and Occupational Safety and Health (OSH) aspects must be included to generate the expected results and the degree of detail of these results.
- ii. For the evaluation of the work plan, the following aspects will be considered, among others:
- The established schedule is consistent with the deliverables, presents the duration of each activity (and the relation between the activities), has a logical sequence between activities and assignment of key personnel.
 - The schedule is realistic and feasible, meets expectations and allows the gradual and orderly approach to a good term of the Consultancy.
 - The work plan has the right key staff, the overall composition of the proposed key staff is balanced and shows an appropriate mix of competencies.
 - It shows the deadlines of reports, consistency with the technical approach and methodology.
- iii. The Scoring will be made according to the extent to which the consultants meet the expectations of the contracting party, as follows:

Level	Description
High	The detail of the activities included in the methodology and the Work Plan correspond 100% to what is required in the ToR and also proposes an added value to it.
Acceptable	The detail of the activities included in the methodology and the Work Plan correspond exactly to what is required in the ToR.
Deficient	The detail of the activities included in the methodology and the Work Plan do not fully correspond to what is required in the ToR.

Examples of these criteria are:

Example 1:

Evaluation criteria	Maximum Score	Assigned score	
Adherence of the methodology to the objective and scope of the Consultancy to the ToR	10	High Level	10
		Acceptable	9
		Deficient	0
Adherence of the Work Plan and Schedule to the ToR	10	High Level	10
		Acceptable	9
		Deficient	0
Total	20		

c. Qualification of proposed key personnel and their suitability for the job

Assigned score: Between 30 - 60

This criterion evaluates the academic background, experience and suitability of the proposed key personnel. A score will be assigned to each specialist who will be graded in three (3) sub-criteria:

i. General Qualifications

General education, training, and experience
Weighting between 10 % - 20 % (of assigned score)

ii. Suitability for relevant work, education, and training

Experience in the sector or similar jobs.
Weighting between 60% - 80% (of the assigned score)

iii. If relevant according to the scope defined in the ToR

Relevant experience in the region, sufficient level of management of the local language(s) to work in the place/knowledge of the local culture or administrative system, the organization of the Government, etc.

Weighting between 0% - 10% (of the assigned score)

Examples of these criteria are:

Key Professional Personnel	Assigned scores		Maximum score
Team Leader-Project Manager			
General Qualifications			
University Professional in civil engineering or related.	Complies / Does not comply	2	10
Minimum general experience of 15 years	2		
Suitability for the job			
Master's in Project Management or similar	2	8	

Key Professional Personnel	Assigned scores		Maximum score	
Experience in Management of at least three projects	Less than 3 projects = 0			
	3 projects = 5			
	4 or more projects = 6			
Project Resident				
General Qualifications				
University Professional in civil engineering or related career.	Complies / Does not comply	4	20	
Minimum 10 years of general experience.	4			
Suitability for the job				
Master's in Project Management or similar.	4	16		
Experience in supervision of at least 3 pavement road construction projects with asphalt concrete whose construction cost exceeds US\$ 10 Mm and has a minimum length of 5 km.	Less than 3 projects = 0			
	3 projects = 10			
	4 or more projects = 12			
Pavement Specialist				
General Qualifications				
University Professional in civil engineering or related career.	Complies / Does not comply	1.5		15
Minimum 10 years of general experience.	1.5			
Suitability for the job				
Postgraduate studies in areas related to road engineering, geotechnics, pavements	1.5	13.5		
Experience in the position of pavement specialist of at least 3 projects of design or supervision of rehabilitation or construction of pavement roads with asphalt concrete whose construction cost exceeds US\$ 10 Mm and has a minimum length of 5 Km.	Less than 3 projects = 0			
	3 projects = 10			
	4 or more projects = 12			
Environmental and Social Specialist				
General Qualifications				
University Professional in environmental engineering or related career.	Complies / Does not comply	1.5	15	
Minimum 10 years of general experience.	1.5			
Suitability for the job				
Experience in the position of environmental and / or social specialist of at least 3 projects in management, planning, control or coordination of environmental studies or supervision of road construction projects which construction cost exceeds US\$ 10 Mm and has a minimum length of 5 Km.	Less than 3 projects = 0	13.5		
	3 projects = 10			
	4 or more projects = 12			
Total				60
In case one of the key professionals does not comply with a sub-criteria evaluated as "Comply / Does not Comply", 0 points will be assigned to the professional and in case of being awarded, this professional must be replaced during the negotiation of the contract				

d. Knowledge transfer program-training if included in the ToR

Assigned score: Between 0 - 10

This criterion evaluates whether the consultant's proposal is consistent with the work required in accordance with the ToR. The assignment of scores will be made according to the extent to which the consultants meet the expectations of the contracting party detailed in the ToR, as follows:

Level	Description
High	The detail of the activities included in the ToR and also offers an added value to it.
Acceptable	The detail of the activities included exactly as required in the ToR.
Deficient	The detail of the activities does not fully correspond to what is required in the ToR.

Examples of these criteria are:

Example 1:

Evaluation Criteria	Maximum Score	Assigned Score	
		Level	Score
Knowledge transfer program	10	High level	10
		Acceptable	9
		Deficient	0
Total	10		

e. Determination of minimum score

The minimum score that the consulting firm must achieve to move to the financial proposal evaluation stage will be the sum of the minimum values of each evaluation criterion as follows:

Example:

Evaluation criteria	Assigned score		Max score	Minimum
	Level	Score		
Have made in the last 10 years at least 3 designs of sanitary sewer systems for populations of more than 10,000 inhabitants that include wastewater treatment plant	Less than 3 designs	0	10	4
	From 3 to 5 designs	4		
	More than 5 designs	10		
Total			10	4

Evaluation Criteria	Assigned scores		Max score	Minimum
Adherence of the methodology to the objective and scope of the Consultancy to the ToR	High Level	10	10	
	Acceptable	9		
	Deficient	0		
Adherence of the Work Plan and Schedule to the ToR	High Level	10	10	
	Acceptable	9		
	Deficient	0		
Total			20	18

Evaluation Criteria	Assigned scores		Max score	Minimum
Knowledge transfer program	High Level	10	10	
	Acceptable	9		
	Deficient	0		
Total			10	9

Key Professional Personnel	Assigned scores		Max score	Minimum	
Team Leader - Project Management					
General Qualifications					
University Professional in civil engineering or related.	Complies / Does Not comply	2	10		
Minimum general experience of 15 years	2				
Suitability for the job					
Master's in Project Management or similar	2	8			
Experience managing at least 3 projects	Less than 3 projects = 0				
	3 projects = 5				
	4 or more projects = 6				
Project Resident					
General Qualifications					
University Professional in civil engineering or related career.	Complies / Does not comply	4		20	
Minimum 10 years general experience.	4				
Suitability for the job					
Master's in Project Management or similar.	4	16			
Experience in supervision of at least 3 pavement road construction projects with asphalt concrete whose construction cost exceeds US\$ 10 Mm and has a minimum length of 5 km.	Less than 3 projects = 0				
	3 projects = 10				
	4 or more projects = 12				
Total					14

Evaluation Criteria	Assigned scores		Max score	Minimum		
Pavement Specialist						
General Qualifications						
University Professional in civil engineering or related career.	Complies / does not comply	1.5	15	11.5		
Minimum 10 years general experience.	1.5					
Suitability for the job						
Postgraduate studies in areas related to road engineering, geotechnics, pavements	1.5	13.5				
Experience in the position of pavement specialist of at least 3 design or supervision projects of rehabilitation or construction of pavement roads with asphalt concrete whose construction cost exceeds US\$ 10 Mm and has a minimum length of 5 Km.	Less than 3 projects = 0					
	3 projects = 10					
	4 or more projects = 12					
Environmental and Social Specialist						
General Qualifications						
University Professional in environmental engineering or related career.	Complies / Does not comply	1.5			15	11.5
Minimum 10 years general experience.	1.5					
Suitability for the job						
Experience in the position of environmental and / or social specialist of at least 3 projects in management, planning, control or coordination of environmental studies or supervision of road construction projects which construction cost exceeds US\$ 10 Mm and has a minimum length of 5 Km.	Less than 3 projects = 0	13.5				
	3 projects = 10					
	4 or more projects = 12					
Total			60	44		
Total			100	75		
The minimum score required should be considered globally, not necessarily as a minimum for each of the sub-criteria.						

3. Simplified Technical Proposals

3.1. Quality of the proposed methodology and work plan and their conformity with the ToR

Assigned Score: Between 20 - 40

See details of Extended Technical Proposal (section 2 of this document).

3.2. Qualifications of proposed key personnel and their suitability for the job

Assigned Score: Between 60 - 80

See details of Extended Technical Proposal (section 2 of this document).

3.3. Determination of minimum score

The minimum score that the consulting firm must achieve to move to the financial proposal evaluation stage will be calculated in the same way as in the extended technical proposals.