

**Technical Proposals Evaluation Report Format for the Selection of 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 technical proposals of public competitions for 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 technical 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 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 necessarily have to be extensive. Technical 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 cross-references as well as references to relevant clauses in the competition documents should be made.
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 of**

**Technical Proposals for the Selection of**

**Consulting Firms**

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
| Contracting Party: |  |
| No. and Project Name: |  |
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# Technical Proposals Evaluation Report

## Evaluation Report Presentation

This report contains the results of the evaluation of the technical 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 the information regarding its verification, if applicable, in witness of which this report is presented.

The persons responsible of 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)*

These 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 contracting Party is responsible for this process, the evaluation of the technical proposals will be in accordance with the criteria established in the SCD and the application of the procedures established in the Policy for Procurement of Goods, Works, Services and Consultancies with CABEI Resources and its Application rules.

## Competition Process

*(Below are several sections within which the Contracting Party must write a chronological description of the competition process, dates of approval of the documents, dates of publication, clarifications and amendments to the bidding documents, withdrawal of the documents, among others).*

1. **Competition Document and its approvals**

* No Objection Number: *(enter the No Objection reference number).*
* No Objection Date: *(indicate date).*

1. **Invitations**

* Date when the SCD was sent to all the Short-listed firms: *(indicate date).*

1. **Clarifications and Amendments to the Documents**
   1. **Requests for clarifications received**

During the period of proposals preparation, the following inquiries were received from the consultants:

|  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- |
| **No.** | **Consulting Firm** | **Date** | **Inquiry Received** |
| 1 | *Name of the Firm* | *Date* | *Briefly describe the inquiry* |
| 2 |  |  |  |
| n |  |  |  |

*If there are no clarifications, indicate in this section "Not Applicable"*

* 1. **Clarifications to the SCD issued.**

During the period of proposals preparation, the following clarifications were made to the standard competition document, which were communicated to the short-listed firms:

|  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| **Clarification No** | **Date of issue** | **Clarification Issued** | **Communication** | |
| **Firm** | **Date of the Communication** |
| 1 | *Date* | *Describe the content of the clarification issued* |  | *(Mention the date of official communication of the clarification)* |
|  |  |
| 2 |  |  |  |  |
|  |  |
| n |  |  |  |  |

*If there are no clarifications, indicate in this section "Not Applicable"*

* 1. **Amendments to the SCD, including respective No Objections.**

During the proposal preparation stage, the following amendments to the SCD were issued:

| **No. Of Amendment** | **Date of Issue** | **Content of Amendment** | **No Objection number** | **Acknowledgement of receipt from bidders or Proof of delivery** | |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| **Firm** | **Date of receipt acknowledgement** |
| 1 | *Date* | *Describe the content of the amendment issued* | *No Objection when applicable* |  |  |
|  |  |
| 2 |  |  |  |  |  |
|  |  |
| n |  |  |  |  |  |

*If there are no amendments, indicate in this section "Not Applicable”*

1. **Reception and technical proposals opening**

*(Write in this section a description of the date and time of receipt of the proposals, the number of proposals, and the number of proposals rejected due to late submission. Also describe any relevant observations of the event, among others proposal validity period lower than the requirement, if the financial proposals were sealed and duly identified, etc. and the process of securing the sealed envelopes containing the financial proposals. Complete the box with the corresponding data in the same order as the opening).*

|  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- |
| **No.** | **Identification of the Consulting Firm** | **Observations \*** |
| 1 |  |  |
| 2 |  |  |
| 3 |  |  |
| n |  |  |

**\*** As it was read aloud at the opening ceremony.

Minutes of the proposals opening is included in the Annexes.

## Evaluation of the Technical Proposals

*(A description of the evaluation process should be written in this section, indicating date, place of start and the relevant aspects at each stage of the process for example if there are clarifications or corrections).*

The evaluation of the proposals was carried out in accordance with the provisions of the SCD, section I, Instructions to consultants, clause 25 “Technical Proposals Evaluation”, verifying that they were complete and that they included all the documents requested in clause ITC 11 of the SCD.

1. **Evaluation of the background and qualification of the consultant**

The evaluation was carried out in the offices *of (indicate place where the evaluation was carried out)* located in *(indicate physical address of the offices)* on the day: *(indicate day, month and year),* being the *(indicate time)* official time of the Republic of *(indicate the Country).*

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 indicating the references to the annexes where the communications issued and received are included).*

The result of the evaluation at this stage is summarized below:

| **No.** | **Consulting Firm** | **Observations** | **Continues with the evaluation** |
| --- | --- | --- | --- |
| 1 | *(indicate the name of the Firm)* | *(Write the reasons that cause the technical proposal to not comply with the requirements as set forth in Section III of the SCD and comply with the requirements: “none”)* | *(Indicate yes or no)* |
| 2 |  |  |  |
| 3 |  |  |  |
| n |  |  |  |

Details of the assessment can be found in **Table 4** of this report.

The evaluation was carried out on the dates of (*indicate day, month and year*), and concluding on *(indicate day, month and year*).

1. **Evaluation of the Technical Proposal**

The evaluation of technical proposals of the consultants who met the background criteria was carried out, and it was conducted on the dates of *(indicate month, day and year),* and ended on *(indicate month, day and year).*

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.)*

The result of the evaluation of the technical proposals is summarized as follows:

|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| **No.** | **Consultant** | **Specific Experience**  (\*) | **Methodology and Work Plan** | **Proposed Key Personnel** | **Transfer Programs** (\*) | **Total** |
|  | Assigned score | Assigned score | Assigned score | Assigned score | Assigned score | 100 |
| 1 | *Indicate the legal name of the Consultant* | *Indicate obtained*  *score* | *Indicate obtained*  *score* |  |  |  |
| 2 |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| n |  |  |  |  |  |  |

(\*) Delete in case of simplified technical proposals.

|  |  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| **No.** | **Consultant** | **Obtained score** | **Weighted Score** | **Continues to the Financial Proposal Evaluation** | **Nationality** |
| 1 | *Indicate the legal name of the Consultant* | *Indicate obtained*  *score* | *Indicate weighted*  *score* | *(indicate yes or no)* | *Indicate the country of legal constitution of the Consultant* |
| 2 |  |  |  |  |  |
| n |  |  |  |  |  |

Details of the assessment of each consultant can be found in Table No. 5 where the strengths and weaknesses of each proposal are highlighted.

1. **Recommendation**

Firms that obtained a score higher than the one indicated in the ITC 25.3 will be invited to the opening of the financial proposals, once the approvals/No Objections corresponding to this report are obtained.

These firms are: *(list)*

1.

2.

3.

This report is signed on *(month/day /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)*

# Tables of the Evaluation Report

## Table 1: Identification

|  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- |
| 1. **IDENTIFICATION** | | |
| 1.1 | Name of the Contracting Party |  |
|  | Name |  |
|  | Address |  |
| 1.2 | Name and identification of the financing |  |
| 1.3 | Contract Identification Number |  |
| 1.4 | Description of the Scope of the Consulting Service |  |
| 1.5 | Cost Estimation (According to the GPP) |  |
| 1.6 | Procurement Method (select one) | QCBS: \_\_ QBS: \_\_\_ LCBS: \_\_\_ FBS: \_\_ |
| 1.7 | Does it require CABEI’s prior review? | Yes \_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_ No \_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_ |
| 1.8 | Type of contract (choose one) | Lump Sum: \_\_\_\_ Time worked: \_\_\_\_ |
| 1.9 | Co-financing if any | Yes \_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_ No \_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_ |
|  | 1. Name of financier |  |
|  | 1. Amount and percentage of funding |  |

## Table 2: Procurement Process

| 1. **PROCUREMENT PROCESS** | | | |
| --- | --- | --- | --- |
| 2.1 | General Procurement Plan |  | |
|  | 1. Date of first publication |  | |
|  | 1. Date of the latest update |  | |
| 2.2 | Short List |  | |
|  | 1. Consulting Firms of the short-list | Name of the consulting firm | Country of Legal Constitution |
|  |  |
|  |  |
|  |  |
|  |  |
|  |  |
|  |  |
|  | 1. Date of Bank’s communication of No Objection to the short list and the SCD |  | |

## Table 3: Proposals submission and opening

| 1. **PROCUREMENT PROCESS** | | |
| --- | --- | --- |
| 3.1 | Deadline for proposals submission |  |
|  | 1. Original date and time |  |
|  | 1. Extensions, if any |  |
| 3.2 | Proposals opening | *Indicate time, month, day, year* |
| 3.3 | Number of bids received |  |
| 3.4 | Bids validity period | By *(indicate the number of days) days*, until *(indicate month, day, year)* |
|  | 1. Period originally specified |  |
|  | 1. Extensions, if any | By *(indicate the number of days) days*, until *(indicate month, day, year)* |

## Table 4: Background Evaluation

|  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| **No** | **Name of the Consultant** | **Proposal submission** | **Authorization to submit proposal** | **Identification of the Consultant’s representative** |
| 1 | *Indicate the legal name of the Consultant* | * *Indicate whether the original Proposal Cover Letter document has been submitted in accordance with Form CC-1, which shall include commissions and gratuities if paid or payable to agents or other party related to this Proposal.* * *Indicate the folio number and characteristics of the form.* * *Indicate whether the information provided complied with the requirements.* | * *Indicate if the simple copy of the Power of Attorney of the person who subscribes to the proposal has been submitted.* * *In the case of proposals submitted by a JV, the power of representation of each of the members of the JV.* * *Indicate the folio number and characteristics of the document presented.* * *Indicate whether the information provided complied with the requirements.* | * *Indicate whether the simple copy of the valid identity card or similar identification document of the person who subscribes to the proposal has been presented.* * *Indicate the folio number and characteristics of the document presented.* * *Indicate whether the information provided complied with the requirements.* |
| 2 |  |  |  |  |
| 3 |  |  |  |  |
| 4 |  |  |  |  |
| 5 |  |  |  |  |
| n |  |  |  |  |

## Table 5: Evaluation of Technical Proposals

| **Consultant: *Indicate Name of the Consultant*** | | | | | |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| **No** | **Evaluation Criteria** | **Score Assigned** | **Information presented and analysis** | **Clarifications or corrections** | **Score obtained** |
| 1 | *Specific Experience of the Firm* (\*)  *Delete in case of simplified technical proposals.* | *Indicate the score assigned* | *Indicate:*   * *Description and analysis of the Information presented, indicating the reasoning for assigning score and whether the information provided met the requirements* * *Folio number and characteristics of the information presented* | *If no clarification or correction has been required indicate "Not Applicable"*  *In case 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.* | *Indicate obtained score* |
| 2 | *Quality of the proposed methodology and work plan and their conformity with the terms of reference* |  |  |  |  |
| 3 | *Qualifications of proposed key personnel and their suitability for the job* |  |  |  |  |
| ***Key Personnel 1*** |  |  |  |  |
| *General Qualifications* |  |  |  |  |
| *Suitability for work, relevant education and training* |  |  |  |  |
| *Others according to the SCD* |  |  |  |  |
| ***Key Personnel n*** |  |  |  |  |
| *General Qualifications* |  |  |  |  |
| *Suitability for work, relevant education and training* |  |  |  |  |
| *Others according to the SCD* |  |  |  |  |
| 4 | Knowledge transfer programme (\*) |  |  |  |  |
| ***Total*** | | **100** |  |  | *Score obtained* |
| Strengths: *Example of strengths: Experience in very similar projects in the country; quality of methodology; demonstration of a clear understanding of the scope of work; strengths of the local partner, and experience in similar work of the proposed staff.* | | | | | |
| Weaknesses: *Example of weaknesses: From a certain component of the proposal; lack of experience in the country; low level of involvement of the local partner, lack of practical experience (experience in studies rather than implementation); of the experience of the staff compared to the experience of the firm; of a key official (e.g., team leader), lack of adjustment of the proposal to what is required in the Request for Proposals, and disqualifications (conflict of interest).* | | | | | |
| Recommendations in case of contract award: *(indicate recommendations in case it is required to negotiate the contract).* | | | | | |

(\*) Remove in case of requesting simplified technical proposals.

# Annexes to the Report

Annex No. 1. Appointment of the proposal’s evaluators and confidentiality agreements

Annex No. 2. Copy of the invitations with the acknowledgement receipt.

Annex No. 3. Evidence of consultations, clarifications, and amendments during the preparation of proposals.

Annex No. 4. Minutes of Public Bids Opening

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

Annex No. 7. Supporting documents of the detailed background evaluation of the consultants

Annex No. 8. Supporting documents of the detailed technical evaluation of the Consultant.