



REPUBLIC OF GHANA

**STANDARD TENDER
DOCUMENT**

**Standard Tender Evaluation Format
Selection of Consultants**

**Public Procurement Authority
Accra, Ghana**

April, 2014

Preface

Procurement under projects financed from the Public Funds of the Republic of Ghana, is carried out in accordance with the procedures laid down in the Public Procurement Act 2003, Act 663,

This Standard Tender Evaluation Format for Selection of Consultants has been prepared for use by Procurement Entities in the application of the evaluation criteria in the Request for Proposal process. The procedures and practices they convey have been developed in conformity with the Public Procurement Act 2003, Act 663, particularly PART V, Sub-Part III - Evaluation and Comparison of Tenders and PART VI - Methods and Procedures to Engage the Services of Consultants Sections 66 - 77, as well as exposure to broad international experience and best practices.

The document sets out the format of a sample evaluation report. It is mandatory for Procurement Entities to use this document in order to facilitate the evaluation of Consultants' proposals and the subsequent review of these proposals by the relevant Entity Tender Committee. The evaluation must be in accordance with the criteria spelled out in the **Request for Proposals: Selection of Consultants** and carried out by qualified evaluators. The Request for Proposals should be prepared in agreement with the provisions of the Public Procurement Act 2003, Act 663. The Technical Evaluation Report should be endorsed by the Entity Tender Committee before the Financial Proposals are opened.

Upon notification of contract award to the successful Consultant by the procurement Entity, and in accordance with the Public Procurement Act 2003, Act 663, the Public Procurement Authority is authorized to publish a description of the contract, the name and nationality of the contract awardee, and the contract price in the Public Procurement Bulletin and website.

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.

The report can be used for all methods of selection described in the Public Procurement Act 2003. 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, Procurement Entities may wish to obtain assistance from consultants to evaluate proposals.

Additional information on Public Procurement in the Republic of Ghana can be obtained from:

Public Procurement Authority

Accra, Ghana.

Telephone: _____

Facsimile: _____

Email: _____

Website: _____

¹ This preface is not part of the report. It should not appear in the report submitted to the Entity Tender Committee.

CONSULTANT EVALUATION REPORT

Project Name _____

Title of Consulting Services _____

Date of Submission, _____

FINAL DRAFT

Table of Contents

Scoring Guide	1
Section I. Technical Evaluation Report – Text ²	3
1. Background	3
2. The Selection Process (Prior to Technical Evaluation)	3
3. Technical Evaluation	3
Section II. Technical Evaluation Report – Forms ³	5
Form IIA. Technical Evaluation - Basic Data	6
Form IIB. Evaluation Summary	11
Technical Scores/Ranking	11
Form IIC. Individual Evaluations-Comparison	12
Section III. Financial Evaluation Report-Award	13
Recommendation - Text ⁶	13
Section IV. Financial Evaluation Report-Award	14
Recommendation-Forms ⁷	14
Form IVA. Financial Evaluation – Basic Data	15
Form IVB. Adjustments – Currency Conversion – Evaluated Prices ⁸	17
Form IVC. QCBS – Combined Technical/Financial Evaluation – Award Recommendation	18
Form IVD. Fixed-Budget and Least-Cost Selection – Award Recommendation ⁹	19
Section V. Annexes ¹⁰	20
Annex I (i). Individual Evaluations	21
Annex I(ii) Individual Evaluations – Key Personnel	22
Annex II. Information Data Monitoring	23
Annex III. Minutes of Public Opening of Financial Proposals ¹⁴	24
MINUTES	24
Annex IV. Request for Proposals ¹⁵	25
Annex V. Miscellaneous Annexes – Ad Hoc	26

Scoring Guide

[This Scoring Guide is a reference to]

1. The number of points to be given under each of the evaluation criteria are:

	<u>Points</u>
(i) Specific experience of the Consultants related to the assignment [Insert sub criteria] [Insert sub criteria] [Insert sub criteria]	[5 - 10]
(ii) Adequacy of the proposed work plan and methodology in responding to the Terms of Reference [Insert sub criteria] [Insert sub criteria] [Insert sub criteria]	[20 - 50]
(iii) Qualifications and competence of the key staff for the Assignment (including membership of professional bodies) [Insert sub criteria] [Insert sub criteria]	[30 - 60]
(iv) Suitability of the transfer of knowledge program (training) [Insert sub criteria] [Insert sub criteria] [Insert sub criteria]	[0 - 10]
(v) Local participation (as reflected by nationals among key staff presented by foreign and local Consultants; maximum not to exceed 10 points) [Insert sub criteria] [Insert sub criteria] [Insert sub criteria]	[10 - 15]
(vi) Consideration of Health, Environmental, Social, Safety, Security and Sustainability issues [Insert sub criteria] [Insert sub criteria] [Insert sub criteria]	[0 - 5]

Total Points: 100

2. The number of points to be given under each evaluation sub criteria for qualifications of staff are:

	<u>Points</u>
(i) General qualifications	[20 - 30]
(ii) Adequacy for the project	[50 - 60]
(iii) Experience in region &	[10 - 20]
Total Points:	100

3. The minimum technical score required to pass *[Insert number of points]*: _____

4. The single currency for price conversions is: _____

5. The source of official selling rates is: _____

6. The date of exchange rates is: _____

7. The formula for determining the financial scores is the following:

[Either $S_f = 100 \times F_m/E$, in which S_f is the financial score, F_m is the lowest price and F the price of the proposal under consideration, or another proportional linear formula]

8. The weights given to the Technical and Financial Proposals are:

T= _____ *[Normally between 0.7 and 0.9]*, and

P= _____ *[Normally between 0.1 and 0.3]*

Section I. Technical Evaluation Report – Text²

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 Expression of Interest, the establishment of the shortlist, expressions of interest, and withdrawals of firms before proposal submissions. Describe major events that may have affected the timing (delays, complaints from consultants, key correspondence with the Employer, Request for Proposals (RFP), extension of proposal submission date, and so on). 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; 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).

² Section I 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).

- 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).

Items requiring further negotiations.

Use up to three pages.]

Section II. Technical Evaluation Report – Forms³

Form IIA. Technical Evaluation – Basic Data

Form IIB. Evaluation Summary – Technical Scores/Ranking

Form IIC. Individual Evaluations – Comparison (Average Scores)

FINAL DRAFT

³ Section II 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 IIA

Form IIA. Technical Evaluation - Basic Data

2.1 Name of Project _____ [Specify]

2.2 Employer:

a. Name _____ [Specify]

b. Details

Address: _____ [Specify]

Telephone: _____ [Specify]

Facsimile _____ [Specify]

Email _____ [Specify]

Website _____ [Specify]

2.3 Type of assignment _____ [Specify]
(pre-investment, preparation,
or implementation), and
brief description of sources

2.4 Method of selection⁴:

[please tick one]

QCBS

Quality-Based

Fixed Budget

Least-Cost

Consultant's Qualifications

Single-Source

2.5 Request for expressions of
interest

a. Publication in Public Procurement Bulletin,
national newspaper(s) Yes _____ No _____

b. Number of responses _____ [Specify]

FINAL DRAFT

- 2.6 Shortlist:
names/nationality of firms/
associations (mark domestic
firms and firms that had
expressed interest) 1. _____
2. _____
3. _____
4. _____
- 2.6 (a) Date of RFP issuance to
Consultants _____/_____/_____
- 2.7 Amendments and clarifications
to the RFP (describe) _____

- 2.8 Contract:
(a) Standard Time-Based Yes ____
Price adjustment: Yes ____ No ____
(b) Standard Lump Sum Yes ____
Price adjustment: Yes ____ No ____
(c) other (describe) _____

- 2.9 Pre-proposal conference: Yes ____ No ____
(a) minutes issued Yes ____ No ____
- 2.10 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: _____
- 2.11 Submission of Financial Proposal Location: _____
- 2.12 Opening of Technical Proposals
by selection committee Date: _____ Time: _____
- 2.13 Number of proposals submitted _____

2.14 Evaluation Committee⁵:
 Members' names and titles
 (normally three to five)

1. _____
 2. _____
 3. _____
 4. _____
 5. _____

2.15 Proposal validity period (days):

(a) original expiration date Date: _____ Time: _____
 (b) extension(s), if any Date: _____ Time: _____

2.16 Evaluation Criteria/subcriteria⁷

(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 _____

⁵ It is important that evaluators be qualified

2.17 Technical scores by Consultant Minimum qualifying score_____

Consultant's Names	Technical Scores
1. _____	_____
2. _____	_____
3. _____	_____
4. _____	_____

2.18 Evaluation report
(a) Submission to the Entity
Tender Committee to accept for
further evaluation

Date: _____

FINAL DRAFT

Form IIB. Evaluation Summary

Technical Scores/Ranking

Consultants' Names	<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]</i>
Experience	Scores	Scores	Scores	Scores
Methodology				
Proposed staff				
Training				
Local input				
Health, Environmental, Social, Security, Safety and Sustainability issues				
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	A C	B AV ^a D		
Methodology				
Key staff				
Training				
Local input				
Health, Environmental, Social, Security, Safety and Sustainability issues				
Total				

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

**Section III. Financial Evaluation Report-Award
Recommendation - Text⁶**

[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.]*

⁶ Applies to QCBS, Fixed-Budget, and Least-Cost. For Quality-Based, Qualifications, and Single-Source. Provide relevant information as indicated.

**Section IV. Financial Evaluation Report-Award
Recommendation-Forms⁷**

- Form IVA. Financial Evaluation – Basic Data
- Form IVB. Adjustments – Currency Conversion – Evaluated Prices
- Form IVC. QCBS – Combined Technical/Financial Evaluation – Award Recommendation
- Form IVD. Fixed-Budget and Least-Cost Selection – Award Recommendation

⁷ Applies to QCBS, Fixed-Budget, and Least-Cost. For Quality-Based, Qualifications, and Single-Source. Provide relevant information as indicated.

Form IVA. Financial Evaluation – Basic Data

4.1 Endorsement of technical evaluation report (Quality-Based, Qualifications, Single-Source) by Entity Tender Committee

Date: _____

4.2 Public opening of financial proposals

Date: _____ Time: _____

(a) Names and proposal prices (mark Consultants that attended public opening)

- 1. _____
- 2. _____
- 3. _____
- 4. _____

4.3 Evaluation committee: members' names and titles (if not the same as in the technical evaluation - Quality-Based, Qualifications, Single-Source)

4.4 Methodology (formula) for evaluation of cost (QCBS only; cross as appropriate)

Weight inversely proportional to cost _____

Other _____

4.5 Submission of final technical/ financial evaluation report to the Tender review Board (Quality-Based, Qualifications, Single-Source)

Date: _____

4.6 QCBS

(a) Technical, financial and final scores (Quality-Based: technical scores only)

Consultant's Name	Technical Scores	Financial Scores	Final Scores
_____	_____	_____	_____
_____	_____	_____	_____
_____	_____	_____	_____

(b) Award recommendation

4.7 Fixed Budget and Least-Cos

Consultant's Name	Technical Scores	Financial Scores	Final Scores
-------------------	------------------	------------------	--------------

(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 score

Name: _____

FINAL DRAFT

Form IVB. Adjustments – Currency Conversion – Evaluated Prices⁸

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

- 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 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 (e.g., US\$1 = GHS 8,000). Indicate source as per RFP.

⁸ For Quality-Based, Qualifications, and Single-Source, fill out only up to column 3

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

Consultants' names	Technical Evaluation			Financial Evaluation		Combined Evaluation	
	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

Form IVD. Fixed-Budget and Least-Cost Selection – Award Recommendation⁹

Consultants' names	Fixed-Budget Selection		Least-Cost Selection	
	Technical scores ^a	Evaluated prices ^b	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.

Section V. Annexes¹⁰

- 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

¹⁰ 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 I (i). Individual Evaluations

Consultant's name: _____

Criteria/Sub-Criteria	Maximum Scores	Evaluator					Average Scores
		1	2	3	4	5	
Experience --							
Methodology --							
Key Staff --							
Transfer of Knowledge (Training ^a) --							
Participation by Nationals ^a --							
Health, Environmental, Social, Security, Safety and Sustainability							
Total	100						

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 ^a	Maximum Scores	General Qualifications () ^b	Adequacy for the Assignment () ^b	Experience in Region () ^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

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 II. Information Data Monitoring

5.2 General Procurement Notice

- (a) first issue date _____
- (b) latest update _____

5.3 Request for expressions of interest¹¹

- (a) publication in Public Procurement Bulletin Date: _____
- (b) publication in international and national local newspaper(s) of wide circulation Name of newspaper(s) and date(s) _____

5.4 Did the use of price as a factor of selection change the final ranking?¹² Yes _____ No _____

5.5 Did the use of “local input” as a factor of selection change the technical ranking?¹⁵ Yes _____ No _____

¹¹ Required for large contracts (see Public Procurement Act).

¹² Compare technical rank with rank in Form IVC.

¹³ Figure out technical scores with and without “local input” (Form IIB).

Annex III. Minutes of Public Opening of Financial Proposals¹⁴

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 Employer, at its discretion, may consider appropriate. All attendees must sign the Minutes.]

FINAL DRAFT

¹⁴ Annex III applies to QCBS, Fixed-Budget, and Least-Cost

Annex IV. Request for Proposals¹⁵

FINAL DRAFT

¹⁵ Annex IV applies to all selection procedures (*The Public Procurement Board Standard Request for Proposals may be used for Qualifications and Single-Source, with appropriate modifications*).

Annex V. Miscellaneous Annexes – Ad Hoc

FINAL DRAFT