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**Preface[[1]](#footnote-1)**

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) as amended of the Republic of Ghana for the Selection of Consultants.

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) as amended, 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 approved and 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: \_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_

# CONSULTANT’S EVALUATION REPORT

Project Name \_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_

Title of Consulting Services \_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_

Date of Submission, \_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_
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**SCORING GUIDE**

# Scoring Guide

[*This Scoring Guide is a reference to* ]

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

|  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- |
|  |  | Points |
| (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] [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); [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:

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
|  | Points |
| (i) General qualifications(ii) Adequacy for the project(iii) Experience in region & language |  | [*20 - 30*] [*50 - 60*] [*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 Sf = 100 x Fm/F, in which Sf is the financial score, Fm 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 - TEXT**

# Section I. Technical Evaluation Report—Text[[2]](#footnote-2)

## 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: Technical Evaluation-Basic Data. Describe briefly the selection process, beginning with the advertising (if required), the Expression of Interest, the responses to the expressions of interest, the establishment of the shortlist 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 entity tender 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).*.

1. *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.*
2. *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-FORMS**

# Section II. Technical Evaluation Report—Forms[[3]](#footnote-3)

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 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 (pre-investment, preparation,or implementation), andbrief description of sources |  | \_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_[*Specify*] |
| 2.4 | Method of selection[[4]](#footnote-4): |  | [*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*] |

|  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- |
| 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 | Entity tender committee[[5]](#footnote-5):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 \_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_ |

|  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- |
| 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: \_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_

# 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*]** |
| Experience | Scores | Scores | Scores | Scores |
| Methodology |  |  |  |  |
| Proposed staff |  |  |  |  |
| Training |  |  |  |  |
| Local input |  |  |  |  |
| Health, Environmental, Social, Security, Safety and Sustainability issues |  |  |  |  |
| **Total Scorea** |  |  |  |  |
| **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 B AVa C 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 AND AWARD RECOMMENDATION-TEXT**

# Section III. Financial Evaluation Report and Award Recommendation - Text[[6]](#footnote-6)

*[The text will indicate:*

1. *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;*
2. *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));*
3. *tax-related problems;*
4. *award recommendation; and*
5. *any other important information.*]

**SECTION III: FINANCIAL EVALUATION REPORT AND AWARD RECOMMENDATION-FORMS**

# Section IV. Financial Evaluation Report and Award Recommendation-Forms[[7]](#footnote-7)

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

# 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 Team: 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 Entity Tender Committee (Quality-Based, Qualifications, Single-Source) |  | Date: \_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_ |
| 4.6 | QCBS |  |  |  |
|  | (a) | Technical, financial and final scores (Quality-Based: technical scores only) |  | Consultant’sName | TechnicalScores | FinancialScores | FinalScores |
| \_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_ | \_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_ | \_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_ | \_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_ |
|  | (b) | Award recommendation |  | \_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_ |
| 4.7 | Fixed Budget and Least-Cost |  | Consultant’sName | TechnicalScores | FinancialScores | FinalScores |
|  | (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: \_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_ |

# Form IVB. Adjustments—Currency Conversion—Evaluated Prices[[8]](#footnote-8)

|  |  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| Consultants’ Names | Proposals’ pricesa | Adjustmentsb | Evaluated price(s) | Conversion to currency of evaluationc | Financial scoresd |
| Currency | Amounts(1) | (2) | (3) = (1) + (2) | Exchange rate(s)e(4) | Proposals’ prices(5) = (3)(4) | (6) |
|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |

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.

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

|  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- |
| Consultants’ names | TechnicalEvaluation | FinancialEvaluation | Combined Evaluation |
| Technical scoresa S(t) | Weighted scores S(t) × Tb | Technical rank | Financial scoresc S(f) | Weighted scores S(f) × Fd | ScoresS(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 Recommendation[[9]](#footnote-9)

|  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- |
| Consultants’ names | Fixed-Budget Selection | Least-Cost Selection |
| Technical scoresa | Evaluated pricesb | 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: ANNEXES**

# Section V. Annexes[[10]](#footnote-10)

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 I (i). Individual Evaluations

Consultant’s name:

|  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- |
| **Criteria/Sub-Criteria** | **Maximum****Scores** | **Evaluators** | **Average****Scores** |
| **1** | **2** | **3** | **4** | **5** |
| Experience-- |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Methodology-- |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Key Staff-- |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Transfer of Knowledge (Traininga)-- |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Participation by Nationalsa-- |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| 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 Namesa** | **Maximum****Scores** | **General Qualification s****( )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 interest[[11]](#footnote-11) |  |  |
|  | (a) | publication in PublicProcurement 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]](#footnote-12) |  | Yes \_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_ No \_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_ |
| 5.5 | Did the use of “local input” as afactor of selection change thetechnical ranking?[[13]](#footnote-13) |  | Yes \_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_ No \_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_ |

# Annex III. Minutes of Public Opening of Financial Proposals[[14]](#footnote-14)

## 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.]*

# Annex IV. Request for Proposals[[15]](#footnote-15)

# Annex V. Miscellaneous Annexes—Ad Hoc

1. This preface is not part of the report. It should not appear in the report submitted to the Entity Tender Committee. [↑](#footnote-ref-1)
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) [↑](#footnote-ref-2)
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 [↑](#footnote-ref-3)
4. See Public Procurement Act [↑](#footnote-ref-4)
5. It is important that evaluators be qualified [↑](#footnote-ref-5)
6. Applies to QCBS, Fixed-Budget, and Least-Cost. For Quality-Based, Qualifications, and Single-Source. Provide relevant information as indicated [↑](#footnote-ref-6)
7. Applies to QCBS, Fixed-Budget, and Least-Cost. For Quality-Based, Qualifications, and Single-Source. Provide relevant information as indicated. [↑](#footnote-ref-7)
8. For Quality-Based, Qualifications, and Single-Source, fill out only up to column 3 [↑](#footnote-ref-8)
9. Fill in appropriate part of form [↑](#footnote-ref-9)
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. [↑](#footnote-ref-10)
11. Required for large contracts *(see Public Procurement Act)* [↑](#footnote-ref-11)
12. Compare technical rank with rank in Form IVC. [↑](#footnote-ref-12)
13. Figure out technical scores with and without “local input” (Form IIB). [↑](#footnote-ref-13)
14. Annex III applies to QCBS, Fixed-Budget, and Least-Cost [↑](#footnote-ref-14)
15. Annex IV applies to all selection procedures *(The Public Procurement Authority’s Standard Request for Proposals may be used for Qualifications and Single-Source, with appropriate modifications)* [↑](#footnote-ref-15)