



Guideline

for

Evaluation of Technical and Financial Proposals in

Selection and Employment of Consultants

Public Procurement Regulatory Authority
P.O. Box 2865,
Dodoma.

May, 2020

Preface

Consultants employed by public authorities are selected and employed according to the Public Procurement Regulations, 2013 [Government Notice No. 466 of 2013] (hereinafter referred to as "Regulations). The Regulations specify the procuring entities' obligations to submit reports to the tender board during the selection process:

- a) A technical evaluation report subject to prior review by the tender board for the tender board's approval prior to opening the financial proposals; or
- b) The combined technical or financial evaluation report.

This document sets out the format of a sample evaluation report to be provided to procuring entities to facilitate the evaluation of consultants' proposals and the subsequent review of these proposals by the procurement management units and approval by tender boards. The evaluation must be in accordance with the criteria spelt out in the Request for Proposals and carried out by qualified evaluators. The Request for Proposals should be prepared in accordance with the regulation 287.

The evaluation report consists of nine sections:

- Section I: Appointment of Committees for the Selection and Employment of Consultants
- Section II: Evaluation of Technical Proposals
- Section III: Format of Technical Evaluation Report – Text
- Section IV: Technical Evaluation Report – Forms
- Section V: Price Competition for Consultant Selection: Acceptable Methods in Appropriate Circumstances
- Section VI: Evaluation of Financial Proposals
- Section VII: Financial Evaluation Report – Award Recommendations –Text
- Section VIII: Financial Evaluation Report – Forms
- Section IX: Annexes:
 - Annex I: Individual Evaluation
 - Annex II: Information Data Monitoring
 - Annex III: Minutes of the Public Opening of the Technical and Financial Proposals
 - Annex IV: Copy of the Request for Proposals
 - Annex V: Miscellaneous Annexes – Ad Hoc

Annex VI: Proposal Evaluation Checklist

Annex VII: Personal Covenant for Members of the Evaluation Committee

Annex VIII: Personal Covenant for Members the Tender Board

The format for report is suitable for all methods of selection described in the Regulations. The Guidelines mainly address 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, procuring entities may wish to obtain assistance from consultants to evaluate proposals.

Table of Contents

Preface	ii
PART I: INTRODUCTION.....	1
Background	1
Short Title	1
Application.....	1
Interpretation	1
Purpose of Guidelines	1
Importance of Guidelines.....	1
PART II: APPOINTMENT, COMPOSITION AND DUTIES	2
Appointment	2
Composition.....	2
Duties of Evaluation Committee	3
Duties of Chairman	3
PART III: QUORUM, CONDUCT AND CONFLICT OF INTEREST	3
Quorum.....	3
Part VII: Technical Evaluation Report	3
Disclosure of Consultants.....	3
Conflict of Interest.....	4
PART IV: EVALUATION OF TECHNICAL PROPOSALS.....	4
Briefing	4
Evaluation Procedure	4
Marking system	5
Evaluation of technical quality of proposal.....	5
Points given to main evaluation criteria	7
Clarification of proposals	9
Grading of technical proposals	9
Evaluation Report.....	9
Review of evaluation report by Tender Board.....	9
Notification of results	9
Evaluation Procedure	9
Margin of preference	10
Evaluation of the financial proposals	11

Combined quality and cost evaluation	12
Technical Quality	13
Comparability of technical proposals and least cost consideration.....	13
Quality and fixed budget.....	13
Negotiations parameters.....	13
Post-qualification	14
PART VI: FORMAT OF THE TECHNICAL EVALUATION REPORT – Text.....	15
Background	15
The selection process (prior to technical evaluation).....	15
Technical evaluation.....	15
CONSULTANT EVALUATION REPORT.....	16

PART I: INTRODUCTION			
1.	Background	1.1	Pursuant to section 9(1)(e) of the Act, the Authority is mandated to issue procurement Guidelines to enhance effective and efficient implementation of the Act. These Guidelines are made in compliance with the section with regard to evaluation of proposals for selection and employment of Consultants.
2.	Short Title	2.1	These Guidelines may be cited as the “Guidelines on Evaluation of Technical and Financial Proposals”.
3.	Application	3.1	These Guidelines shall apply to all PEs when Evaluating Technical and Financial Proposals and Preparation of Evaluation Reports on Selection and Employment of Consultants.
4.	Interpretation	4.1	In these Guidelines, unless the context requires otherwise- “Act” means the Public Procurement Act, Cap. 410; “Authority” means the Public Procurement Regulatory Authority; “Regulations” means the Public Procurement Regulations, 2013 (GN.No. 446 of 2013); ”Tender board” means a tender board established under section 31 of the Act.
5.	Purpose of Guidelines	5.1	General Purpose To guide Procuring Entities on how to undertake evaluation processes on selection and employment of consultants.
		5.2	Specific Purpose of these Guidelines is to- a) set out the format of evaluation report for procuring entities to facilitate the evaluation of consultants’ proposals and subsequent review of these proposals by the procurement management units and approval by tender boards; and b) to ensure consistency in the application of the evaluation Guidelines.
6.	Importance of Guidelines	6.1	The use of these Guidelines will ensure that evaluation committees, procurement management units and tender boards use the appropriate procedures when making decision of selecting consultants.
			The use of these Guidelines will standardize reporting format for all PEs.

PART II: APPOINTMENT, COMPOSITION AND DUTIES			
7.	Appointment	7.1	Procurement Management Unit of a procuring entity shall recommend names of the Evaluation Committee to the Accounting Officer.
		7.2	The recommended committee members shall comprise of: a) at least one member with technical knowhow of the subject matter under procurement; b) a member from user department in consultation with head of User Department; c) others with an appropriate level of expertise and experience, depending on the value and complexity of the procurement requirement; and/ or d) a member with procurement expertise provided that such member shall not be involved in subsequent proceeding of the tender in question.
		7.3	Members of the evaluation committee shall be public officials and may be external to the procuring entity, where the required skills or experience are not available within the procuring entity or where members are indisposed or have a conflict of interest.
		7.4	The Accounting Officer shall be responsible for appointment of Chairman and members of Evaluation Committee as recommended by PMU.
		7.5	In the event that the Chairman is unable to perform the duties, the accounting officer or chief executive officer shall appoint another person with the necessary qualifications to act as the chairperson.
		7.6	In the absence of the Chairman at any meeting, the other members present shall appoint one of them to act as chairperson. The acting chairperson shall report their deliberations or findings to the committee chairperson appointed by the accounting or chief executive officer concerned.
8.	Composition	8.1	The Evaluation Committee shall consist of a minimum of three (3) members and maximum of five (5) members for both Technical and Financial Proposal.
		8.2	Under exceptional circumstances, the accounting officer may form an Evaluation Committee of more than five (5) members depending on the value and complexity of the procurement if there are justifiable reasons to increase the number of members of the evaluation committee.

		8.3	The Chairman shall be fully acquainted with the evaluation procedures and shall be familiar with the contents of the Request for Proposal documents during evaluation process.
9.	Duties of Evaluation Committee	9.1	The duties of the Evaluation Committee shall be, to: a) agree on the detailed evaluation criteria as stipulated in the Request for Proposal document; b) study, evaluate and rank all technical proposals; c) prepare and submit to PMU technical evaluation report as required; d) study, evaluate and rank all financial proposals; and e) prepare and submit combined evaluation report on the technical and financial proposal required by the procuring entity.
10.	Duties of Chairman	10.1	The duties of the Chairman shall be, to: a) manage evaluation process and ensure conduct of evaluation is in accordance with all legal requirements; b) make sure all committee members perform their duties as per scope of work; c) evaluate proposal and finalise evaluation process; d) manage communication between evaluation committee and PMU in all matters relating to evaluation; e) ensure all members are aware of their responsibilities, including the need for confidentiality; f) ensure all members have a common understanding of the process of evaluation and objectives to be achieved; g) ensure members understand their own role in evaluation and the standard approach of the team; h) ensure evaluation team has access to necessary information; and i) ensure final report on evaluation is prepared in a provided format and submitted to PMU.
PART III: QUORUM, CONDUCT AND CONFLICT OF INTEREST			
11.	Quorum	11.1	The quorum for evaluation committees under clause 8 shall be all members of the evaluation committee.
12.	Disclosure of Consultants	12.1	After the evaluation committee has been formed in accordance with clause 8 of these Guidelines, the names of the consultants or firms on the shortlist and those who have submitted the proposals shall be disclosed to the members before evaluation for declaration of conflict of interest.

13.	Conflict of Interest	13.1	If a member of a committee appointed in accordance with clause 8 has any interest, pecuniary or otherwise, direct or indirect in any of the consultants, firms, associations or joint ventures that have submitted expression of interest or proposals, shall as soon as practicable, disclose the fact and shall not take part in the evaluation, consideration or discussion on any question with respect to it.
		13.2	Each committee member shall individually, sign a declaration form (<i>See Annex VII</i>) to indicate whether or not he has any pecuniary interest in any of the firms and an undertaking not to disclose to unauthorized parties not related to the evaluation any information related to the proposals or the firms. The declaration shall be made part of the report.
		13.3	The accounting officer or chief executive officer of the procuring entity and the secretary of the tender board shall cause to be recorded in a book or other document to be kept for the purposes, particulars of any disclosure made under Regulation 7. The committee members shall also sign a declaration form.
		13.4	Where a member of the Committee has declared conflict of interest under this clause, a new member shall be appointed in accordance with these Guidelines.
PART IV: EVALUATION OF TECHNICAL PROPOSALS			
14.	Briefing	14.1	Prior to evaluation process appropriate PMU shall brief evaluators on the objective of the tender under evaluation and all necessary documents including tendering documents and evaluation Guidelines.
15.	Evaluation Procedure	15.1	The evaluation of the technical proposals shall be carried out by- <ul style="list-style-type: none"> a) conducting preliminary examination of eligibility requirements prescribed in the RFP. Non responsive proposals shall be rejected at this stage; b) examination of technical conformity, in line with conditions laid down in the request for proposals; and c) rejecting all proposals which do not meet the minimum score set out in the RFP under paragraph (b) above.
		15.2	Proposals which meet the minimum score under clause 15.1 shall be subjected to financial evaluation.

		15.3	After the evaluation of technical quality is completed, the procuring entity shall notify consultants whose proposals have not met the minimum qualifying mark or were considered non-responsive to the request for proposals and terms of reference, indicating that their financial proposals shall be returned unopened after completing the selection process.
		15.4	A Consultant who is dissatisfied with the results of technical scores prescribed in the notice may lodge a complaint to accounting officer pursuant to the Act.
16.	Marking system	16.1	All technical proposals are marked on a merit point system or scores system specified in the Request for Proposals through TANEPS.
17.	Evaluation of technical quality of proposal	17.1	The technical proposals shall be: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> i) evaluated in the manner prescribed under clause 15 and 17; ii) evaluated solely on quality aspects that are examined before opening the financial proposals or before price negotiation; iii) and carried out on the basis of the system of grading described in the request for proposals through TANEPS.
		17.2	To avoid collusion, each member of the evaluation committee shall independently evaluate the technical proposal(s) by applying agreed evaluation sub – criteria based on the evaluation criteria of the letter of invitation or request for proposals.
		17.3	The evaluation committee shall provide feedback on the comments and observations of the terms of reference made by each firm or association or joint venture, indicating if it has any implications for evaluation at this stage and subsequent stages.
		17.4	The Committee members shall average the evaluation results and reach a consensus on the ranking between committee members.
		17.5	The evaluation criteria are related to the following main criteria and sub – criteria: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> a) Firm's general experience, reputation and experience in previous similar assignments <ul style="list-style-type: none"> i) experience in similar projects

			<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ii) experience in similar areas and conditions; iii) capacity of consultants to carry out the assignment; iv) specialization; v) reference from clients, banks and any other required by the PE; vi) organization and management; vii) quality assurance programmes; viii) legal disputes; and ix) any other relevant information required by the PE.
			<p>b) Understanding of the terms of reference, methodology and the overall quality of the proposal</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> i) understanding of the objectives of the assignment; ii) responsiveness to the Terms of Reference; iii) innovativeness; iv) quality and clarity; v) efficiency in resource utilization; vi) technology; vii) flexibility and adaptability; viii) timeliness of out puts; ix) reliability and sustainability; x) efficiency in transfer of skills; and xi) any other relevant information required by the PE.
			<p>c) Qualification of key personnel</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> i) general qualifications; ii) age; iii) education level; iv) experience in similar assignments; v) publications on relevant subjects; vi) specialization; vii) language capability; viii) professional experience and status; ix) training experience; x) career attainment; and xi) any other relevant information required by the PE.
			<p>d) Local firms participation Demonstration of inclusion of local firms in the assignment by:</p>

			<ul style="list-style-type: none"> i) 50% and above – score 15 points; ii) 25% to 49% - score 10 to 14 points; iii) 1% to 24% - score 1 to 9 points; and iv) 0% - score 0 point.
			<p>e) Participation by national experts</p> <p>Demonstration of inclusion of local key staff in the assignment by:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> i) 50% and above – score 10 points; ii) 25% to 49% - score 6 to 9 points; iii) 1% to 24% - score 1 to 5 points; and iv) 0% - score 0 point.
			<p>f) Knowledge of the country (Tanzania)</p> <p>These may include:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> i) local language; ii) culture; iii) administrative system; iv) government organization; and v) any other relevant information required by the PE.
18.	Points given to main evaluation criteria	18.1	The relative importance of the sub-criteria rated out of one hundred will vary with the type of services to be performed and as a guide, the relative merit points may be specified in the Request for Proposals and used in the evaluation process.
		18.2	Where there is a participation of only local persons or firms, the weight given to local firm participation and participation of national experts shall be fixed to zero.

Points given to main evaluation criteria							
Type of assignment	Firm's general experience, reputation and experience in previous similar assignments	Understanding of the terms of reference, methodology and the overall quality of the proposal	Qualifications of Key Personnel	Local Firms participation	Participation by national experts	Knowledge of the country (Tanzania)	Total
Technical Assistance and training	5 – 15	20 – 40	30 – 60	15	10	5 – 10	100
Pre-investments and feasibility studies	5 – 15	20 – 40	30 – 60	15	10	5 – 10	100
Engineering /design	5 – 15	20 – 40	30 – 60	15	10	5 – 10	100
Implementation and supervision	5 – 15	20 – 40	30 – 60	15	10	5 – 10	100

19.	Clarification of proposals	19.1	During evaluation processes, a procuring entity may request a consultant to clarify his proposal in order to assist in the examination, evaluation and comparison of proposals but no advantage shall be sought, offered or permitted to change any matter of substance in the proposal.
20.	Grading of technical proposals	20.1	After evaluation of the technical proposals, the Evaluation Committee shall grade and rank the technical proposals in accordance with the scores obtained.
21.	Evaluation Report	21.1	a) The Evaluation Committee shall prepare and submit the evaluation report on technical proposals to the Procurement Management Unit for review. b) The Procurement Management Unit shall after review, comment on the evaluation report and submit the report and its recommendations to the Tender Board together with all copies of the proposals attached to it, for approval prior to opening and evaluation of financial proposals.
		21.2	The report may indicate items or areas to be discussed during negotiations.
		21.3	Where the evaluation and preparation of the report is not conducted in accordance with evaluation guidelines, the Procurement Management Unit shall return the evaluation report to the Evaluation Committee for re-evaluation.
		21.4	Where the re-evaluation fails to resolve the disagreement or, where Procurement Management Unit disagrees with the Evaluation Committee on any other matter pertaining to the evaluation report, the Procurement Management Unit shall refer the matter to the Tender Board for decision.
22.	Review of evaluation report by Tender Board	22.1	Tender Board shall review and approve the technical evaluation report submitted by Procurement Management Unit.
		22.2	Where a Tender Board disagrees with the recommendations of the procurement management unit, the Tender Board shall return the submission to the Procurement Management Unit for review and shall, in addition, give reasons, in writing, for such decision.
23.	Notification of results	23.1	The procuring entity shall notify consultants whose proposals have not met the minimum qualifying mark or where considered non-responsive to the request for proposal.
		23.2	A procuring entity shall notify the consultants who have scored the minimum qualifying mark, the date, time and place for opening of the financial proposals.
PART V: EVALUATION OF FINANCIAL PROPOSALS			
24.	Evaluation Procedure	24.1	The evaluation of the financial proposals shall be carried out as follows: a) An evaluation committee shall first review the financial

			<p>proposals for consistency with the technical proposals and if there are any inconsistencies they shall make the necessary adjustment.</p> <p>b) Examination of conformity of the financial proposal to the technical proposal in terms of the main inputs of the services to be provided such as:-</p> <p>i) key staff named in the financial proposal are not named in the technical proposal,</p> <p>ii) the technical proposal stated a different validity period than specified in the financial proposal,</p> <p>iii) financial proposal signed by a person different from the one who signed the technical proposal.</p> <p>c) An evaluation committee shall review the financial proposals and where there are any arithmetical errors, such errors shall be corrected in the manner prescribed in the Request for Proposal document and the procuring shall give prompt notice of any such correction to the consultants who submit the proposal.</p> <p>d) For the purpose of comparing proposals, the costs shall be converted to a common currency selected by the procuring entity as stated in the Request for Proposals.</p> <p>e) The evaluation committee shall make the conversion by using the selling (exchange) rates for those currencies quoted by an official source such as the Bank of Tanzania as stated in the Request for Proposals.</p>
25.	Margin of preference	25.1	<p>After the financial proposals of the successful firms have been opened and reviewed by the evaluation committee, the proposals which are responsive shall be classified into the following groups:</p> <p>a) Group A: financial proposals offered by national consultants as well as association between national consultants, eligible for the preference;</p> <p>b) Group B: financial proposals submitted by associations between national and foreign consultants, eligible for the preference; and</p> <p>c) Group C: financial proposals offered by foreign Consultants.</p>
		25.2	<p>For the purpose of evaluation and comparison of financial proposals:</p> <p>a) an amount equal to the specified margin of preference for group A shall be added to financial proposals received from consultants in Group C; and</p> <p>b) an amount equal to the difference between the margin of preference for group A and that of Group B shall be added to financial proposals received from consultants in</p>

			group B.
26.	Evaluation of the financial proposals	26.1	<p>The proposals which pass the examination indicated under clause 25 of these Guidelines shall be evaluated in detail. The logical steps to be followed in the evaluation of financial proposals may be summarized as follows:-</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> a) Proposal are verified; b) Adjustments are made to correct arithmetic errors in the light of deviations or quantifiable reservations or possible benefits to certain public corporations; c) Price variations applicable to the base prices are not taken into consideration at this stage; d) For the purposes of evaluation, import duties and local taxes may be excluded if so specified in the Request for Proposals; e) The different currencies of the financial proposals are then converted into a single currency (usually in Tanzanian shillings) for similar transactions provided that the date shall not be earlier than four weeks prior to the deadline for submission for proposals; f) The adjusted prices converted to a single currency of the consultants retained are thus obtained and used for the subsequent calculations or comparisons; g) The prices used in the financial evaluation are those proposed by the consultants and which directly concern their services namely those that include personnel costs, reimbursable costs for foreign exchange and local currency expenses; h) On completion of the evaluation of proposals of combined report on the evaluation of technical and financial proposals comprising the evaluation forms together with the recommendations concerning the selection of the consultant shall be addressed to the Procurement Management Unit for review and later for tender board approval irrespective of the selections procedure followed. The report shall have copies of the evaluated proposals attached to it; i) The tender board shall approve the recommendations of the evaluation report before the procuring entity invites the consultant to negotiate a contract; j) Where the selection of the consultant is based only on technical criteria, the details of the adjustments and arithmetic corrections to prices are worked out during the negotiations but before an invitation is

			issued to the best ranked consultant to appear for negotiations. The procedures mentioned in clause 26.1(h) and 31.1(i) must be followed.
		26.2	The proposal with the lowest cost may be given a financial score of 100 and other proposals given financial scores that are inversely proportional to their prices. Alternatively, a directly proportional or other methodology may be used in allocating the marks for the cost. The methodology to be used shall be described in the request for proposals.
		26.3	The formula for determining the financial scores is: a) Either $S_f = 100 \times F_m/F$ where S_f = the financial score F_m = the lowest price F = price of the proposal under consideration b) Or another proportional linear formula.
27.	Combined quality and cost evaluation	27.1	In the case of the quality and cost based selection, the total score shall be obtained by weighting the quality and cost scores as specified in the Request for Proposals and adding them.
		27.2	The technical proposals considered satisfactory (scoring above a specified threshold prescribed in the RFP) are classified by order of merit and the corresponding financial proposals shall be opened and examined.
		27.3	After the necessary correction of arithmetic errors are made, a score of one-hundred percent shall be given to the lowest financial proposal and the score given to each of the other financial proposals is proportionately reduced.
		27.4	The technical and financial proposals shall be weighted as specified in the Request for Proposal and the combined value of the two proposals shall be calculated for each firm.
		27.5	The proposals will be ranked according to their combined technical (S_t) and financial (S_f) scores using the weights indicated in the Request for Proposals: $S = S_t \times T\% + S_f \times P\%$ Where: T = Weight given to the technical proposal P = Weight given to the financial proposal $T + P = 1$ or $T + P = 100$
		27.6	The firm which has the highest combined score shall be invited for negotiations. The exercise may continue until an agreement is reached with one of the firms whose technical

			proposals are considered satisfactory and retained.
28.	Technical Quality	28.1	Financial proposal of the firm which has submitted the best technically acceptable proposal shall be opened not later than seven (7) working days after notification date, examined and be the first to be invited for negotiation.
		28.2	If no agreement is reached, then the financial proposal of the consultant whose technical proposal is ranked the second lowest shall be opened, examined and invited for negotiation. The exercise may continue until an agreement is reached with one of the firms whose technical proposals are considered satisfactory and retained.
29.	Comparability of technical proposals and least cost consideration	29.1	The technical proposals considered satisfactory (scoring above a specified threshold prescribed in the RFP) are classified by order of merit and the corresponding financial proposals shall be opened not later than seven working days after notification date and examined.
		29.2	The consultant whose financial offer is considered the lowest shall be invited for negotiations on condition that it can be covered with the financial resources available for the project.
		29.3	Where an agreement is not reached, the consultant whose financial offer is ranked second lowest, shall be invited to negotiate and so on until an agreement is reached with one of the best ranked consultants.
30.	Quality and fixed budget	30.1	Financial proposals of consultants scoring above the minimum technical threshold prescribed in the RFP document shall be opened not later than seven (7) working days after notification date.
		30.2	The financial proposals that exceed the indicated budget shall be rejected.
		30.3	The consultant who has submitted the highest ranked technical proposal among the rest shall be selected and invited to negotiate a contract.
31.	Negotiations parameters	31.1	The Evaluation Committee shall consider during evaluation of proposals the following listed parameters when recommending on areas for negotiations: a) the terms of reference; b) comments made by the consultant on the scope of services; c) the methodology; d) staffing; e) counterpart staff and training; f) procuring entity's inputs, and special conditions of the contract; g) consultant's proposed work programme; h) quoted price reduction; i) consultants' tax liability and how tax liability has been or would be reflected in the contract; and

			j) details that were not apparent or could not be finalised at the time of evaluation.
		31.2	The Evaluation Committee shall not recommend for negotiations parameters that shall substantially alter the original terms of reference or the terms of the contract.
32.	Post-qualification	32.1	The PE shall conduct post-qualification to determine whether the Consultant with the best-evaluated proposal has the capability, legal capacity and resource to carry out the contract.
		32.2	The post-qualification shall verify, validate, and ascertain all statements made and documents submitted by the first ranked consultant using non-discretionary criteria, as stated in the Request for Proposal.
		32.3	The criteria for post-qualification or due diligence shall be set out in the request for proposal and shall include: (a) legal requirements: to verify, validate, and ascertain licenses, certificates, permits, and agreements submitted by the consultant and the fact that it is not included in any “blacklist”; (b) technical requirements: to determine compliance of the consulting services offered with the requirements specified in the request for proposal including, where applicable verification and validation of the consultant’s stated competence and experience on similar contracts, and the competence and experience of the consultant’s key personnel to be assigned to the consulting services; (c) financial requirements: to verify, validate and ascertain the audited financial statements of the consultant and the financial proposal; (d) knowledge of local working conditions; (e) current commitments; (f) litigation record; or (g) any other relevant criteria.
		32.4	Where the first ranked consultant does not meet the post qualification criteria- (a) the proposal shall be rejected; and (b) where applicable, post-qualification shall be conducted to the next ranked consultant.
		32.5	The result of the post-qualification shall be embodied in a formal report.

PART VI: FORMAT OF THE TECHNICAL EVALUATION REPORT – Text¹			
33.	Background	33.1	It shall include a brief description, context, scope, and objectives of the services. <i>[Use about a quarter of a page]</i>
34.	The selection process (prior to technical evaluation)	34.1	Describe briefly the selection process, beginning with the advertising (if required), expressions of interest and the establishment of the shortlist. Describe major events that may have affected the timing (delays, complaints from consultants, key correspondence with the Procurement Management Unit, request for proposals, extension of proposal submission date, and other related information). <i>[Use about one-half to one page]</i> .
35.	Technical evaluation	35.1	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; relevant correspondence with the Procurement Management Unit; and compliance of evaluation criteria prescribed in the RFP.
		35.2	Present results of the technical evaluation: scores and the award recommendation.
		35.3	Highlight strengths and weaknesses of each proposal (most important part of the report).
			<p>a) <u>Strengths:</u></p> <p>Experience in very similar projects in the United Republic of Tanzania; quality of the methodology, providing a clear understanding of the scope of the assignment; strengths of the local partner; and experience of proposed staff in similar assignments.</p> <p>b) <u>Weaknesses:</u></p> <p>Of a particular component of the proposal; of a lack of experience in the United Republic of Tanzania; 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 staff (e.g., the team leader); of a lack of responsiveness; and of disqualifications (conflict of interest etc)</p>
		35.4	Comment on individual evaluators' scores (discrepancies).
		35.5	Items requiring further negotiations. <i>[Use up to three pages]</i> .

¹ Part VI 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).

CONSULTANT EVALUATION REPORT

Project Name [*insert: project name*]

Project Identification number: (*insert: project identification number if any*)

Procuring Entity: (*insert: name of procuring entity*)

Title of Consulting Services [*insert: title*]

Date of Submission [*insert: date*]

Part VII: Technical Evaluation Report – Forms²

- | | |
|-----------|--|
| Form IVA. | Technical Evaluation – Basic Data |
| Form IVB. | Evaluation Summary – Technical Scores/Ranking |
| Form IVC. | Individual Evaluations – Comparison (Average Scores) |

² Part VII 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 IVA.

Form IVA: Technical Evaluation – Basic Data

1. Name of Project _____

2. Client:
 - a. name _____
 - b. address, phone, facsimile _____

3. Type of assignment, and brief description _____

4. Method of selection.³ QCBS _____ Quality-Based _____

5. Prior review thresholds: TZS. _____

6. Request for expressions of interest⁴:
 - (a) Publication of the General Procurement Notice⁵ _____

 - (b) Publication in national Newspaper (s) Yes _____ No _____

 - (c) Number of responses _____

7. Shortlist:
 - (a) Name/nationality of Firms/associations (mark domestic firms and firms that had expressed interest)
 1. _____
 2. _____
 3. _____
 4. _____
 5. _____
 6. _____

3 See Regulations

4 Required for large contracts (see Regulations).

5 Indicate whether expressions of interest advertised in Web or hardcopy edition

- b) Submission to the tender board for approval Date _____
- c) Tender board approval Date _____
8. Request for Proposals:
- a) Submission to the tender board for approval Date _____
- b) Tender board approval Date _____
- c) Issuance to Consultants Date _____
9. Amendments and clarifications to the RFP (describe) _____

10. Types of Contract:
- a) Simple Time-Based Yes _____ No _____
Price adjustment: Yes _____ No _____
- b) Lump Sum Yes _____ No _____
Price adjustment: Yes _____ No _____
- c) Complex Time-Based Yes _____ No _____
Price adjustment: Yes _____ No _____
- d) Other (describe) _____

11. Pre-proposal conference:
- a) minutes issued Yes _____ No _____
Yes _____ No _____
12. 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 _____
13. Submission of Proposal Location _____
14. Opening of Technical Proposal by Tender opening adhoc committee Date _____ Time _____
15. Number of proposals submitted _____
16. Evaluation committee⁶: Members' names and titles (Minimum 3)
1. _____
2. _____
3. _____
4. _____
5. _____
17. Proposal validity period (days):

- a) Original expiration date Date _____ Time _____
- b) Extension, if any Date _____ Time _____

1.8 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
 - (i) _____ Weight _____
 - (ii) _____ Weight _____

6 It is important that evaluators be qualified.
 7 Maximum of three sub-criteria per criterion.

19. Technical scores by Consultant Minimum qualifying score __

Consultants' names	Technical scores
1.	
2.	
3.	
4.	

20 Evaluation report:

(a) Submission to PMU
for review; and Date _____

(b) Submission to tender board
for deliberation. Date _____

Form IVB: Evaluation Summary

Technical Scores/Ranking

<i>Consultants' names</i>	<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], etc</i>
Criteria	Scores	Scores	Scores	Scores
Firm's general experience, reputation and experience in previous similar assignments				
Understanding of the terms of reference, methodology and the overall quality of the proposal				
Qualifications of Key Personnel				
Local Firms participation				
Participation by national experts				
Knowledge of the country(Tanzania)				
Total Score^a				
Rank				

a. Proposals scoring below the minimum qualifying score of [number] points have been rejected.

Form IVC: Individual Evaluations - Comparison

<i>Consultants' Names</i>	<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],etc</i>
Firm's general experience, reputation and experience in previous similar assignments	A B C AV ^a D			
Understanding of the terms of reference, methodology and the overall quality of the proposal				
Qualifications of Key Personnel				
Local Firms participation				
Participation by national experts				
Knowledge of the country(Tanzania)				
Total				

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

Note:

Please see the Preface.

Financial proposals must not be opened before the approval of the appropriate tender board on the technical evaluation. The technical evaluation (technical scores in particular) cannot be changed following the opening of the financial proposals.

**Part VIII: Financial Evaluation Report – Award
Recommendation – Text⁸**

[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) any other important information, including issues related to quoted price to be negotiated; and
- e) award recommendation.

Taxes may not be taken into account in the financial evaluation whereas reimbursable should be taken into account

⁸ Applies to QCBS, Fixed-Budget, and Least-Cost. For Quality-Based, Qualifications, and Single-Source provide relevant information as indicated.

**Part IX: Financial Evaluation Report – Award
Recommendation – Forms⁹**

- Form VIIIA. Financial Evaluation – Basic Data
- Form VIIIB. Adjustments – Currency Conversion – Evaluated Prices
- Form VIIC. QCBS – Combined Technical/Financial Evaluation –
Award Recommendation
- Form VIID. Fixed-Budget and Least-Cost Selection-Award
Recommendation

⁹ Applies to QCBS, Fixed-Budge, and Least-Cost. For Quality-Based, Qualifications, and Single-Source, provide relevant information as indicated.

Form VIII A: Financial Evaluation – Basic Data

1. Tender board’s approval to technical evaluation report (Quality-Based, Qualifications, Single-Source) Date _____

2. Public opening of financial proposals Date _____ Time _____
 - (a) Names and proposal prices
 1. _____
 2. _____
 3. _____
 4. _____

3. Evaluation committee: members’ names and titles (if not the same as in the technical evaluation)

4. Methodology (formula) for evaluation of cost (QCBS only; cross as appropriate) Weight inversely proportional to cost
 Other _____

5. Submission of final technical/financial evaluation report to the tender board (Quality-Based, Qualifications, Single-Source) Date _____

6. QCBS

	Consultant’ Name	Technical scores	Financial scores	Final scores
(a) Technical, financial and final scores (Quality-Based: technical scores only)	_____	_____	_____	_____
	_____	_____	_____	_____
	_____	_____	_____	_____

 (b) Award recommendation _____

7. Fixed Budget and Least-Cost

	Consultant’ Name	Technical scores	Proposal Evaluated prices
(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 Name _____
score

Form VIIIIB: Adjustments - Currency Conversion - Evaluated Prices 10

Consultant's Name	Proposal's prices ^a		Adjustment ^b	Evaluated	Conversion to currency of evaluation ^c		Financial Scores ^d
	Currency	Amounts (1)			(2)	(3)=(1)+ (2)	
	USD	100	(10)	90	2300		

- 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.
- c. 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, normally the local currency (e.g., 1 US\$ = Tshs. 1350 CONSIDER USING EXAMPLES OF CURRENT EXCHANGE RATES). Indicate source as per RFP.

¹⁰ For Quality-Based, Qualifications, and Single-Source, fill out up to column3.

Form VIIIIC: QCBS - Combined Technical/Financial Evaluation - Award Recommendation

Consultant's names	Technical Evaluation			Financial Evaluation		Combined Evaluation	
	Technical Scores ^a S(t)	Weighted scores S(t) x T ^b	Technical Rank	Financial Scores ^c S(f)	Weighted Scores ^c S(f) x 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 VIIID: Fixed-Budget and Least-Cost Selection - Award Recommendation¹¹

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.

¹¹ Fill in appropriate part of form.

Part X: Annexes¹²

Annex I.	Individual Evaluations
	Form IX Annex I (i). Individual Evaluation
	Form IX Annex I (ii). Individual Evaluation- 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

¹² 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 1 (i): Individual Evaluations

Consultant's name: _____

Criteria	Sub-Criteria	Maximum Scores	Evaluators					Average Scores
			1	2	3	4	5	
Firm's general experience, reputation and experience in previous similar assignments	i)							
Sub Total								
Understanding of the terms of reference, methodology and the overall quality of the proposal								
Sub Total								
Qualifications of Key Personnel								
Sub Total								
Local Firms participation								
Sub Total								
Participation by national experts								
Sub Total								
Knowledge of the country(Tanzania)								
Sub Total								
Total		100						

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

Name of Evaluator: _____ Signature: _____ Date: _____

Annex II: Information Data Monitoring

- 5.1 Loan/credit/grant _____
(a) number _____
(b) date of effectiveness _____
(c) closing date _____
(i) original _____
(ii) revised _____
- 5.2 General Procurement Notice
(a) first issue date _____
(b) latest update _____
- 5.3 Request for expressions of interest:
(a) publication in the TANEPS
Date _____
- 5.5 Did the use of “local input” as a factor of selection change the technical ranking?²
Yes _____ No _____

² Figure out technical scores with and without “local input” (Form IIB).

Annex III: Minutes of Public Opening of Technical and Financial Proposals³

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 Client, at its discretion, may consider appropriate.]

³ Annex III applies to QCBS, Fixed-Budget, and Least-Cost.

Annex IV: Request for Proposals¹⁶

[Relevant section of the Request for Proposal should be appended]

¹⁶ Annex IV applies to all selection procedures (The Standard Request for Proposals may be used for Qualifications and Single-Source, with appropriate modifications).

Annex V: Miscellaneous Annexes - Ad Hoc

Annex VI: Proposal Evaluation Checklist

1. General factors

- a) Has the consultant responded with an appropriate technique or is he or she trying to fit the problem to favorite technique?
- b) What priority will this project receive from the consultant? How important will it be to his or her firm?
- c) Does the proposal meet the terms of reference and the intended scope of the study?
- d) How useful or capable implementations will the end product be?
- e) What degree of originality is present in the proposal?
- f) Are the submission of progress reports and presentation of interim briefings required? What progress reports and interim briefings are planned?
- g) What degree of direct consultant – client liaison is proposed? Does the consultant client relationship include a training component for the client's personnel? What type of training is proposed?
- h) Is the proposed content of progress reports in accordance with the requirements of the Client? Will progress reports contain a monthly statement of costs incurred, commitments and if necessary, a revised estimated of total costs?
- i) When the project is completed, how does the consultant intend to hand over the project?
- j) What degree of follow-up and/or debriefing is proposed? To whom do the relevant data belong and what happens to them when the project is completed?

2. Past performance

- a) Is the usual business of the consultant closely related to the proposed work?
- b) Does the references to past experience include activities specifically related to the requirements of the proposed study?
- c) Has the consultant been honored by professional societies because of his/her performance in a specific professional area?
- d) What reputation does the firm hold in the area of the proposed assignment?
- e) Has the firm worked for this client before, and if so, with what success?
- f) Are the statements of past performance worded so you can identify what work was actually performed?
- g) Are there aspects of past performance that indicate particular weaknesses or strengths?

3. Scope of Work

- a) Has the proposal demonstrated an understanding of the problems to be solved?
- b) Is this assignment area new to the company?
- c) Has the consultant made an accurate assessment of the problem based on an interpretation of the requirements set forth in the work statement?
- d) Has the consultant presented an approach that will achieve the stated objectives?
- e) Is the proposed approach supported with justification of why it should achieve the objectives?
- f) Do you think the suggested approach will work?
- g) Has the consultant introduced unanticipated events which may result in a project overrun or an expanded scope of work?
- h) Does the proposal distinguish between the simpler and the more difficult performance requirements?
- i) Does the proposals convincingly show a depth of understanding of the problem?
- j) Are the technical problems clearly delineated or are they merely “parroted” from the request for proposals?
- k) Have the limits of the problem been specified to show that the proposed assignment will be restricted to an appropriate scope?
- l) Is there a concise and adequate review of literature? Is the literature review merely an annotated bibliography or is it a scholarly critique?
- m) Are the specific objectives of the proposal clearly stated? Are these goals realistic in view of time, equipment, budget and professional experience of the principal instigator?
- n) Is the proposal fully responsive to all written requirements and specifications?
- o) Are there any apparent discrepancies or omissions?
- p) Are the output clearly defined and presented?

4. Personnel

- a) Is it clear which tasks in the assignment will be assigned to specific personnel and for what amount of time?
- b) Are the personnel assigned to specific tasks qualified by training and experience to perform the tasks successfully?
- c) Is there a clear organization chart depicting project management? Is there realistic apportionment of personnel level and time to specific tasks?

- d) What assurances are made concerning the availability of personnel proposed? Was a contingency plan requested if certain personnel become unavailable?
- e) Have enough time and personnel been included to provide adequate service required.
- f) Does the success of the project depend, to a large degree, upon personnel not directly associated with the prospective firm?
- g) Does CVs related to specific experience of personnel relate to the specific needs of this assignment?
- h) Does the proposal show the capabilities of the management to handle a project of the size contemplate?
- i) Is the position for the programmed manager in the overall organization and the limits of his/her authority and responsibility shown?
- j) Are the type, frequency and effectiveness of management controls and method for corrective action shown?
- l) Is the proposal dependent upon recruitment of key personnel?

5. Planning and management

- a) Has the work schedule been specified clearly, and is it realistic in terms of time and money? Does it fit with available personnel?
- b) If time of performance is important and is a competitive evaluation factor, is the proposed schedule supported by the technical proposal?
- c) Is the planning realistic? Does it follow recognized and accepted procedures?
- d) Does the proposal show that the delivery schedule will be met and how it will be met?
- e) Are the various technical phases of the project detailed and realistically scheduled?
- f) Are effective review, evaluation and control provided at specific check points?
- g) Has the consultant allowed for all necessary clearances?

6. Facilities

- a) Are the facilities and equipment needed for successful completion of the study specified in the proposal?
- b) How does the consultant intend to access facilities not at the client's site?
- c) Does the use of facilities outside the client require a subcontract? If so, is the proposed subcontract specifically mentioned, along with an explanation of required qualifications?

- d) Is the planned use of facilities, such as printing, data processing etc realistic?
- e) If computer services are required, are these controls built into the processing so corrective action can be taken at intermittent points, if necessary?
- f) Is any government – furnished equipment required?
- g) Are the proposed laboratory and test facilities adequate for the requirements of the technical scope of work?
- h) Are resources over – committed?

7. Cost

- a) Is the overall cost within range of your (the contracting agency's) budget?
- b) What is the relationship between the cost figures and equivalent items in the technical proposal?
- c) Are the personnel costs reasonable according to the tasks to be performed?
- d) Are the appropriate personnel assigned to perform the appropriate tasks?
- e) Has expenditure been set aside for subcontracting requirements, such as data processing?
- f) Have costs for development of instruments, purchase of materials, such as scoring sheets etc been included?
- g) Does the travel schedule/plan seem reasonable when compared to the tasks to be accomplished?
- h) If consultants or experts are included, is their daily rate reasonable and within the proper financial range? Is the proposed time reasonable?
- i) Is an appropriate type of contract requested?
- j) Is the schedule of payment acceptable?
- k) Have appropriate procedures been used to estimate costs?

**Annex VII: Personal Covenant for Members of the Evaluation
Committee**

THE PUBLIC PROCUREMENT ACT, Cap.410

PERSONAL COVENANT

1. I (full name of member) (*designation of member*)
of (*name of institution*) being a Member of the Evaluation
Committee for Tender No. of for the
..... (*description of services*) constituted under Section 40 of the Public
Procurement Act, 2011 DO HEREBY state as follows:-
- a) That, I do not have any interest, pecuniary or otherwise, directly or
indirectly in any of the consultants, firms, associations or joint ventures
that have submitted expressions of interest / proposals for the above
mentioned tender; that is to say:-
- i) M/s
- ii) M/s
- iii) etc.
- b) That, all knowledge, reports or any other materials not within the public
domain which I may acquire from the evaluation process, by virtue of the
performance of my duties as Member of the said Evaluation Committee,
shall for all time and for all purposes be regarded by me as strictly
confidential and I shall not divulge them to persons not officially
concerned with this evaluation process.
- c) That, as a Member of the Evaluation Committee shall at all times adhere
fully with the terms and conditions contained in the Public Procurement
Act 2011 and the Public Procurement Regulations, 2013 - Government
Notice No. 446 of 2013.
- d) That, the breach of this Covenant or any provisions of the Public
Procurement Act, 2011 shall not preclude the institution of criminal
proceedings pursuant to the Penal Code, the Prevention of Corruption
Act, 1971 or any other written law against me.
2. Signed by the said this day of
..... 20

THE PUBLIC PROCURMENT ACT, Cap. 410

PERSONAL COVENANT

3. I (*full name of member*) (*Designation of member*) of (*name of institution from where the member comes from*) being a Member of the [Ministry / Regional/District etc] Tender Board of the (*name of the institution for whom this selection is being done*) constituted under Section 31 of the Public Procurement Act, 2011 DO HEREBY state as follows:-

a) That, I do not have any interest, pecuniary or otherwise, directly or indirectly in any of the consultants, firms, associations or joint ventures that have submitted expressions of interest / proposals for the above mentioned tender; that is to say:-

- i) M/s
- ii) M/s
- iii) etc

b) That, all knowledge, reports or any other materials not within the public domain which I may acquire from the evaluation process, by virtue of the performance of my duties as Member of the tender board, shall for all time and for all purposes be regarded by me as strictly confidential and I shall not divulge them to persons not officially concerned with this evaluation process.

c) That, as a Member of the tender board shall at all times adhere fully with the terms and conditions contained in the Public Procurement Act 2011 and the Public Procurement Regulations, 2013 – Government Notice No. 446 of 2013.

d) That, the breach of this Covenant or any provisions of the Public Procurement Act, 2011 shall not preclude the institution of criminal proceedings pursuant to the Penal Code, the Prevention of Corruption Act, 1971 or any other written law against me.

3. Signed by the said this day of 20