



**PUBLIC PROCUREMENT REGULATORY AUTHORITY
(PPRA)**

**GUIDELINES FOR EVALUATION OF PROPOSALS DURING THE
SELECTION AND EMPLOYMENT OF CONSULTANTS, 2026**

JANUARY 2026

**GUIDELINES FOR EVALUATION OF PROPOSALS DURING THE
SELECTION AND EMPLOYMENT OF CONSULTANTS, 2026**

Approved by	Title	Signature	Date
Board of Directors	Director General		21 st January 2026

Issued by:

Director General,
Public Procurement Regulatory Authority,
Tambukareli, Dodoma,
3 Ununuzi Street,
P. O. Box 2865,
41104 Dodoma,
TANZANIA

Email Address: dg@ppra.go.tz

Phone: +255 (0) 26 296 3854

Website: <https://www.ppra.go.tz>

TABLE OF CONTENTS

TABLE OF CONTENTS	ii
ABBREVIATIONS AND ACRONYMS	v
DOCUMENT VERSION CONTROL	vi
PART I: INTRODUCTION.....	1
Background.....	1
Short Title.....	1
Application	1
Interpretation.....	1
Purpose of Guidelines.....	2
Rationale of the Guidelines	2
PART II: APPOINTMENT, COMPOSITION, AND DUTIES OF THE EVALUATION COMMITTEE.....	2
Composition	2
Appointment of the evaluation committee	3
Duties of Chairperson	4
Duties of Evaluation Committee.....	6
PART III: QUORUM, CONDUCT AND CONFLICT OF INTEREST	6
Quorum of the evaluation committee	6
Conflict of Interest	6
PART IV: EVALUATION OF PROPOSALS.....	7
Evaluation of Expression of Interest.....	7
Evaluation of Technical Proposals	8
Marking system.....	14
Evaluation of the technical quality of the proposal	15
Clarification of proposals.....	20
Aggregation and Grading of Technical Proposals	20
Recommendation of the evaluation committee	21
PART V: SELECTION PROCEDURE.....	21
Selection based solely on technical quality.	21
Selection based on combined technical quality and Cost consideration.	21

Selection based on compatibility of technical proposals and the least cost consideration.....	22
Selection based on technical quality and fixed budget.....	22
Selection based on consultant qualifications.....	22
Proposal to remain unopened	23
PART VI: TECHNICAL EVALUATION REPORT	23
Technical Evaluation Report.....	23
Review of the evaluation report by the Tender Board or the Accounting officer	23
Notification of results.....	24
PART VII: EVALUATION OF FINANCIAL PROPOSALS	24
Examination of financial proposals.....	24
Evaluation of the financial proposals.....	25
Evaluation of proposal based on combined quality and costs selection procedure....	26
Evaluation of financial proposal based solely on the technical quality selection procedure.....	27
Evaluation of the proposal based on the compatibility of technical proposals and least cost consideration selection procedure.....	28
Evaluation of the proposal based on technical quality and the fixed budget selection procedure.....	28
Evaluation of the proposal based on the consultant qualifications selection procedure	29
Margin of preference.....	29
Recommendations of negotiations parameters.....	29
Combined technical and financial evaluation Report	30
Review of the evaluation report by the Tender Board or the Accounting Officer	31
Evaluation report.....	31
Post qualification.....	31
PART VIII: HANDLING DISAGREEMENTS IN THE TENDER EVALUATION PROCESS	33
Disagreements between the Accounting Officer and the Tender Board	33
Disagreements between the Tender Board and the PMU	33
Disagreements between the delegated Tender Board and the delegated PMU	34
Disagreements between the Procurement management unit and the user department	34

Disagreements between the PMU and the evaluation committee..... 34

Repeal of Previous Guidelines..... 34

Review of the Guidelines 34

ABBREVIATIONS AND ACRONYMS

Cap	-	Chapter
G.N.	-	Government Notice
PPRA	-	Public Procurement Regulatory Authority
PE	-	Procuring Entity
PPA	-	Public Procurement Act, Cap 410
PPR	-	Public Procurement Regulation, G.N. 518 of 2024

DOCUMENT VERSION CONTROL

Name of the Document	Guidelines for evaluation of proposals during the Selection and employment of consultants, 2026
Version	1.0
Document Number	PPRA/PSCD/MPS/26/3
Nature of Document	External Guideline
Developed by	PPRA
Approved	Board, January 2026
Applicability	PPRA, Tenderers and PEs
Purpose	To guide Procuring Entities on how to undertake evaluation processes during the selection and employment of consultants.
It is part of	Public Procurement Guidelines issued by PPRA
Related Documents	PPA, CAP 410, PPR, GN 518 of 2024 (as amended)
Official Repository	Office of the Director General
Distribution	Board, Management, PEs, and Tenderers

REVISION HISTORY

Revision Number	Revision Date	Section/Part	Revision Description

PART I: INTRODUCTION			
1.	Background	1.1.	The Public Procurement Regulatory Authority (PPRA), in accordance with Section 130 of the Public Procurement Act, Cap 410, is mandated to develop and issue guidelines for the effective implementation of the Act.
		1.2.	These Guidelines are made in compliance with regulations 290, 291, 294, and 295 regarding the evaluation of proposals for the selection and employment of consultants.
2.	Short Title	2.1.	These Guidelines shall be cited as the “Guidelines for evaluation of proposals during the Selection and employment of consultants, 2026” .
3.	Application	3.1.	These Guidelines shall apply to all PEs during the evaluation of proposals in the 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; “Accounting Officer” shall have the meaning ascribed to it under the CAP 410. “Authority” means the Public Procurement Regulatory Authority. “Chairperson of evaluation committee,” for these guidelines, means the person appointed by the Accounting Officer to be the chairperson of an evaluation committee

			“Evaluation committee” means an evaluation committee established under Section 42 of the Act. “Regulations” means the Public Procurement Regulations, 2024 (GN. 518 of 2024); “Tender board” means a tender board established under section 32 of the Act.
5.	Purpose of Guidelines	5.1.	To guide Procuring Entities on how to undertake evaluation processes during the selection and employment of consultants.
		5.2.	The Specific Purpose of these Guidelines is to guide on: - a) evaluation of the expression of interest and to prepare a shortlist of consultants; b) evaluation of the technical proposals; c) evaluation of the financial proposals; and preparation of the technical evaluation report and the combined technical and financial evaluation report.
6.	Rationale of the Guidelines	6.1.	The rationale of the Guidelines is to ensure that the evaluation of proposals in the selection and employment of the consultant complies with the legal requirements during the evaluation process.
		6.2.	The use of these Guidelines will standardize the reporting format for all PEs.
PART II: APPOINTMENT, COMPOSITION, AND DUTIES OF THE EVALUATION COMMITTEE			
7.	Composition	7.1.	The Evaluation Committee shall consist of a minimum of three (3) members and a maximum of five (5) members.

		7.2.	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.
		7.3.	Subject to subclause 7.2, where the number of members of the Evaluation Committee increases, an odd number shall be maintained.
		7.4.	The Chairperson of the evaluation committee shall be fully acquainted with the evaluation procedures and familiar with the contents of the Request for Proposal documents throughout the evaluation process.
8.	Appointment of the evaluation committee	8.1.	The Procurement Management Unit, in collaboration with the user department of a procuring entity, shall recommend names of the Evaluation Committee to the Accounting Officer for appointment of both the chairperson and members of the Evaluation Committee.
		8.2.	The recommended committee members shall comprise: - a) at least one member with technical know-how of the subject matter under procurement; b) a member(s) from user department; c) other member(s) 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 proceedings of the tender in question.
		8.3.	Members of the evaluation committee may be public officials or 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.
		8.4.	In the event that one of the members of the evaluation committee is unable to perform the evaluation duties, the accounting officer shall appoint another member with necessary qualifications as a replacement, or may opt to appoint a new evaluation committee.
		8.5.	The accounting officer may appoint a separate Evaluation Committee in each evaluation stage, namely evaluation of the expression of interest, technical proposals, or financial proposals.
		8.6.	Notification of appointment of evaluation committee members shall be sent to the members through the system with the tender number and description, and the duration of the evaluation.
9.	Duties of Chairperson	9.1.	The chairperson of the Evaluation Committee in managing the evaluation process shall have the following duties: - a) opening the evaluation to allow other members to declare a conflict of interest;

			b) ensuring all members have a common understanding of their roles, responsibilities, the process of evaluation and objectives to be achieved in a particular evaluation; c) ensuring the evaluation team has access to all necessary information; d) initiating the evaluation process; e) ensuring the conduct of the evaluation is in accordance with all legal requirements; f) ensuring all committee members perform their duties as per the scope of work; g) managing communication between the evaluation committee and PMU in all matters relating to evaluation; h) ensuring members of the evaluation committee provide justifications for their evaluation decisions and allocated scores that match the justifications provided; i) providing general justifications for each consultant and finalizing each evaluation stage; j) Closing the evaluation process and generating the evaluation report; and k) Signing and submitting the evaluation report to PMU for further action.
--	--	--	--

10.	Duties of Evaluation Committee	10.1.	The evaluation committee shall evaluate proposals based on the evaluation criteria explicitly stipulated in the expression of interest or request for proposal document. The duties of the Evaluation Committee shall be, to: a) familiarize with the requirements of the Request for Proposal document; b) agree on the detailed evaluation criteria as stipulated in the Request for Proposal document, where necessary; c) study, evaluate, and prepare a shortlist of consultants; d) study, evaluate, and rank all technical proposals; e) prepare and submit to PMU a technical evaluation report as required; f) study, evaluate, and rank all financial proposals; and Prepare and submit a combined evaluation report on the technical and financial proposal required by the procuring entity.
PART III: QUORUM, CONDUCT AND CONFLICT OF INTEREST			
11.	Quorum of the evaluation committee	11.1.	The quorum for the evaluation committee shall be all members of the evaluation committee.
12.	Conflict of Interest	12.1.	Each committee member shall individually declare and sign a covenant form to declare whether or not he has any interest in any of the consultants or firms who have submitted the

			proposals, 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.
		12.2.	If a member of an evaluation committee has any interest, such as pecuniary interest, personal interest or otherwise, direct or indirect in any of the consultants, firms, associations or joint ventures that have submitted expression of interest or proposals, shall disclose the interest, and shall not take part in the evaluation, consideration or discussion with respect to the tender under evaluation.
		12.3.	Where a member of the Committee has declared a conflict of interest under this clause, a new member shall be appointed in accordance with these Guidelines.
PART IV: EVALUATION OF PROPOSALS			
13.	Evaluation of Expression of Interest	13.1.	The Evaluation Committee shall evaluate the submitted Expressions of Interest in two main stages: preliminary examination and detailed evaluation. A. Preliminary Examination At the preliminary examination stage, the Evaluation Committee shall assess the EOIs to: i. Determine the eligibility of the consulting firms; ii. Verify whether the Expression of Interest has been submitted by a consulting firm,

			and not by an individual, where firm submission is required; iii. Confirm that the consulting firm is not suspended or debarred from participating in public procurement proceedings. B. Detailed Evaluation Consulting firms that pass the preliminary examination shall be subjected to a detailed evaluation based on the established criteria, including: i. The consulting firm's proven experience in providing similar services; ii. The firm's experience in similar conditions and within the relevant region; iii. Qualifications, competence, and relevant experience of key professional staff proposed, demonstrating appropriate skills in the same or related field.
14.	Evaluation of Technical Proposals	14.1.	The evaluation procedure for technical Proposals shall comprise two stages, which are: - a. Preliminary evaluation b. Detailed evaluation A. PRELIMINARY EVALUATION The evaluation of the technical proposals shall be carried out by checking the responsiveness of each proposal based on the criteria set for assessing commercial responsiveness, as follows:

			A: Verification Verification of submitted documents shall be done to determine the accuracy and relevance of the following: a) Attention should be directed towards deficiencies that, if accepted, would provide unfair advantages to the Consultant; such as: - i. Power of attorney shall be examined for its correctness by checking whether the donee is the one who was appointed by a proper authority, with a proper signature and witnessed by a commissioner for the oath; b) The validity of the Proposal requires that all relevant forms be signed by an authorized person or persons; c) If the Applicant/Bidder/Proposer is a joint venture, the joint venture agreement or a letter of intent to execute a Joint Venture Agreement must be submitted, as applicable. d) If the Bidder/Proposer is not a manufacturer, an authorization from the manufacturer must be provided in addition to any documentation required from the Bidder/Proposer itself. B: Eligibility and Qualification Requirements
--	--	--	---

			a) The Bidders/Proposers shall meet the eligibility requirements and substantially meet the qualification requirements. b) The Consultant must be a national or a juristic entity from an eligible source country. All partners to a joint venture shall be from an eligible source country, and the joint venture shall be registered in an eligible source country. c) If Expression of Interests has taken place, only Proposal(s) from a list of consultants shortlisted can be considered. The juridical entities of the shortlisted consultant may not be modified in the submission of proposals. d) The Consultant (including all members of a joint venture and subcontractors) may be disqualified if affiliated with a firm that has provided related consulting services on the project, or if the Consulting firm is a publicly owned enterprise from the United Republic of Tanzania, lacking legal and financial autonomy. e) All Goods, Works, and/or non-Consulting Services shall also meet the eligibility requirements. C: Proposal Security a) The Procurement Documents may require submission of a Bid/Proposal security.
--	--	--	--

			b) If so, the proposal security must conform to the requirements of the Instructions to consultants, and it must accompany the proposal. If the proposal security is issued as a bank guarantee, it must be consistent with the wording of the proposal security form provided in the request for proposal documents. c) Submission of a copy of the security or submission of a counter guarantee naming the procuring entity's bank instead of the procuring entity is unacceptable. d) Furthermore, securities for an amount smaller or for a period shorter than the one specified in the Instructions to Tenderers are not acceptable. e) The security for a proposal submitted by a joint venture should be in the names of all of the partners of the joint venture; f) In case a Proposal Securing Declaration is required, it shall be submitted in accordance with the instructions to consultants. Proposal: Securing a declaration for joint ventures shall be in the names of all partners of the joint venture. D: Completeness of Application/Proposal a) Unless the request for proposal documents have specifically allowed partial proposal – permitting consultant(s) to quote for only the selected scope.
--	--	--	--

			Proposals not offering all of the required scope or proposals inserting new scope not specified or not required by the request for proposal. Documents should ordinarily be considered nonresponsive. b) Only Bids/Proposals from eligible and qualified Bidders/Proposers that have passed the preliminary examination will proceed to the detailed technical evaluation stage. c) In case of uploads, any missing pages in the original copy of the proposal may be cause for rejection of the proposal, as they may cause contradictions in model numbers or other designations of critical scope; E: Substantial responsiveness: a) Major deviations from the commercial requirements and technical specifications are a basis for the rejection of proposals. As a general rule, major deviations are those that, if accepted, would not fulfil the purposes for which the proposal is requested, or would prevent a fair comparison with proposals that are properly compliant with the request for proposal documents. Examples of major deviations include: i) Stipulating price adjustment when fixed price tenders were called for;
--	--	--	--

			ii) Failing to respond to terms of reference by offering instead a different solution or design or product that does not offer substantial equivalence in critical performance parameters or in other requirements; iii) Phasing of contract start-up, delivery, installation, or construction not conforming to required critical dates or progress markers; iv) Subcontracting in a substantially different amount or manner than that permitted; v) Refusing to bear important responsibilities and liabilities allocated in the request for proposal document, such as performance guarantees and insurance coverage; vi) Taking exception to critical provisions such as applicable law, taxes and duties, and dispute resolution procedures; vii) Those deviations that are specified in the Instructions to consultants as requiring rejection of the proposal (such as, in the case of works, participating in the submission of another's proposal other than as a subcontractor.
--	--	--	---

15.	Marking system	15.1.	Evaluation of the technical proposal shall be carried out based on the principal criteria to which merit points are accorded, so that each proposal is scored out of a hundred, and the firms shall be ranked by order of merit based on the highest score. The Evaluation Committee may apply a score from 0% to 100%, whereby: a) 0%–20% = means that the narration of the feature relative to the assignment is absent, or the information is very insufficient to demonstrate how the requirement can be met; b) 21%–60% = means that the narration of feature relative to the assignment is being present but showing deficiencies such as insufficient or information that lacks clarity; c) 61%–80%= means that the narration of the feature relative to the assignment is meeting the requirements; sufficient information to demonstrate how the requirement will be met; d) 81%–95%= means that the narration of the feature relative to the assignment is marginally exceeding the requirements; sufficient information to demonstrate that the requirement will be marginally exceeded; and v) 96%-100%= means that the narration of the feature relative to the assignment is
-----	-----------------------	-------	---

			significantly exceeding the requirements (consultant's innovativeness, technology, flexibility and adaptability, timeliness of outputs, reliability and sustainability; efficiency in transfer of skills), sufficient information that significantly exceeds the requirements and/or contributes to significant value addition.
16.	Evaluation of the technical quality of the proposal	16.1.	The technical proposals shall be: i) evaluated in the manner prescribed under clauses 14 and 16 of these guidelines; ii) evaluated solely on quality aspects that are examined before opening the financial proposals or before price negotiation; and iii) carried out based on the system of grading described in the request for proposals.
		16.2.	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 stated in the request for proposals.
		16.3.	The evaluation committee member shall provide scores, comments, and observations on the submission made by each firm or consultant for each criterion.
		16.4.	The evaluation committee shall rate each criterion out of one hundred percent to the evaluation criteria related to the following main criteria and sub – criteria: -: a) Assessing the Firm's general experience, reputation, and experience in previous

			similar assignments by allocating a score between 0%-100% by considering the following: - i) experience in similar projects; 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.
			b) assessing the understanding of the terms of reference, methodology, and the overall quality of the proposal by allocating a score between 0%-100% by considering the following: - i) understanding of terms of reference by providing constructive comments and Suggestions on; a. the Terms of Reference; b. Counterpart Staff; and c. Facilities to be Provided by the Client;

			ii) approach methodology and overall quality of the proposal; a. Technical Approach, b. Technical Methodology, c. Work Plan, and d. Organization, Staffing, and efficiency in resource utilization e. innovativeness; iii) Compliance with environmental and social aspects (reliability, sustainability, social and environmental aspects); and iv) any other relevant information required by the PE.
			c) assessing the qualification of key personnel by allocating a score between 0%-100% by considering the following: - The consultant has to provide details showing the qualifications of key personnel available for assignment based on the qualification criteria in the terms of reference by checking: - a. Adequacy for the Project i. Specialization; ii. publications on relevant subject matter; iii. experience in similar assignments;

			iv. professional experience and status; v. career attainment; vi. Relevant Training Required b. Experience in Region and Language i. language capability; ii. Culture and ethnicity; iii. experience in a similar environment; c. General Qualifications i. Academic qualifications; and ii. age; d. any other relevant information required by the PE.
			d) assessing the Local firms' participation by allocating a score between 0%-100% by considering the following: - Foreign firms are required to demonstrate mandatory inclusion of local firms. The local firm may be engaged through a joint venture, associations, or a subcontract. Demonstration of inclusion of local firms in the assignment shall be governed by: i) If the local firm is given part of the assignment for 50% and above – shall be granted a score of 100%

			ii) If the local firm is given part of the assignment between 25% to 49% - shall be granted a score between 50%-99% iii) If the local firm is given part of the assignment between 1% to 24% - shall be granted a score between 1% to 49%; and iv) If the local firm is given part of the assignment for 0% - shall be granted a score of 0%.
			e) assessing the Participation by national experts in the consulting assignment by allocating a score between 0%-100% by considering the following: - Participation by nationals among proposed key staff should be calculated as a ratio of the national Key Experts' time input (in person - months) to the total number of Key Experts' time input (in person - months) in the Consultant's Technical Proposal Demonstration of inclusion of local key staff in the assignment shall be governed by: i) Participation by National Experts by 50% or above – shall be granted a score of 100% ii) Participation by National Experts between 25% - 49% - shall be granted a score between 50-99%%

			iii) Participation by National Experts between 1% - 24% - shall be granted a score of between 1-49% iv) Participation by National Experts by 0% - shall be granted a score of 0%
			f) Assessing the consultant's knowledge of the country (Tanzania) by allocating a score between 0%-100% by considering the following: - i) The evaluation committee should determine whether the consultant has demonstrated knowledge of the country in terms of: - local language; ii) culture; iii) administrative system; iv) government organization; and v) any other relevant information required by the PE.
17.	Clarification of proposals	17.1.	During evaluation processes, a procuring entity may request a consultant to clarify any part of the submitted proposal, but no advantage shall be sought, offered, or permitted to change any matter of substance in the proposal.
18.	Aggregation and Grading of Technical Proposals	18.1.	After evaluation of the technical proposals, the scores by members of the evaluation committee shall be aggregated by averaging the individual members' scores in each criterion.
		18.2.	The total score of the consultant shall be the sum of the average score obtained from the average calculated under sub clause 18.1 of these guidelines.

		18.3.	After evaluation of the technical proposals, the scores obtained in the technical proposals shall be graded and ranked through the System.
19.	Recommendation of the evaluation committee	19.1.	The evaluation committee shall, after completion of ranking, recommend the opening of financial proposals and the areas of negotiation pursuant to the selection procedure provided in the request for proposal.
		19.2.	Based on the selection procedures, the recommendations by the evaluation committee shall be as provided under these Guidelines.
PART V: SELECTION PROCEDURE			
20.	Selection based solely on technical quality.	20.1.	The consultant who has submitted the best technically acceptable proposal shall be the first to be invited for negotiations
		20.2.	The financial proposals of the highest-ranked consultant who has met the minimum required technical pass mark shall be opened and discussed, and if no agreement is reached, the negotiation process shall continue with the next-ranked consultants until an agreement is achieved with one of the qualified consultants.
21.	Selection based on combined technical quality and Cost consideration.	21.1.	The financial proposals of all the consultants who have met the minimum required technical pass mark shall be opened.

22.	Selection based on compatibility of technical proposals and the least cost consideration.	22.1.	The financial proposals of all the consultants who have met the minimum required technical pass mark shall be opened.
		22.2.	The consultant whose financial offer is considered the lowest shall be invited for negotiations. Where an agreement is not reached, the consultant whose financial offer is ranked second lowest shall, in turn, be invited to negotiate and so on until an agreement is reached with one of the best-ranked consultants.
23.	Selection based on technical quality and fixed budget.	23.1.	The financial proposals of all the consultants who have met the minimum required technical pass mark shall be opened.
		23.2.	The consultant who has submitted the highest-ranked technical proposal that is within the budget shall be selected and invited for contract negotiation. If an agreement is not reached, the consultant whose financial offer is ranked second-highest shall, in turn, be invited to negotiate, and so on until an agreement is reached with one of the best-ranked consultants.
24.	Selection based on consultant qualifications	24.1.	The consultant with the most appropriate qualifications shall be requested to submit a combined technical and financial proposal and be invited for negotiation.
		24.2.	Where an agreement is not reached, the consultant with the second highest ranked qualification shall be invited to negotiate, and so

			on until an agreement is reached with one of the best ranked consultants.
25.	Proposal to remain unopened	25.1.	The financial proposals of all the consultants who have not met the minimum required technical pass mark shall remain unopened.
PART VI: TECHNICAL EVALUATION REPORT			
26.	Technical Evaluation Report	26.1.	a) The Evaluation Committee shall prepare and submit the evaluation report on technical proposals to the Procurement Management Unit for review. b) 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. c) The Procurement Management Unit shall, after review, submit the report and its recommendations to the Tender Board or Accounting officer, for approval before opening and evaluation of financial proposals.
		26.2.	The report may indicate items or areas to be discussed during negotiations.
27.	Review of the evaluation report by the Tender Board or the Accounting officer	27.1.	The Tender Board or Accounting Officer shall review and approve the technical evaluation report submitted by the Procurement Management Unit.

		27.2.	Where a Tender Board or Accounting officer disagrees with the recommendations of the procurement management unit, the Tender Board or Accounting Officer shall return the submission to the Procurement Management Unit for review and shall, in addition, give reasons, in writing, for such a decision.
28.	Notification of results	28.1.	The procuring entity shall notify consultants whose proposals have not met the minimum qualifying mark or were considered non-responsive to the request for proposal and terms of reference, indicating their financial proposals shall not be opened after completing the selection process.
		28.2.	A procuring entity shall notify the consultants who have scored the minimum qualifying mark, the date and time for opening of the financial proposals.
		28.3.	A Consultant who is dissatisfied with the results of technical scores prescribed in the notice may complain to the accounting officer through NeST within 5 working days from the day of notification of the results of the technical evaluation.
PART VII: EVALUATION OF FINANCIAL PROPOSALS			
29.	Examination of financial proposals	29.1.	Examination of conformity of the financial proposal to the technical proposal in terms of the main inputs of the services to be provided, to establish whether such: -

			i) Key staff named in the financial proposal are those named in the technical proposal; ii) the validity period of the financial proposal is the same as stated with the technical proposal ; iii) financial proposal signed by an authorized person; c) where there are any errors (mismatch of technical input and those quoted in the financial proposal), the procuring entity shall give prompt notice of such errors to the consultants who submit the proposal.
30.	Evaluation of the financial proposals	30.1.	The proposals that pass the examination indicated under clause 23 of these Guidelines shall be subjected to financial evaluation. During the evaluation for the comparison of financial proposals, the evaluation committee shall: - a. exclude, import duties and local taxes if so, specified in the Request for Proposals; b. Convert different currencies of the financial proposals into a single currency (in Tanzanian shillings) using the exchange rate provided in the request for proposal for the subsequent calculations or comparisons;

			c. Consider all costs/prices proposed by the consultants in the services under procurement includes other reimbursable expenses, such as travel, translation, report printing, or secretarial expenses.
31.	Evaluation of proposal based on combined quality and costs selection procedure	31.1.	The proposal with the lowest cost shall be given a financial score of 100% and other proposals given financial scores that are inversely proportional ratio relative 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.
		31.2.	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.
		31.3.	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 consultant.

		31.4.	The proposals will be ranked according to their combined technical (St) and financial (Sf) scores using the weights indicated in the Request for Proposals. The total score shall then be obtained by summing the technical and financial scores as described below: $S = St * T\% + Sf * P\%$ Where: St = Technical score Sf = Financial score T = Weight given to the technical proposal P = Weight given to the financial proposal (Note T + P = 1 or T+ P = 100)
		31.5.	The consultant who has obtained the highest combined score shall be recommended for the award and invited for negotiations.
32.	Evaluation of financial proposal based solely on the technical quality selection procedure.	32.1.	The financial proposal of the best technically acceptable proposal shall be evaluated based on the criteria provided under clauses 29 and 30 of these Guidelines. Thereafter, the Consultant shall be invited for negotiations.
		32.2.	Where no agreement is reached, the evaluation and negotiation process as provided under sub clause 32.1 above, shall continue with the next-

			ranked consultants until an agreement is achieved with one of the qualified consultants.
33.	Evaluation of the proposal based on the compatibility of technical proposals and least cost consideration selection procedure.	33.1.	The financial proposals of all the consultants who have met the minimum required technical pass mark shall be evaluated based on the criteria provided under clauses 29 and 30 of these Guidelines.
		33.2.	The consultant whose financial offer is considered the lowest shall be invited for negotiations, where an agreement is not reached, the consultant whose financial offer is ranked second lowest shall in turn be invited to negotiate and so on until an agreement is reached with one of the best-ranked consultants.
34.	Evaluation of the proposal based on technical quality and the fixed budget selection procedure.	34.1.	Financial proposals of the consultant that exceed the fixed budget amount shall be rejected.
		34.2.	The financial proposals of all the consultants who have met the minimum required technical pass mark shall be evaluated based on the criteria provided under clauses 29 and 30 of these Guidelines.

		34.3.	The consultant who has submitted the highest-ranked technical proposal that is within the budget shall be selected and invited for contract negotiation.
		34.4.	Where an agreement is not reached, the consultant whose technical proposal is ranked the best second shall be invited for negotiation, and so on until an agreement is reached with one of the best-ranked consultants.
35.	Evaluation of the proposal based on the consultant qualifications selection procedure	35.1.	The consultant with the most appropriate qualifications shall be requested to submit a combined technical and financial proposal and be invited for negotiation.
		35.2.	Where an agreement is not reached, the consultant with the second highest ranked qualification shall be invited to negotiate and so on until an agreement is reached with one of the best ranked consultants.
36.	Margin of preference	36.1.	Where the margin of preference is applicable, the financial proposals of the consultants, depending on the selection procedure, shall be evaluated as per the Guidelines for application of preference scheme in public procurement of 2025 issued by the Authority.
37.	Recommendations of negotiations parameters	37.1.	The Evaluation Committee shall consider during the evaluation of proposals the following parameters when recommending 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; g) special conditions of the contract; h) consultant's proposed work programme; i) quoted price reduction; j) consultants' tax liability and how tax liability has been or would be reflected in the contract; and k) details that were not apparent or could not be finalized at the time of evaluation
		37.2.	The Evaluation Committee shall not recommend for negotiations parameters that shall substantially alter the original terms of reference or the terms of the contract.
38.	Combined technical and financial evaluation Report	38.1.	Upon completion of the combined quality and cost evaluation, the evaluation committee shall prepare and submit to the Procurement Management Unit a final evaluation report;
		38.2.	The report may indicate items or areas to be discussed during negotiations as provided under clause 30;
		38.3.	The Procurement Management Unit shall, after review, submit the report and its recommendations to the Tender Board or Account officer, for approval.

39.	Review of the evaluation report by the Tender Board or the Accounting Officer	39.1.	The accounting officer or tender board shall review the evaluation report and recommendations for the award of the contract to the consultant and may: a. approve the recommendations for contract award; or b. return for reevaluation of the tender, re-advertisement of the tender, or take such other actions with justifiable reasons.
40.	Evaluation report	40.1.	The format and contents of the final evaluation report shall be as provided in the Schedule of these Guidelines.
41.	Post qualification	41.1.	The PE may conduct a post-qualification to determine whether the Consultant with the best-evaluated proposal has the capability, legal capacity, and resources to carry out the contract.
		41.2.	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.

		41.3.	The criteria for post-qualification 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.
		41.4.	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.

		41.5.	The result of the post-qualification shall be embodied in a formal report.
		41.6.	Where post qualification of the consultant was conducted the post qualification report shall be submitted together with the evaluation report to the Procurement Management Unit as the final evaluation report.
		41.7.	The procedure for appointments of post qualification team shall be as provided under Guidelines for use of National Electronic Procurement System of Tanzania in Public Procurement and Supply Management, 2025.
PART VIII: HANDLING DISAGREEMENTS IN THE TENDER EVALUATION PROCESS			
42.	Disagreements between the Accounting Officer and the Tender Board	42.1.	Where the accounting officer is not satisfied with the decision of the tender board regarding the application or interpretation of any procurement method, process, or practice, the matter shall be handled in accordance with regulation 59 of the Regulations.
		42.2.	In any case, the Accounting Officer or Chief Executive Officer shall not decide on behalf of the Tender Board.
43.	Disagreements between the Tender Board and the PMU	43.1.	Likewise, where a tender board disagrees with the recommendations of the procurement management unit, the matter should be handled in accordance with regulation 60 of the Regulations.

44.	Disagreements between the delegated Tender Board and the delegated PMU	44.1.	Where a delegated tender board disagrees with the recommendations of a delegated procurement management unit, the matter should be handled in accordance with regulation 61 of the Regulations.
45.	Disagreements between the Procurement management unit and the user department	45.1.	Where a PMU disagrees with the user department concerning any decision about the application or interpretation of any procurement method, process or practice, the matter should be handled in accordance with regulation 62 of the Regulations.
46.	Disagreements between the PMU and the evaluation committee	46.1.	Where a PMU disagrees with the evaluation committee on the evaluation report, the matter should be handled in accordance with regulation 563 of the Regulations.
47.	Repeal of Previous Guidelines	47.1.	The Guidelines on the Evaluation of Technical and Financial Proposals for Selection and Employment of Consultants of 2020 Version No. PPRA: GL/03/2020/EVCS are hereby repealed and replaced by these Guidelines.
48.	Review of the Guidelines	48.1.	These Guidelines shall be reviewed every three years or may be amended anytime when the need arises.

APPENDICES

COMBINED TECHNICAL AND FINANCIAL EVALUATION REPORT

Name of the PE:

{PE_NAME}

Name of Project:

{NAME_PROJECT}

Project Identification/Proposal Number:

{PROPOSAL_NUMBER}

Title of Consultancy Services:

{PROPOSAL_DESCRIPTION}

Date of Submission to HPMU:

{PROPOSAL_EVALUATION_SUBMISSION_DATE}

1. SECTION I. TECHNICAL EVALUATION REPORT

1.0 SECTION I. TECHNICAL EVALUATION REPORT

1.1. Introduction

{PE_NAME} published Proposal No. {TENDER_NUMBER} for {RFP_DESCRIPTION} through NeST. The Procurement Management Unit facilitated the timely opening of the tenders via the NeST platform. Following this, the Accounting Officer (AO) appointed the Technical Evaluation Committee (TEC) to carry out the evaluation, in full compliance with the Public Procurement Act, CAP 410. The evaluation commenced with the identification of basic information, as detailed in as outlined in Form II A: Basic Data (***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).*** [Use about one-half to one page].

.

This Technical Proposal Evaluation Report now emanates from the outcome of the processes of evaluation carried by the Technical Evaluation Committee.

1.2. The Selection Process (Prior to Technical Evaluation)

The consultant selection process for this assignment was conducted in accordance with the Public Procurement Act CAP 410, and the selection method adhered to the {SELECTION_PROCEDURE} outlined in the Public Procurement Regulations of 2024. The process commenced with the development of the Terms of Reference (TOR), preparation of cost estimates and budget, as well as the establishment of shortlisting criteria, as detailed below:

1.2.1. Advertisement

An advertisement for the Request for Expression of Interest (REOI) was prepared and published through NeST on {PRE_PROPOSAL_INVITATION_DATE}. Interested consultants were required to submit documentation demonstrating their qualifications and relevant experience to undertake the services outlined in the RFP. This included proof of a demonstrated record of accomplishment in delivering similar services, as well as qualifications and experience in the execution of {PROPOSAL_DESCRIPTION}. In

addition, consultants were expected to provide detailed information on the qualifications and relevant experience of key personnel, particularly in the context of similar assignments and conditions within the region.

Subsequent to the advertisement, ({APPLICANT_CONSULTANT_NUMBER}) Consultants responded and submitted their proposals within the prescribed deadline for evaluation.

OR

If the shortlist was prepared without advertisement of Request for Expression of Interests (REOI)

The shortlist was prepared using the {SOURCE_OF_SHORTLIST} on consultants' assignment the shortlist was guided by PPA Cap.410 and its Regulations.

1.2.2. Preparation of the shortlist

The shortlisting exercise was conducted following an evaluation of the Consultants based on their general qualifications, understanding of the assignment, experience in executing similar projects, the firm's experience within the country, and the qualifications of key staff, as outlined in the REOI. The Shortlisting Report was prepared in accordance with the shortlisting criteria specified in the REOI and the Guidelines for the Evaluation of Consultancy Services issued by the Public Procurement Regulatory Authority.

In view of the above, the Procuring Entity approved ({NUMBER_OF_SHORTLISTED_FIRMS}) Consultants:

if PREQUALIFICATION CONDUCTED

- (a) {LIST_OF_SHORTLISTED_FIRMS}
- (b) {LIST_OF_SHORTLISTED_FIRMS}
- (c) {LIST_OF_SHORTLISTED_FIRMS}
- (d) {LIST_OF_SHORTLISTED_FIRMS}
- (e) {LIST_OF_SHORTLISTED_FIRMS}
- (f) {LIST_OF_SHORTLISTED_FIRMS}
- (g) {LIST_OF_SHORTLISTED_FIRMS}

OR

If the shortlist was prepared without advertisement of Request for Expression of Interests (REOI)

The shortlist was compiled based on the {SOURCE_OF_SHORTLIST}, in alignment with the Public Procurement Act (PPA) CAP 410 and its Regulations. The shortlisting process considered was based on one of the following sources:

1. A list of consultants provided by the relevant government body;
2. Donor directives (if applicable);
3. The Procuring Entity's (PE) own experience with Consultants and individual consultants;
4. Direct solicitation of interest from qualified firms based on the PE's own knowledge;
5. A standard list of consultants with demonstrated experience in delivering similar services to other Procuring Entities; and
6. Directives from the relevant government authority.

In view of the above, the procuring entity approved {NUMBER_OF_SHORTLISTED_FIRMS} Consultants:

- (a) {LIST_OF_SHORTLISTED_FIRMS}
- (b) {LIST_OF_SHORTLISTED_FIRMS}
- (c) {LIST_OF_SHORTLISTED_FIRMS}
- (d) {LIST_OF_SHORTLISTED_FIRMS}
- (e) {LIST_OF_SHORTLISTED_FIRMS}
- (f) {LIST_OF_SHORTLISTED_FIRMS}
- (g) {LIST_OF_SHORTLISTED_FIRMS}

1.2.3. RFP issuance and Proposal Submission

The Request for Proposal (RFP), including the Letter of Invitation (LOI), was prepared for issuance to the shortlisted consultants on {PROPOSAL_INVITATION_DATE}. Following

this, {PE_NAME} formally invited the shortlisted Consultants to submit both technical and financial proposals for the execution of the assignment referenced above.

A total of ({SUBMITTED_PROPOSALS _NUMBER}) consultants submitted their proposals within the stipulated deadline, as outlined in NeST. The submissions were received in accordance with the timelines and procedures established in the RFP documentation.

The Minutes of the Technical Proposal Opening are available and can be accessed through the NeST platform under the submodule for the Record of Proposal Opening.

1.2.4. The List of Consultants Submitted Proposals

The Consultants that submitted proposal timely are shown in Table 1:

Table 1: List of Consultants

SN	Leading Firm Consulting Firm.	Email	Address	Country
1	{SHORTLISTED_CULTANTANT_NAME}	{CONSULTANT_EMAIL}	{CONSULTANT_ADDRESSES}	{CONSULTANT_COUNTRY}
2				
3				
4				
5				
6				
7				

1.3. Appointment of Technical Evaluation Committee

The Accounting Officer appointed the Technical Proposal Evaluation Committee pursuant to the Public Procurement Act, CAP 410. The Technical Proposal Evaluation Committee was required to evaluate the proposal, determine the responsive proposal and recommend the shortlist for {PROPOSAL_DESCRIPTION}. The list of the appointed members of the evaluation committee is shown in Table 2.

Table 2: The Evaluation Committee Members

S n	Identificati on/ Check #	Full Nam es	Designati on	Positi on	Reason for appointm ent	Member instituti on	Phone Numb er	Ema il
1.								
2.								
3.								
4.								
5.								

1.4. Signing of Personal Covenant for Evaluation Committee

Each member of the Technical Proposal Evaluation Committee signed a Personal Covenant Form in compliance with the Public Procurement Act, CAP 410 and its attendant Regulations. The signed covenants to declare conflict of interest are shown in this report in Table 3.

Table 3: Declaration of Conflict of Interest

S n	Identificatio n/ Check #	Full Name s	Designati on	Positio n	Declarati on	Declarati on Reason	Signatu re Date
1.							
2.							
3.							

4.							
5.							

1.5. Technical Evaluation Criteria

The evaluation was carried out in full conformity with the provisions of the RFP. The committee agreed on the criteria that were to be used for evaluation as per the relevant Instruction to Consultants [ITC] Clause. The criteria used included the following:

1.6. Preliminary Evaluation

The Technical Evaluation Committee carried out the preliminary examination in Commercial responsiveness as per the Instructions to Consultants [ITC] of the issued RFP documents. The purpose of preliminary evaluation was to identify and determine proposal that was substantially responsive to all terms of the commercial conditions set out in the RFP document.

1.6.1 Preliminary Evaluation - Commercial

The Proposal Technical Evaluation Committee first checked out the responsiveness of each Proposal on the criteria listed that were used to assess commercial responsiveness based on the following: -

(a) Eligibility

- (i) Litigation History**
- (ii) Contract Completion Period**
- (iii) Debarment history - Post-qualification issue**

(b) Standard Proposal Forms

- (i) Proposal Validity Period**
- (ii) Notarized Special Power of Attorney**
- (iii) Technical Proposal Submission form**
- (iv) JVCA agreement/ Letter of intent to JVCA/Subcontracting Letter of Intent - must be visible If applicable**

(c) Proposal Security

(d) Financial Situation and Performance

- (i) Financial Statement**

(ii) Average Annual Turnover

(iii) Access to Financial Resources (Sources of Fund)

The outcome of each Proposal on commercial criteria is shown in Table 7A -Preliminary Examination [Commercial Responsiveness] in Section II of the report.

1.7. TECHNICAL EVALUATION PROCESS

After assessment of commercial responses, the Technical Evaluation Committee proceeded with checking out the responsiveness of each proposal on the criteria listed for the technical aspect under Table 4 as follows:

(i) Technical score rating Evaluation criterion as per Table 4:

- (a) General Experience of the Consultant (as a firm) in previous similar assignment(s).
- (b) Understanding of the Terms of Reference, Methodology, and the Overall Quality of the Proposal
- (c) Qualifications of Key Personnel's qualifications and competence for the Assignment
- (d) Participation by Tanzanian nationals among the proposed key staff
- (e) Knowledge of the Country:
- (f) Transfer of knowledge (training) program (relevance of approach and methodology):
- (g) Local Firm Participation

(ii) Combined Average Score of the Consultants as per Table 5.

(iii) Highlights of strengths and weaknesses of each proposal as per Table 6.

(iv) Determination of key issues requiring further negotiations as per Table 7:

- (a) Constructive Comments on the Terms Of Reference;
- (b) Comments Made by The Consultant on the Scope Of Services;
- (c) Methodology;
- (d) Staffing;
- (e) Cost/quoted price;
- (f) Counterpart Staff;
- (g) Training;
- (h) Inputs By Client;
- (i) Special Conditions Of The Contract;
- (j) Consultant's Proposed Work Programme; and
- (k) Clarification of details that were not apparent or could not be finalized at the time of evaluation

Instruction to developers: Every Evaluation Criteria must display corresponding evaluation stage/step based on the tender subcategory selected by PE, as follows};

Table 4: Evaluation Criterion
[Should be captured from the main criteria selected by PE]

Sn	Main Criteria	Sub-criteria weight	Main criteria weight
a)	General Experience of the Consultant (as a firm) in previous similar assignment(s).		{SCORE_MARK} 10
	Sub criterion 1 Sub criterion 2 Sub criterion 3	...% of {SCORE_MARK} ...% of {SCORE_MARK} ...% of {SCORE_MARK}	
b)	Understanding of the Terms of Reference, Methodology and the Overall Quality of the Proposal		{SCORE_MARK}
	Sub criterion 1 Sub criterion 2 Sub criterion 3	...% of {SCORE_MARK} ...% of {SCORE_MARK} ...% of {SCORE_MARK}	
c)	Qualifications of Key Personnel's qualifications and competence for the Assignment:		{SCORE_MARK}
	Sub criterion 1 Sub criterion 2		

Sn	Main Criteria	Sub-criteria weight	Main criteria weight
	Sub criterion 3	...% of {SCORE_MARK} ...% of {SCORE_MARK} ...% of {SCORE_MARK}	
d)	Participation by Tanzania nationals among the proposed key staff		{SCORE_MARK}
	1. 50% and above - 10 2. 25-49%...% of {SCORE_MARK} 3. 1-24%...% of {SCORE_MARK} 4. 0% - 0		
e)	Knowledge of the Country:		{SCORE_MARK}
	Sub criterion 1 Sub criterion 2 Sub criterion 3	...% of {SCORE_MARK} ...% of {SCORE_MARK} ...% of {SCORE_MARK}	
f)	Transfer of knowledge (training) program (relevance of approach and methodology):		{SCORE_MARK}
	Sub criterion 1 Sub criterion 2 Sub criterion 3	...% of {SCORE_MARK}	

Sn	Main Criteria	Sub-criteria weight	Main criteria weight
		...% of {SCORE_MARK} ...% of {SCORE_MARK}	
g)	Local Firm Participation		{SCORE_MARK}
	1. 50% and above - 15 2. 25-49%...% of {SCORE_MARK} 3. 1-24%...% of {SCORE_MARK} 4. 0% - 0		

Minimum pass mark for technical {MINIMUM_PASS_MARK}

Weight for technical is {MINIMUM_WEIGHT_TECHNICAL}

1.8. Evaluation Results

Each evaluation member awarded the scores depending on the Consultant's technical proposal responses. After completion of the evaluations by each member, the chairperson of the evaluation committee reviewed all the results and **did NOT) experience major discrepancies** among the individual evaluators for the award given to each criterion. Thus, members unanimously agreed for the Consultant who was substantially responsive to the terms and conditions as stipulated in the RFP and scored above the required average minimum marks of {MINIMUM_PASS_MARK} to qualify for second stage. Table 5 shows technical evaluation results while details of the same is shown Section II of the Evaluation Summary.

The average score for the Consultant after combining results from each member of evaluation obtained shown in Table 5.

Table 5: Combined Average Score of the Consultants

SN	Consulting Firm	Email	Address	Country	Score
1	{SHORTLISTED_CULTANTANT_NAME}	{CONSULTANT_EMAIL}	{CONSULTANT_ADDRESS}	{CONSULTANT_COUNTRY}	{SCORE_MARKS}

1.9. Strengths and Weaknesses of the Proposal(s)

Table 6 highlights strengths and weaknesses of each proposal in summary:

Table 6: Strengths and weakness
[This Table will repeat for each Consulting firm]

Consultant Name: {NAME_OF_CONSULTANT}			
Sn	Main Criteria	Details	Comments
a)	General Experience of the Consultant (as a firm) relevant to the Assignment:	Strength	{SUMMARY_OF_STRENGTHS}
		Weakness	{SUMMARY_OF_WEAKENESS}
b)	Understanding of the Terms of Reference, Methodology and Proposal Quality of the Assignment including work plan in responding to the Terms of Reference (TORs):	Strengths	{SUMMARY_OF_STRENGTHS}
		Weakness	{SUMMARY_OF_WEAKENESS}
c)	Qualifications of Key Personnel's qualifications and competence for the Assignment:	Strengths	{SUMMARY_OF_STRENGTHS}
		Weakness	{SUMMARY_OF_WEAKENESS}
d)	Participation by Tanzania nationals among proposed key staff	Strengths	{SUMMARY_OF_STRENGTHS}
		Weakness	{SUMMARY_OF_WEAKENESS}
e)	Knowledge of the Country:	Strengths	{SUMMARY_OF_STRENGTHS}
		Weakness	{SUMMARY_OF_WEAKENESS}
f)	Transfer of knowledge (training) program	Strengths	{SUMMARY_OF_STRENGTHS}
		Weakness	{SUMMARY_OF_WEAKENESS}

	(relevance of approach and methodology):		
g)	Local Firm Participation	Strengths	{SUMMARY_OF_STRENGTHS}
		Weakness	{SUMMARY_OF_WEAKENESS}

Table to repeat for each Consultant

1.10.Determination of key issues requiring further negotiations.

The evaluation committee after observing weakness and key findings during evaluation recommended to procuring entity areas for negotiations could be outlined, for further discussion, clarification and agreement if the Consulting firm is expected to be awarded the contract. Areas requiring negotiations are as highlighted in Table 7:

Table 7: Key issues Requiring Further Negotiations

Consultant Name: {NAME_OF_CONSULTANT}		
Sn	Negotiation Area	Details of Negotiation area
a)	{AREAS_FOR_NEGOTIATION}	{DETAILS_OF_NEGOTIATION_AREA}
b)	{AREAS_FOR_NEGOTIATION}	{DETAILS_OF_NEGOTIATION_AREA}
c)	{AREAS_FOR_NEGOTIATION}	{DETAILS_OF_NEGOTIATION_AREA}
d)	{AREAS_FOR_NEGOTIATION}	{DETAILS_OF_NEGOTIATION_AREA}

Table to repeat for each Consultant

1.11.Recommendations

In accordance with the evaluation results, the Technical Proposal submitted by only {NUMBER_OF_CONSULTANT_PASSED_MINIMUM_SCORE} Consultant(s) was/were found to be substantially responsive, compliant with the terms and conditions of RFP as well as had technical scores above the required minimum score of {MINIMUM_SCORE} indicated in the RFP.

The Evaluation team therefore recommends list of consultant(s) shown in Table 9 be notified through NeST on the date and time for Opening of their Financial Proposals for Proposal No: {PROPOSAL_NUMBER} {PROPOSAL_DESCRIPTION}.

Table 8: Consultant Passed Minimum Technical Pass Mark

S N	Leading Firm Consulting Firm	Email	Address	Country	Score
1	{CONSULTANT_PASSED_MINIMUM_SCORE}	{CONSULTANT_EMAIL}	{CONSULTANT_ADDRESS}	{CONSULTANT_COUNTRY}	{SCORE_MARKS}

The undersigned are the members of the Technical Proposal Evaluation Committee who were appointed as listed under paragraph 1.3 and hereby submit this technical evaluation report.

Sn	Full Names	Position	Member Signature and date
1.			
2.			
3.			

4.			
5.			

1.12.Submission of Evaluation Report

This report has been prepared by the TEC after successful evaluation on
{EVALUATION_REPORT_SUBMISSION_DATE} at
{EVALUATION_REPORT_SUBMISSION_TIME} hours local time.

{CHAIRPERSON_EVALUATION_COMMITTEE_SIGNATURE}

CHAIRPERSON EVALUATION COMMITTEE

2 SECTION II. TECHNICAL EVALUATION REPORT—FORMS

This part has three main forms for that provide details of Evaluation Report Form IIA: for Technical Evaluation—Basic Data; Form IIB: for Evaluation Summary - Technical Scores/Ranking; and Form IIC: for Individual Evaluations - Comparison (Average Scores). Details of Technical Evaluation - Basic Data is shown in Form IIA.

Form II A: Basic Data

2.0. Name of Country	United Republic of Tanzania
2.1. Name of Project	{PROPOSAL_DESCRIPTION}
2.2. Client:	
(a) Name	{PE_NAME}
(b) Address	{PE_ADDRESS}
(c) Contact phone	{PE_PHONES}
2.3. Type of assignment, and brief description.	{SUMMARY_BRIEF_DESCRIPTION}
2.4. Method of Selection	{SELECTION_METHOD}
2.5. Prior Review Amount	{PRIOR_REVIEW_AMOUNT}
2.6. Request for Expressions of Interest:	
(a) Publication of the General Procurement Notice	{GPN_DATE}
(b) Publication of Request for Expression of Interest	{PRE_INVITATION_DATE}
(c) Number of Responses	{APPLICANT_CONSULTANT_NUMBER}
2.7. Shortlist:	
(a) Name/nationality of 1. Firms/associations (mark 2. domestic firms and firms 3. that had expressed interest)	{CONSULTANT_NAME}
	{CONSULTANT_NAME}
	{CONSULTANT_NAME}
	{CONSULTANT_NAME}
	{CONSULTANT_NAME}

	{CONSULTANT_NAME}
	{CONSULTANT_NAME}
(b) Submission for Approval Date	{PMU_SUBMISSION_DATE}
(c) Approval date	{APPROVAL_DATE}
2.8. Request for Proposals:	
(a) Submission for approval Date	{RFP_SUBMISSION_DATE}
(b) Approval Date	{RFP_APPROVAL_DATE}
(c) Issuance to Consultants	{RFP_INVITATION_DATE}
2.9. Amendments and clarifications to the RFP (describe)	{RFP_AMMENDMENT_DETAILS}
Contract Type	
(a) Contract type	{CONTRACT_TYPE}
(b) Contract Adjustment	{CONTRACT_ADJUSTMENT}
2.10. Proposal Conference	{PRIOR_REVIEW_APPLICABILITY}
(a) Proposal Conference Applicability	{PRE_PRPOSAL_APPLICABILITY}
(b) Proposal Conference Date	{PRE_PROPOSAL_DATE}
2.11. Proposal Submission	
(a) two envelopes (technical and financial proposals)	{PROPOSAL_SUBMISSION_RESPONSE}
(b) one envelope (technical)	{PROPOSAL_SUBMISSION_RESPONSE}
(c) original submission Date Time	{PROPOSAL_SUBMISSION_DATE} at {PROPOSAL_SUBMISSION_TIME} Hours Local Time
(d) extensions(s)	{PROPOSAL_EXTENSION_APPLICABILITY}

	{PROPOSAL_SUBMISSION_DATE} at {PROPOSAL_SUBMISSION_TIME} Hours Local Time	
2.12. Opening of Technical Proposal	{ACTUAL_PROPOSAL_OPENING_DATE} at {ACTUAL_PROPOSAL_OPENING_TIME} Hours Local Time	
2.13. Number of proposals submitted	{PROPOSAL_NUMBER_SUBMITTED}	
2.14. Evaluation committee		
(a) Chairperson	{EVALUATION_COMITTEE_CHAIRPERSON}	
(b) Member 1	{EVALUATION_COMMITTEE_MEMBER}	
(c) Member 2	{EVALUATION_COMMITTEE_MEMBER}	
(d) Member 3	{EVALUATION_COMMITTEE_MEMBER}	
(e) Member 4	{EVALUATION_COMMITTEE_MEMBER}	
2.15. Proposal validity period (days):		
(a) original expiration date	{PROPOSAL_VALIDITY_PERIOD} days	
(b) extension(s), if any	{PROPOSAL_VALIDITY_EXTENSION} days	
2.16. Evaluation Criteria/ sub criteria		
1) General Experience of the Consultant (as a firm) relevant to the Assignment: {SCORE_MARK}		
(a) {SUBCRITERIA_DETAIL}	{SUBCRITERION_SCORE_MARK}	
(b) {SUBCRITERIA_DETAIL}	{SUBCRITERION_SCORE_MARK}	
(c) {SUBCRITERIA_DETAIL}	{SUBCRITERION_SCORE_MARK}	
2) Understanding of the Terms of Reference, Methodology and Proposal Quality of the Assignment including work plan in responding to the Terms of Reference (TORs): {SCORE_MARK}		
(a) {SUBCRITERIA_DETAIL}	{SUBCRITERION_SCORE_MARK}	
(b) {SUBCRITERIA_DETAIL}	{SUBCRITERION_SCORE_MARK}	
(c) {SUBCRITERIA_DETAIL}	{SUBCRITERION_SCORE_MARK}	

3) Qualifications of Key Personnel's qualifications and competence for the Assignment: {SCORE_MARK}	
(a) {SUBCRITERIA_DETAIL}	{SUBCRITERION_SCORE_MARK}
(b) {SUBCRITERIA_DETAIL}	{SUBCRITERION_SCORE_MARK}
(c) {SUBCRITERIA_DETAIL}	{SUBCRITERION_SCORE_MARK}
4) Participation by Tanzania nationals among proposed key staff {SCORE_MARK}	
5) Knowledge of the Country: {SCORE_MARK}	
6) Transfer of knowledge (training) program (relevance of approach and methodology): {SCORE_MARK}	
7) Local Firm Participation {SCORE_MARK}	
2.17. Technical scores by consultant	Minimum qualifying score {TECHNICAL_SCORE_PASS_MARK}
1) {CONSULTANT_NAME}	{ATTAINED_TECHNICAL_SCORE}
2) {CONSULTANT_NAME}	{ATTAINED_TECHNICAL_SCORE}
3) {CONSULTANT_NAME}	{ATTAINED_TECHNICAL_SCORE}
4) {CONSULTANT_NAME}	{ATTAINED_TECHNICAL_SCORE}
5) {CONSULTANT_NAME}	{ATTAINED_TECHNICAL_SCORE}
6) {CONSULTANT_NAME}	{ATTAINED_TECHNICAL_SCORE}
7) {CONSULTANT_NAME}	{ATTAINED_TECHNICAL_SCORE}
2.18. Evaluation report:	
(a) Submission to PMU for review; and	{CHAIRPERSON_SUBMISSION_DATE}

Summary of Technical Evaluation is shown in - Form IIB: for Evaluation Summary - Technical Scores/Ranking;

Form IIB. Evaluation Summary - Technical Scores/Ranking

S/n	Criteria & Sub – Criteria Description	<u>Point</u> <u>s</u> <u>%</u>	CONSULT ANT_NAM E}	{CONSULT ANT_NAM E}	CONSULT ANT_NAM E}	CONSULT ANT_NAM E}	CONSULT ANT_NAM E}	CONSULT ANT_NAM E}	CONSULT ANT_NAM E}
1	General Experience of the Consultant (as a firm) relevant to the Assignment	{SCO RE_M ARK}	{ATTAINE D_TECHNI CAL_SCO RE}	{ATTAINE D_TECHNI CAL_SCO RE}	{ATTAINE D_TECHNI CAL_SCO RE}	{ATTAINE D_TECHNI CAL_SCO RE}	{ATTAINE D_TECHNI CAL_SCO RE}	{ATTAINE D_TECHNI CAL_SCO RE}	{ATTAINE D_TECHNI CAL_SCO RE}
2	Understanding of the Terms of Reference, Methodology and Proposal Quality of the Assignment including work plan in responding to the TORs	{SCO RE_M ARK}	{ATTAINE D_TECHNI CAL_SCO RE}	{ATTAINE D_TECHNI CAL_SCO RE}	{ATTAINE D_TECHNI CAL_SCO RE}	{ATTAINE D_TECHNI CAL_SCO RE}	{ATTAINE D_TECHNI CAL_SCO RE}	{ATTAINE D_TECHNI CAL_SCO RE}	{ATTAINE D_TECHNI CAL_SCO RE}
3	Qualifications of Key Personnel's qualifications and	{SCO RE_M ARK}	{ATTAINE D_TECHNI CAL_SCO RE}	{ATTAINE D_TECHNI CAL_SCO RE}	{ATTAINE D_TECHNI CAL_SCO RE}	{ATTAINE D_TECHNI CAL_SCO RE}	{ATTAINE D_TECHNI CAL_SCO RE}	{ATTAINE D_TECHNI CAL_SCO RE}	{ATTAINE D_TECHNI CAL_SCO RE}

	competence for the Assignment:								
4	Transfer of knowledge (training) program	{SCORE_MARK}	{ATTAINED_TECHNICAL_SCORE}	{ATTAINED_TECHNICAL_SCORE}	{ATTAINED_TECHNICAL_SCORE}	{ATTAINED_TECHNICAL_SCORE}	{ATTAINED_TECHNICAL_SCORE}	{ATTAINED_TECHNICAL_SCORE}	{ATTAINED_TECHNICAL_SCORE}
5	Knowledge of the Country	{SCORE_MARK}	{ATTAINED_TECHNICAL_SCORE}	{ATTAINED_TECHNICAL_SCORE}	{ATTAINED_TECHNICAL_SCORE}	{ATTAINED_TECHNICAL_SCORE}	{ATTAINED_TECHNICAL_SCORE}	{ATTAINED_TECHNICAL_SCORE}	{ATTAINED_TECHNICAL_SCORE}
6	<i>Participation by Tanzania nationals among proposed key staff</i>	{SCORE_MARK}	{ATTAINED_TECHNICAL_SCORE}	{ATTAINED_TECHNICAL_SCORE}	{ATTAINED_TECHNICAL_SCORE}	{ATTAINED_TECHNICAL_SCORE}	{ATTAINED_TECHNICAL_SCORE}	{ATTAINED_TECHNICAL_SCORE}	{ATTAINED_TECHNICAL_SCORE}
7	Local Firm Participation	{SCORE_MARK}	{ATTAINED_TECHNICAL_SCORE}	{ATTAINED_TECHNICAL_SCORE}	{ATTAINED_TECHNICAL_SCORE}	{ATTAINED_TECHNICAL_SCORE}	{ATTAINED_TECHNICAL_SCORE}	{ATTAINED_TECHNICAL_SCORE}	{ATTAINED_TECHNICAL_SCORE}
Total points for the four criteria:		100							

Proposals that score below the minimum qualifying score of {TECHNICAL_SCORE_PASS_MARK} % was to be rejected.

Average score of Technical Evaluation for each evaluator is shown in Form IIC: Individual Evaluations - Comparison (Average Scores).

Form IIC. Evaluation Summary - Technical Scores/Ranking

S/n	Criteria & Sub – Criteria Description	Point s %	Evaluator	CONSULT ANT_NAME}	{CONSUL TANT_NAME}	CONSULT ANT_NAME}	CONSULT ANT_NAME}	CONSULT ANT_NAME}	CONSULT ANT_NAME}	CONSULT ANT_NAME}
1	General Experience of the Consultant (as a firm) relevant to the Assignment	{SCORE_MARK}	EV.-1	{ATTAINED_TECHNICAL_SCORE}	{ATTAINED_TECHNICAL_SCORE}	{ATTAINED_TECHNICAL_SCORE}	{ATTAINED_TECHNICAL_SCORE}	{ATTAINED_TECHNICAL_SCORE}	{ATTAINED_TECHNICAL_SCORE}	{ATTAINED_TECHNICAL_SCORE}
			EV.-2	x						
			EV.-3	x						
			EV.-4	x						
			EV.-5	x						
	Average score			Avr. X1						
2	Understanding of the Terms of Reference, Methodology and Proposal Quality of the	{SCORE_MARK}	EV.-1	{ATTAINED_TECHNICAL_SCORE}	{ATTAINED_TECHNICAL_SCORE}	{ATTAINED_TECHNICAL_SCORE}	{ATTAINED_TECHNICAL_SCORE}	{ATTAINED_TECHNICAL_SCORE}	{ATTAINED_TECHNICAL_SCORE}	{ATTAINED_TECHNICAL_SCORE}
			EV.-2	x						
			EV.-3	x						

S/n	Criteria & Sub – Criteria Description	<u>Point</u> <u>s</u> <u>%</u>	Evalu ator	CONSULT ANT_NAM E}	{CONSUL TANT_NA ME}	CONSULT ANT_NAM E}	CONSULT ANT_NAM E}	CONSULT ANT_NAM E}	CONSULT ANT_NAM E}	CONSULT ANT_NAM E}
	Assignment including work plan in responding to the TORs		EV.-4	x						
			EV.-5	x						
	Average score			Avr. X2						
3	Qualifications of Key Personnel’s qualifications and competence for the Assignment:	{SCO RE_M ARK}	EV.-1	{ATTAINE D_TECHNI CAL_SCO RE}	{ATTAINE D_TECHNI CAL_SCO RE}	{ATTAINE D_TECHNI CAL_SCO RE}	{ATTAINE D_TECHNI CAL_SCO RE}	{ATTAINE D_TECHNI CAL_SCO RE}	{ATTAINE D_TECHNI CAL_SCO RE}	{ATTAINE D_TECHNI CAL_SCO RE}
			EV.-2	x						
			EV.-3	x						
			EV.-4	x						
			EV.-5	x						
	Average score			Avr. X3						
4	Transfer of knowledge (training) program	{SCO RE_M ARK}	EV.-1	{ATTAINE D_TECHNI CAL_SCO RE}	{ATTAINE D_TECHNI CAL_SCO RE}	{ATTAINE D_TECHNI CAL_SCO RE}	{ATTAINE D_TECHNI CAL_SCO RE}	{ATTAINE D_TECHNI CAL_SCO RE}	{ATTAINE D_TECHNI CAL_SCO RE}	{ATTAINE D_TECHNI CAL_SCO RE}

S/n	Criteria & Sub – Criteria Description	Point s %	Evalu ator	CONSULT ANT_NAM E}	{CONSUL TANT_NA ME}	CONSULT ANT_NAM E}	CONSULT ANT_NAM E}	CONSULT ANT_NAM E}	CONSULT ANT_NAM E}	CONSULT ANT_NAM E}
			EV.-2	x						
			EV.-3	x						
			EV.-4	x						
			EV.-5	x						
	Average score			Avr. X4						
5	Knowledge of the Country	{SCO RE_M ARK}	EV.-1	{ATTAINE D_TECHNI CAL_SCO RE}	{ATTAINE D_TECHNI CAL_SCO RE}	{ATTAINE D_TECHNI CAL_SCO RE}	{ATTAINE D_TECHNI CAL_SCO RE}	{ATTAINE D_TECHNI CAL_SCO RE}	{ATTAINE D_TECHNI CAL_SCO RE}	{ATTAINE D_TECHNI CAL_SCO RE}
			EV.-2	x						
			EV.-3	x						
			EV.-4	x						
			EV.-5	x						
				Avr. X5						
	Average score									
6	Participation by Tanzania nationals among	{SCO RE_M ARK}	EV.-1	{ATTAINE D_TECHNI CAL_SCO RE}	{ATTAINE D_TECHNI CAL_SCO RE}	{ATTAINE D_TECHNI CAL_SCO RE}	{ATTAINE D_TECHNI CAL_SCO RE}	{ATTAINE D_TECHNI CAL_SCO RE}	{ATTAINE D_TECHNI CAL_SCO RE}	{ATTAINE D_TECHNI CAL_SCO RE}

S/n	Criteria & Sub – Criteria Description	<u>Point</u> <u>s</u> <u>%</u>	Evalu ator	CONSULT ANT_NAM E}	{CONSUL TANT_NA ME}	CONSULT ANT_NAM E}	CONSULT ANT_NAM E}	CONSULT ANT_NAM E}	CONSULT ANT_NAM E}	CONSULT ANT_NAM E}
	<i>proposed key staff</i>		EV.-2	x						
			EV.-3	x						
			EV.-4	x						
			EV.-5	x						
				Avr. X6						
	Average score									
7	Local Firm Participation	{SCO RE_M ARK}	EV.-1	{ATTAINE D_TECHNI CAL_SCO RE}	{ATTAINE D_TECHNI CAL_SCO RE}	{ATTAINE D_TECHNI CAL_SCO RE}	{ATTAINE D_TECHNI CAL_SCO RE}	{ATTAINE D_TECHNI CAL_SCO RE}	{ATTAINE D_TECHNI CAL_SCO RE}	{ATTAINE D_TECHNI CAL_SCO RE}
			EV.-2	x						
			EV.-3	x						
			EV.-4	x						
			EV.-5	x						
Average score				Avr. X7						
Total points for the four criteria:		100		Avr(X1+..X 7)						

2. SECTION III. FINANCIAL EVALUATION REPORT - AWARD RECOMMENDATION

2.1. Technical Aspect

After technical evaluation was complete, the proposal that was responsive to the Request for Proposal and met the minimum pass mark and was notified for opening date and time of financial proposal for Proposal No: {PROPOSAL_NUMBER} for {PROPOSAL_DESCRIPTION}.

The list of consultants who passed minimum technical pass mark is shown in Table 8: List of consultant who passed minimum technical score.

2.2. Financial Aspect

The financial proposals for consultant(s) who passed minimum technical score was opened on {FINANCIAL_PROPOSAL_OPENING_DATE} at {FINANCIAL_PROPOSAL_OPENING_TIME} hours local time.

Minutes of the financial proposals opening is available in a Submodule for Proposal Opening Report at Proposals Closing Today | NeST - National e-Procurement System of Tanzania.

From the financial proposal, the opening report showed total amounts covering staff remuneration, reimbursable, and VAT as shown in Table 9. (Summary of Cost by Activity) per respective consultant.

Table 9: Summary of Cost by Activity**FINANCIAL OPENING REPORT**

SN	Consultant Name	Physical Address	Technical Proposal Result (Score %)	Submission Currency	Financial Opening Details					Total Proposal discounted Price with VAT
					Remuneration without VAT	Reimbursable without VAT	Un conditional discount amount	Total without VAT	VAT	
(a)	(b)	(c)	(d)	(e)	(f)	(g)		(i)	(j)	(k)
1										
2										
3										
4										
5										
6										
7										

Minimum Technical Pass mark score set by procuring entity {MINIMUM_PASSMARK}

3 SECTION IV. FINANCIAL EVALUATION REPORT – AWARD

RECOMMENDATION - FORMS

This part has three main forms that provide details of Evaluation Report Form IIIA: for Financial Evaluation - Basic Data; Form IIIB: for Currency Conversion – Evaluated Prices and Form IIIC: Section Procedure Combined Technical and Financial Evaluation - Award Recommendation.

3.6 Basic Data

Details of Technical Evaluation - Basic Data is shown in Form IIA.

3.7 Form IIIA: Financial Evaluation Basic Data

3.7.1 Financial Proposal Opening	{ACTUAL_PROPOSAL_ OPENING_DATE} at	{ACTUAL_PROPOSAL_OPENING _TIME} Hours Local Time
3.7.2 Names and proposal prices	Currency(ies)	Proposal value
{CONSULTANT_NAM E}	{SUBMISSIO_CURREN CY}	{PROPOSAL_SUBMISSION_AMO UNT}
{CONSULTANT_NAM E}	{SUBMISSIO_CURREN CY}	{PROPOSAL_SUBMISSION_AMO UNT}
{CONSULTANT_NAM E}	{SUBMISSIO_CURREN CY}	{PROPOSAL_SUBMISSION_AMO UNT}
{CONSULTANT_NAM E}	{SUBMISSIO_CURREN CY}	{PROPOSAL_SUBMISSION_AMO UNT}
{CONSULTANT_NAM E}	{SUBMISSIO_CURREN CY}	{PROPOSAL_SUBMISSION_AMO UNT}
{CONSULTANT_NAM E}	{SUBMISSIO_CURREN CY}	{PROPOSAL_SUBMISSION_AMO UNT}
3.7.3 Evaluation committee	Position	Institution/organization

(a) Chairperson	{EVALUATION_CHAIRPERSON}		
(b) Member 1	{EVALUATION_COMMITTEE_MEMBER}		
(c) Member 2	{EVALUATION_COMMITTEE_MEMBER}		
(d) Member 3	{EVALUATION_COMMITTEE_MEMBER}		
(e) Member 4	{EVALUATION_COMMITTEE_MEMBER}		
3.7.4 Methodology (formula) for evaluation of cost {SELECTION_METHOD}			
(a) Weight Technical	T=Technical	{WEIGHT_TECHNICAL}	
(b) Weight Financial	F= financial	{WEIGHT_FINANCIAL}	
(c) Other: Sf=100xFm/F Where: Sf=Financial Score, Fm=Lowest Price and F= Price on the proposal under consideration			
3.7.5 Submission of final technical/financial evaluation report to approving organ		{FINANCIAL_EVALUATION_SUBMISSION_DATE}	
3.7.6 {SELECTION_METHOD}			
(a) Technical, financial and final scores Based: on selection method			
Consultants Name	Technical Score	Financial Score	Final Scores
{CONSULTANT_NAME}	{TECHNICAL_SCORE}	{FINANCIAL_SCORE}	{TOTAL_SCORE}
{CONSULTANT_NAME}	{TECHNICAL_SCORE}	{FINANCIAL_SCORE}	{TOTAL_SCORE}

{CONSULTANT_NAME}	{TECHNICAL_SCORE}	{FINANCIAL_SCORE}	{TOTAL_SCORE}
{CONSULTANT_NAME}	{TECHNICAL_SCORE}	{FINANCIAL_SCORE}	{TOTAL_SCORE}
{CONSULTANT_NAME}	{TECHNICAL_SCORE}	{FINANCIAL_SCORE}	{TOTAL_SCORE}
{CONSULTANT_NAME}	{TECHNICAL_SCORE}	{FINANCIAL_SCORE}	{TOTAL_SCORE}
(b) Award recommendation		{WINNING_CONSULTANT_NAME}	

Form IIIB: Adjustments – Currency Conversion – Evaluated Prices

In evaluating financial proposal only costs elements of remuneration for key and non-key experts, and reimbursable expenses were taken into account. This did not include proposed element of taxes. The technical evaluation committee reviewed evaluated technical proposal along with financial proposal to verify whether ALL elements of key activity in technical proposal were aligned with all costs associated for the assignments. The evaluation team proceeded assessing and observing if total time inputs quoted in financial proposal tallied with that shown in technical proposal for each key activities assigned to each key expert. In addition, assessment was done to verify if there was any payment modality requiring more than one foreign currency. Besides, any erroneous omissions of items included in the technical proposals but not quoted in financial activities that could results to adjustments. Form IIIB-1: Adjustments shows review of task activities and time inputs based on submitted proposal.

Examination of proposal price as recorded in priced schedule/cost tables was further scrutinized to see if it had any proposed unconditional discount for all key activities based on time input as required. The outcome of this is shown in Form IIIB-2:

Form IIIB-1: Consultant Responses to Key Deliverables as shown in Technical Proposal

Task Description (Indicative Timing & Key Deliverables) as per RFP		Time in RFP	Deliverable Responses as per assignment					
			Consultant No.1	Consultant No.2	Consultant No.3	Consultant No.4	Consultant No.5	Consultant No.6
{KEY_DELIVERABLE} (Inception Report)	Contract Commencement + Time required							
{KEY_DELIVERABLE} - 1	Contract Commencement + Time required							
{KEY_DELIVERABLE} - 2	Contract Commencement + Time required							
{KEY_DELIVERABLE} -3	Contract Commencement + Time required							
.								
.								
{KEY_DELIVERABLE} (Final Report)	Contract Commencement + Time required							

Total Time inputs in Technical Proposal								
Total Time input in Financial Proposal								
Difference Staff Time Inputs								

Form IIIB-2: Form IIIB-2: Adjustments – Currency Conversion – Evaluated Prices

Consultant Details		Submitted and Opened Proposal Price		Adjustments and Discount				Discounted Proposal Price
Sn	Consultant Name	Currency (ies)	Submitted Proposal Price without VAT and Discount	Adjustment	Total Adjusted Amount	Unconditional Discounts (%)	Discount Amount (%)	
(a)	(b)	(c)	(d)	(e)	(f)=(d)+ (e)	(g)	(h)=(d)	(g) =(d)-(f)
1	{CONSULTANT_NAME}							
2	{CONSULTANT_NAME}							
3	{CONSULTANT_NAME}							
.								
n th	{CONSULTANT_NAME} - n th							

3.8 Exchange rate

The exchange rate on the date of proposal invitation was used to convert the proposal currencies into single evaluation currency, that is Tanzania shillings (TZS). The Bank of Tanzania (BOT) was used as authority or publication to specify exchange rate, using the selling rate on the date of letter of invitation.

Table 10: Exchange Rates

Currency Used for Proposal Evaluation:	Tanzania Shillings (TZS)	
Effective Date of Exchange Rate:	{PROPOSAL_INVITATION_DATE}	
Authority or Publication Specified for Exchange Rate:	Bank of Tanzania	
Effective Rate of Exchange:	Tshs. {BOT_EXCHANGE_RATE}	
Consultant Name	Submission Currency	Rate
Consultant No. 1	USD	2300
Consultant No. 2	TZS	1
Consultant No. 3	GBP	2700.20
....		
Consultant No. n th	YEN	60

Copy of exchange rates provided by Bank of Tanzania is provided in the link www.bot.go.tz

3.9 Conversion of currency for the proposal price submitted.

Proposal price from the discounted price in Form IIIB-2 was converted into Tanzania shillings (TZS). Table 13 shows the outcome of currency conversion to a single currency for price comparison for responsive consultants and calculated its financial score.

**Form IIIB-3: Adjustments – Currency Conversion – Evaluated Prices
for QCBS**

Consultant Details		Discounted Proposal Price		Applicable Exchange Rate(s)		Evaluated Proposal Price	Financial Scored $S_f = 100 \times F_m / F$
Sn	Consultant Name	Currency	Price without VAT	Currency (ies)	Applicable Rate		
(a)	(b)	(c)	(d)	(e)	(f)	(g) = (d) x (f)	
1	{CONSULTANT_NAME}						
2	{CONSULTANT_NAME}						
3	{CONSULTANT_NAME}						
.							
n th	{CONSULTANT_NAME} - n th						

CURRENTLY PARA 4.3 – 4.4 has to be incorporated in the system and effect the evaluation report to proceed as follows

3.10 Conversion of currency for proposal price submitted based on payment composition;

Condition statement (This will be triggered during submission - if Consultant proposes different currencies for payment composition) Proposal price of the responsive proposal from evaluated proposal price in Table 10 was converted into Tanzania shillings (TZS). Table 10-1 shows the outcome of currency conversion to single currency after incorporating payment composition made by consultant for price comparison of responsive Consultant. Otherwise, NO Consultant had proposed different payment composition, thus, this Table 10-1 had not been used.

Form IIIB-4: **Currency Conversion Payment Composition (Single Currency)**

Lot # {LOT_NUMBER} for {LOT_DESCRIPTION}

Consultant Details		Evaluated Consultant Price		Payment Composition			Applicable Exchange Rate used by consultant			Exchange Rate for Evaluation	Evaluated Consultant Price and Ranking		
S n	Consultant Name	Currency (ies)	Evaluated Price without VAT	Currency of Payment	Perce nt of Total Propo sal	Amoun t in Evalua tion Curren cy	Currency (ies)	Applicable Rate	Amou nt in Curren cy of Payme nt		Propo sal Price	Total	Ra nk
(a)	(b)	(c)	(d)	(e)	(f)	(g)=(d) x(f)	(h)	(i)	(j)=(g)/(i)	(k)	(l)=(j)x(k)	(m)	(n)
1	{CONSULTANT _NAME}	TZ S	200,000,0 00.00	TZ S	45%	90,000, 000	TZ S	1.00	90,000, 000	1.00	90,000, 000	206,600 ,000	
				US D	30%	60,000, 000	US D	2,500 .00	24,000	2,400 .00	57,600, 000		

				ZA R	25%	50,000, 000	ZA R	100.0 0	500,00 0	118.0 0	59,000, 000		
...													
n ^t _h	{CONSULTANT _NAME} - n th												

3.11 NATIONAL PREFERENCE

- (i) In all consultancy works to be conducted by foreign firms, the procuring entity shall ensure the inclusion of local experts and local firms in those works.
- (ii) The procuring entity shall include in the Proposal documents the requirement for the inclusion of local experts or local firms in the consultancy works.
- (iii) If a foreign firm enters into a joint venture with a local firm, the local firm shall have paid-up capital that is wholly owned by citizens of the United Republic,
- (iv) a foreign firm awarded a consultancy contract shall ensure that not less than 50% of the required experts or key personnel needed to implement the work are Tanzanians, except where evidence of unavailability of the required expertise in the country is provided.
- (v) A foreign firm performing a consultancy contract shall be required to employ supporting staff as specified in the Proposal documents, who shall be Tanzanians.
- (vi) If a local staff or expert employed in the consultancy work has been substituted for any reason, a local expert shall fill their position.
- (vii) In a consultancy contract between the procuring entity and a foreign consultant who has entered into a joint venture with a local firm, the allocation of financial resources to the participating local company shall not be less than 50% of the total contract price.
- (viii) Any joint venture contract or sub-contract entered into between a foreign firm and a local firm shall be part of the procurement contract to be entered between the procuring entity and the foreign consultant.
- (ix) The calculation of the highest weight of the financial Proposal scores shall follow the following requirements:
 - (a) From the weight allocated for the calculation of the financial Proposal scores, 5% shall be set aside to measure the ratio of cost and financial allocation between the foreign consultant and the local consultant;
 - (b) If in the JVCA or subcontract, 50% of the financial Proposal indicates to be undertaken to the local consultant company, all the 5% allocated marks shall be awarded;

- (c) If the funds allocated for the local consultant the JVCA or subcontract is less than 50% of the financial Proposal, the 5% marks set aside under the provisions of paragraph (a) shall not be awarded in full, but shall be awarded proportionately to the percentage of funds allocated to the local company compared to 50%, and the relevant ratio shall be multiplied by 5% to obtain the marks to be added to the overall weight of the financial Proposal score;
- (d) the calculation of the weight of the financial Proposal in comparison to the financial Proposal ratio of other Consultants, shall take into account the specified weight limit of the financial Proposal minus the 5% of the provisions of paragraph (a);and
- (e) the highest score of the financial Proposal that will be awarded to the successful Consultant is the total of the marks obtained from the 5% as per the provisions of paragraph (a) added to the marks obtained under the provisions of paragraph (d), or the marks of paragraph (d) added to the marks calculated using the provisions of paragraph (c).
- (x) Areas of preference for evaluation includes;
 - (i) National Preference
 - (ii) Exclusive preference
 - (iii) Regional exclusive preference
 - (iv) Subcontracting preference
 - (v) JVCA preference
 - (vi) Exclusive Preference to special groups
 - (vii) Preference to local communities
 - (viii) Capacity building of local firms

3.11.1 National Preference for Consultancy Services

In case of Donor funded projects - Condition statement (This will be triggered when Procuring Entity states National Preference is Applicable)

In a situation where margin of preference is included, the financial proposals of the successful consultancy firms in the technical evaluation shall be opened and reviewed and the proposals, which are responsive, shall be classified into the following groups:

- (a) Group A: financial proposals offered by national consultants as well as association between national consultants eligible for the preference;
- (b) Group B: financial proposals submitted by associations between national and foreign consultants, eligible for the preference; and
- (c) Group C: financial proposals offered by foreign consultants;

3.11.2 The applicable preference scheme.

The procuring entity allowed a margin of preference in accordance with PPA CAP 410 as per table 10.

Table 10 : Domestic Preference for Works and Services

S/N	Consultant Name	Applicable preference Group	Applicable margin of preference
		 Applicable for preference in works te	
1	Consultant 1	GROUP A	10%
2	Consultant 2	GROUP B1	10%
3	Consultant 3	GROUP B2	8%
4	Consultant 4	GROUP C	0%

The Consultant was assessed to determine whether qualified for national preference based on the following category: Group A: financial proposals offered by national consultants as well as association between national consultants eligible for the preference; Group B (Describe B1 and B2): financial proposals submitted by associations between national and foreign consultants, eligible for the preference; and Group C: financial proposals offered by foreign consultants. Table 11 shows the outcome of application of Marginal Preference by respective consultant for price comparison.

Table 11: Margin of Preference for Consultancy Services
DETAILS of Proposal # {PROPOSAL_NUMBER} for {PROPOSAL_DESCRIPTION}

Consultant Details		Evaluated Proposal Price		Preference Details				Applicable Margin of Preference		Evaluated Proposal Price and Ranking	
S n	Consultant Name	Currency (ies)	Price without VAT	Preference Group	Exclusion for Preference	Revised amount Total	Preference %	Different between margin of group A be added to	Preference Amount	Total Proposal Price	Financial Ranking
(a)	(b)	(c)	(d)	(e)	(f)	(g)=(d) - (f)	(h)	(i) = (10 %- Mp)	(i)=(h)*(g)	(j)=(d)-(i)	(k)
1	Consultant - 1	TZ S	20,000,000.00	Group A	20,000,000.00	-	10 %	0%	-	20,000,000.00	1
3	Consultant - 3	TZ S	20,000,000.00	Group B2	18,000,000.00	2,000,000.00	10 %	0%	-	20,000,000.00	2

2	Consultant - 2	TZ S	20,000,000.00	Group B1	14,000,000.00	6,000,000.00	8%	2%	120,000.00	20,120,000.00	3
4	Consultant - 4	TZ S	20,000,000.00	Group C	-	20,000,000.00	0%	10%	2,000,000.00	22,000,000.00	4
.											
n ^t _h	Consultant – nth										

Note: Domestic Preference applicability is on the items that are not supplied from Tanzania (Country of Origin of each item in the Priced schedule)

3.11.3 Preference Scheme for Foreign Firm Subcontracting to Local Firm

Condition statement (This will be triggered when Procuring Entity states local subcontractors Domestic Preference is Applicable)

In case a group C has offered to subcontract a local contractors may qualify for margin of preference in the following manner.

Preference of up to 6% shall be provided to **FOREIGN CONTRACTING** and consultants who sub-contract local firms in the following margins:

No.	Percentage of sub-contracting	Limit of preference
1.	Subcontract of 23 percent to 30 percent of the total project cost	6%
2.	Subcontract of 16 percent to 22 percent of the total project cost	4%
3.	Subcontract of 10 percent to 15 percent of the total project cost	2%
4.	Subcontract of 5 percent to 9 percent of the total project cost	1%

Table 12: Preference Scheme for Foreign Firm Subcontracting to Local Firm

DETAILS of Proposal # {PROPOSAL_NUMBER} for {PROPOSAL_DESCRIPTION}

Consultant Details		Evaluated Proposal Price		Preference Details				Applicable Domestic Preference Rate		Evaluated Proposal Price and Ranking	
S n	Consultant Name	Currency (ies)	Price without VAT	Domestic Preference Group	Exclusion for Preference	Revised Total	Preference %	Different between margin of around	Preference Amount	Total Proposal Price	Rank
(a)	(b)	(c)	(d)	(e)	(f)	(g)=(d) - (f)	(h)	(i) = (0 % - Mp)	(i)=(h)*(g)	(j)=(d)+(i)	(k)
1	Consultant - 1	TZ S	20,000,000.00	Group A	20,000,000.00	-	10 %	0%	-	20,000,000.00	5
2	Consultant - 2	TZ S	20,000,000.00	Group B1 (30%)	14,000,000.00	6,000,000.00	8%	2%	120,000.00	20,120,000.00	7

3	Consultant - 3	TZ S	20,000,000.00	Group B2 (10%)	18,000,000.00	2,000,000.00	10%	0%	-	20,000,000.00	5
4	Consultant - 3	TZ S	20,000,000.00	Group C	-	20,000,000.00	0%	10%	2,000,000.00	22,000,000.00	8
4	Consultant - 4	TZ S	18,000,000.00	Group C (9%) SUB	16,380,000.00	1,620,000.00	1%	-1%	-16,200.00	17,983,800.00	2
5	Consultant - 5	TZ S	18,200,000.00	Group C (30%) SUB	12,740,000.00	5,460,000.00	6%	-6%	-327,600.00	17,872,400.00	1
6	Consultant - 6	TZ S	18,300,000.00	Group C (22%) SUB	16,104,000.00	2,196,000.00	4%	-4%	-87,840.00	18,212,160.00	3
7	Consultant - 7	TZ S	19,000,000.00	Group C (15%) SUB	16,150,000.00	2,850,000.00	2%	-2%	-57,000.00	18,943,000.00	4

3.11.4 PROCEDURE FOR CALCULATION FINANCIAL SCORE FOR CONSULTANCY

Table 13: Calculation of Financial Score Based on the financial proposal assigned to local firm

		financial proposal, TZS	% financ es going to Local firm	Financ ial Weight	Fixed Financ ial Weight	Variabl e Financ ial Weight	Proporti on of Variable Weight	Calculat ed Financi al Weight	Calculat ed Financia l Score, F _s
Consultant		a	b	c	d= c- 5% of c	e	g	h=d+g	i=(a _{min} /a) xh
	Group						if b>= 50%, e=5% of FW; if b<50%, g= e *b/50%		
Consultant - 1	Group A	20,000,000.00	100%	25	23.75	1.25	1.25	25	22.34
Consultant - 2	Group B1 (30%)	20,120,000.00	70%	25	23.75	1.25	1.25	25	22.21

Consultant - 3	Group B2 (10%)	20,000,000.00	90%	25	23.75	1.25	1.25	25	22.34
Consultant - 4	Group C (9%) SUB	17,983,800.00	9%	25	23.75	1.25	0.225	23.975	23.83
Consultant - 5	Group C (30%) SUB	17,872,400.00	30%	25	23.75	1.25	0.75	24.5	24.50
Consultant - 6	Group C (22%) SUB	18,212,160.00	22%	25	23.75	1.25	0.55	24.3	23.85
Consultant - 7	Group C (15%) SUB	18,943,000.00	15%	25	23.75	1.25	0.375	24.125	22.76

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

Consultants' names	Technical Evaluation			Financial Evaluation		Combined Evaluation	
	Technical scores	Weighted scores	Technical rank	Financial scores	Weighted scores	Scores	
	S(t)	S(t) * T ¹		S(f)	S(f) * F ²	S(t) T + S(f) F	Rank

1 From RFP Weight of Technical Score, T= 0.8

2 From RFP Weight of Financial Score, F= 0.2

{CONSULTANT_NAME}	95.00	76.00	1	64.77	12.95	88.95	1
{CONSULTANT_NAME}	84.94	67.95	2	23.37	4.67	72.63	5
{CONSULTANT_NAME}	75.26	60.21	6	36.10	7.22	67.43	6
...	83.00	66.40	4	83.12	16.62	83.02	3
....	84.86	67.89	3	100.00	20.00	87.89	2
{CONSULTANT_NAME} - nth	82.69	66.15	5	61.84	12.37	78.52	4
Award recommendation	To highest combined technical/financial score.						
	Consultant's name: {WINNING_CONSULTANT}						

3.11.6 Form IVC. FBS— Fixed-Budget – Award Recommendation

Consultants' names		Technical Evaluation		
		Technical scores	Evaluated Prices	Technical rank
		S(t)		
{CONSULTANT_NAME}		95.00	345,000,000.00	1
{CONSULTANT_NAME}		84.94	300,000,000.00	2
{CONSULTANT_NAME}		75.26	250,000,000.00	Failed
...		83.00	280,000,000.00	4
....		84.86	300,000,000.00	3
{CONSULTANT_NAME} - n th		82.69	270,000,000.00	5
Award recommendation	To highest technical score			
	Consultant's name: {WINNING_CONSULTANT}			

Assume budget is TZS 350,000,000.00

And Minimum score is 80%

3.11.7 Form IVC. LCS—Least-Cost Selection – Award Recommendation

Consultants' names		Technical Evaluation		
		Technical scores	Evaluated Prices	Technical rank
		S(t)		
{CONSULTANT_NAME}		95.00	340,000,000.00	5
{CONSULTANT_NAME}		84.94	300,000,000.00	4
{CONSULTANT_NAME}		75.26	250,000,000.00	Failed
...		83.00	280,000,000.00	2
....		84.86	300,000,000.00	3
{CONSULTANT_NAME} - n th		82.69	270,000,000.00	1
Award recommendation	To Lowest evaluated financial price			
	Consultant's name: {WINNING_CONSULTANT}			

Assume budget is TZS 270,000,000.00

In addition, Minimum score is 80%

1.1.1 Form IVC. QBS— Quality Based Selection – Award Recommendation

Consultants' names		Technical Evaluation		
		Technical scores	Evaluated Prices	Technical rank
		S(t)		
{CONSULTANT_NAME}		95.00	345,000,000.00	1
{CONSULTANT_NAME}		84.94	N/A	N/A
{CONSULTANT_NAME}		75.26	N/A	N/A
...		83.00	N/A	N/A
....		84.86	N/A	N/A
{CONSULTANT_NAME} - n th		82.69	N/A	N/A
Award recommendation	To highest technical score			
	Consultant's name: {WINNING_CONSULTANT}			

The undersigned are the members of the Technical Proposal Evaluation Committee who were appointed as listed under paragraph 1.3 and hereby submit this technical evaluation report.

Sn	Full Names	Position	Member Signature and date
1.			
2.			
3.			
4.			
5.			

1.2 Submission of Evaluation Report

This report has been prepared by the TEC after successful evaluation on {EVALUATION_REPORT_SUBMISSION_DATE} at {EVALUATION_REPORT_SUBMISSION_TIME} hours local time.

{CHAIRPERSON_EVALUATION_COMMITTEE_SIGNATURE}
CHAIRPERSON EVALUATION COMMITTEE

2.0 APPENDICES

The following Appendixes has been used during detailed evaluation of Technical Proposal(s):

Appendix I. Individual Evaluations Commercial Responsiveness

Appendix II. Individual Evaluations Technical Responsiveness

Appendix III. Individual Evaluations - Qualifications of Key Personnel's:

Appendix IV: Information Data Monitoring

Appendix V. Other information on miscellaneous documents that form evidences

2.1 Preliminary Examination [Commercial Responsiveness]

Appendix I. Individual Evaluations Commercial Responsiveness

2.1.1 Summary Outcome of Preliminary Examination [Commercial Responsiveness]

The outcome of each Proposal on commercial criteria is shown in Table 7A: for Preliminary Examination [Commercial Responsiveness]

Table 7A: Preliminary Examination [Commercial Responsiveness]

Sn	Consultant Name	Evaluator Name	Eligibility	Standard Proposal Forms	Proposal Security	Financial Situation and Performance	Reason for non-responsiveness	Substantial commercial responsiveness	Recommendation for second stage
1.	CONSULTANT	EV No. 1	Not Comply					YES	System over all criteria Score
		EV No. 2	Not Comply					YES*	
		EV No. 3	Comply					YES	
		Nth							
		General Justification by Chairperson							
2.									
N th									

RESULTS FOR INDIVIDUAL CRITERIA EVALUATION

2.1.2 Eligibility

(1) Litigation History (Eligibility Criteria) Every Evaluation Criteria must display corresponding evaluation stage)

Name of Consultant 1: {CONSULTANT_NAME}

(i) Litigation History	PROCURING ENTITY DETAILS		
	PE Requirement	Litigation start year	Litigation end year
	Data		
	CONSULTANT SUBMISSION DETAILS		
	Data Submission		
EV No. 1	EVALUATORS DETAILS		
	Data Evaluation score		
	Data Evaluation justification		
EV No. 2	Data Evaluation score		
	Data Evaluation justification		
EV No. 3	Data Evaluation score		
	Data Evaluation justification		
EV No. 4	Data Evaluation score		
	Data Evaluation justification		
EV No. 5	Data Evaluation score		

	Data Evaluation justification		
--	-------------------------------	--	--

Name of Consultant 2: {CONSULTANT_NAME}

b(i) Litigation History	PROCURING ENTITY DETAILS		
	PE Requirement	Litigation start year	Litigation end year
	Data		
	CONSULTANT SUBMISSION DETAILS		
	Data Submission		
EV No. 1	EVALUATORS DETAILS		
	Data Evaluation score		
	Data Evaluation justification		
EV No. 2	Data Evaluation score		
	Data Evaluation justification		
EV No. 3	Data Evaluation score		
	Data Evaluation justification		
EV No. 4	Data Evaluation score		
	Data Evaluation justification		
EV No. 5	Data Evaluation score		
	Data Evaluation justification		

Please display this financial table below be populated in the report

Financial Statement Start Date	Financial Statement End Date	Minimum Current Ratio [Current Assets(CA)/Current Liabilities(CL)]	Minimum Gross Profit Margin [Gross Profit(GP)/Total Revenue(TR)*100]	Minimum Debt to Equity Ratio [Total Liabilities(TL)/Total Equity(TE)]	Minimum Return on Assets [Profit before Tax(PBT)/Total Assets(TA)*100]	Minimum Cash Ratio [Cash and Bank(C&B)/Current Liabilities(CL)]
2021-01-01	2023-12-31	1	10	1	5	1

(1) Power of Attorney very Evaluation Criteria must display corresponding evaluation stage)	PROCURING ENTITY DETAILS		
	PE Requirement	Litigation start year	Litigation end year
	Data		
	CONSULTANT SUBMISSION DETAILS		
	Data Submission		
EV No. 1	EVALUATORS DETAILS		
	Data Evaluation score		
	Data Evaluation justification		
EV No. 2	Data Evaluation score		
	Data Evaluation justification		
EV No. 3	Data Evaluation score		
	Data Evaluation justification		
EV No. 4	Data Evaluation score		
	Data Evaluation justification		
EV No. 5	Data Evaluation score		
	Data Evaluation justification		

2.2 Appendix II: Individual Evaluations Technical Criteria

Consultant's name: {CONSULTANT_NAME}

S/n	Criteria & Sub – Criteria Description	<u>Points</u> %	Evaluator 1	Evaluator 2	Evaluator 3	Evaluator 4	Evaluator 5	Total Average
1	General Experience of the Consultant (as a firm) relevant to the Assignment	{SCORE_MARK}	{ATTAINED_TECHNICAL_SCORE}	{ATTAINED_TECHNICAL_SCORE}	{ATTAINED_TECHNICAL_SCORE}	{ATTAINED_TECHNICAL_SCORE}	{ATTAINED_TECHNICAL_SCORE}	{ATTAINED_TECHNICAL_SCORE}
	{SUBCRITERA SCORE}	{SCORE_MARK}	X ₁	X ₂	X ₃	X ₄	X ₅	Avg (X ₁ +.. X ₅)
	{SUBCRITERA SCORE}	{SCORE_MARK}						
								
	{SUBCRITERA SCORE}	{SCORE_MARK}						
2	Understanding of the Terms of Reference, Methodology and Proposal Quality of the Assignment including work plan in responding to the TORs	{SCORE_MARK}	{ATTAINED_TECHNICAL_SCORE}	{ATTAINED_TECHNICAL_SCORE}	{ATTAINED_TECHNICAL_SCORE}	{ATTAINED_TECHNICAL_SCORE}	{ATTAINED_TECHNICAL_SCORE}	{ATTAINED_TECHNICAL_SCORE}

	{SUBCRITERA SCORE}							
	{SUBCRITERA SCORE}							
								
	{SUBCRITERA SCORE}							
3	Qualifications of Key Personnel's qualifications and competence for the Assignment:	{SCORE_MARK}	{ATTAINED TECHNICAL SCORE}	{ATTAINED TECHNICAL SCORE}	{ATTAINED TECHNICAL SCORE}	{ATTAINED TECHNICAL SCORE}	{ATTAINED TECHNICAL SCORE}	{ATTAINED TECHNICAL SCORE}
	From Appendix II Team Leader {NAME_PROPOSED}							
	{NAME_PROPOSED}} Key Expert -2							
								
	{NAME_PROPOSED} Key Expert n th							
4	Transfer of knowledge (training) program	{SCORE_MARK}	{ATTAINED TECHNICAL SCORE}	{ATTAINED TECHNICAL SCORE}	{ATTAINED TECHNICAL SCORE}	{ATTAINED TECHNICAL SCORE}	{ATTAINED TECHNICAL SCORE}	{ATTAINED TECHNICAL SCORE}

			CAL_SCO RE}	CAL_SCO RE}	CAL_SCO RE}	CAL_SCO RE}	CAL_SCO RE}	CAL_SCO RE}
	{SUBCRITERA SCORE}							
	{SUBCRITERA SCORE}							
								
	{SUBCRITERA SCORE}							
5	Knowledge of the Country	{SCORE_MARK}	{ATTAINE D_TECHNI CAL_SCO RE}	{ATTAINE D_TECHNI CAL_SCO RE}	{ATTAINE D_TECHNI CAL_SCO RE}	{ATTAINE D_TECHNI CAL_SCO RE}	{ATTAINE D_TECHNI CAL_SCO RE}	{ATTAINE D_TECHNI CAL_SCO RE}
	{SUBCRITERA SCORE}							
	{SUBCRITERA SCORE}							
								
	{SUBCRITERA SCORE}							
6	<i>Participation by Tanzania nationals</i>	{SCORE_MARK}	{ATTAINE D_TECHNI	{ATTAINE D_TECHNI	{ATTAINE D_TECHNI	{ATTAINE D_TECHNI	{ATTAINE D_TECHNI	{ATTAINE D_TECHNI

	<i>among proposed key staff</i>		CAL_SCORE}	CAL_SCORE}	CAL_SCORE}	CAL_SCORE}	CAL_SCORE}	CAL_SCORE}
	{SUBCRITERA SCORE}							
	{SUBCRITERA SCORE}							
								
	{SUBCRITERA SCORE}							
7	Local Firm Participation	{SCORE_MARK}	{ATTAINED_TECHNICAL_SCORE}	{ATTAINED_TECHNICAL_SCORE}	{ATTAINED_TECHNICAL_SCORE}	{ATTAINED_TECHNICAL_SCORE}	{ATTAINED_TECHNICAL_SCORE}	{ATTAINED_TECHNICAL_SCORE}
	{SUBCRITERA SCORE}							
	{SUBCRITERA SCORE}							
								
	{SUBCRITERA SCORE}							
Total points for the four criteria:		100						

Proposals that score below the minimum qualifying score of **{TECHNICAL_SCORE_PASS_MARK}** % pass marks to be rejected.

This should proceed for all Consultants who submitted their proposals

2.3 Appendix III: Individual Evaluations - Qualifications of Key Personnel's and competence for the Assignment:

S/n	Criteria & Sub – Criteria Description	<u>Points</u> %	Evaluator 1	Evaluator 2	Evaluator 3	Evaluator 4	Evaluator 5	Total Avg Score
1	Team Leader {NAME_PROPOSED}	{SCORE_MARK}	{ATTAINE D_TECHNI CAL_SCO RE}	{ATTAINE D_TECHNI CAL_SCO RE}	{ATTAINE D_TECHNI CAL_SCO RE}	{ATTAINE D_TECHNI CAL_SCO RE}	{ATTAINE D_TECHNI CAL_SCO RE}	{ATTAINE D_TECHNI CAL_SCO RE}
	General Qualification	{SCORE_MARK}	X ₁	X ₂	X ₃	X ₄	X ₅	Avg (X ₁ +.. X ₅)
	{Adequacy for the Assignment	{SCORE_MARK}						
	Relevant experience in the Region	{SCORE_MARK}						
2	{PROSED_POSITION} {NAME_PROPOSED} Key Expert - 1	{SCORE_MARK}	{ATTAINE D_TECHNI CAL_SCO RE}	{ATTAINE D_TECHNI CAL_SCO RE}	{ATTAINE D_TECHNI CAL_SCO RE}	{ATTAINE D_TECHNI CAL_SCO RE}	{ATTAINE D_TECHNI CAL_SCO RE}	{ATTAINE D_TECHNI CAL_SCO RE}
	General Qualification							
	{Adequacy for the Assignment							
	Relevant experience in the Region							

3	{PROSED_POSITION} {NAME_PROPOSED} Key Expert - 2	{SCORE_MARK}	{ATTAINED_TECHNICAL_SCORE}	{ATTAINED_TECHNICAL_SCORE}	{ATTAINED_TECHNICAL_SCORE}	{ATTAINED_TECHNICAL_SCORE}	{ATTAINED_TECHNICAL_SCORE}	{ATTAINED_TECHNICAL_SCORE}
	General Qualification							
	{Adequacy for the Assignment}							
	Relevant experience in the Region							
4	{PROSED_POSITION} {NAME_PROPOSED} Key Expert - 3	{SCORE_MARK}	{ATTAINED_TECHNICAL_SCORE}	{ATTAINED_TECHNICAL_SCORE}	{ATTAINED_TECHNICAL_SCORE}	{ATTAINED_TECHNICAL_SCORE}	{ATTAINED_TECHNICAL_SCORE}	{ATTAINED_TECHNICAL_SCORE}
	General Qualification							
	{Adequacy for the Assignment}							
	Relevant experience in the Region							

This should proceed for all Consultants who submitted their proposals

2.4 Appendix IV: Information Data Monitoring

2.4.1 General Procurement Notice	
(a) first issue date	{GPN_DATE}
(b) latest update	{REVISED_GPN_DATE}
2.4.2 Request for Expression of Interest (if conducted, data to display, if not conducted..Not Applicable)	
(a) issue date in NeST	{PRE_QUALIFITATION_INVITATION_DATE}
(b) date of readvertisement	{RE_ADVERTISEMENT_DATE}
2.4.3 Number of firms showed interests in application	{APPLICANT_CONSULTANT_NUMBER} Consultant(s)
2.4.4 Request for Proposal Document	
(a) title	Request for Proposal Document for {PROPOSAL_DESCRIPRION}.
(c) date of Approval	{APPROVAL_DATE}
(d) date of issue Letter of Invitation [LOI]	{INVITATION_DATE}

2.4.5 Amendments to documents, if any	
(a) list all issue dates	{TENDER_MODIFICATION_DATE}
(b) date(s) of amendment approval	{TENDER_MODIFICATION_APPROVAL_DATE}
2.4.6 Date of pre-proposal meeting or site visit (if conducted, data to display, if not conducted. Not Applicable)	
(a) pre-proposal meeting date	{PRE_PROPOSAL_MEETING_DATE}
(b) Site visit date	{SITE_VISIT_DATE}
2.4.7 Proposal submission deadline	
(a) original date, time	{ORIGINAL_DEADLINE_OF_TENDER_SUBMISSION_DATE} at {ORIGINAL_DEADLINE_OF_TENDER_SUBMISSION_TIME} Hours Local Time
(b) extensions, if any	{TENDER_MODIFICATION_DATE_AND_TIME} Hours Local Time
2.4.8 Proposal opening date, time	{ACTUAL_TENDER_OPENING_DATE} at {ACTUAL_TENDER_OPENING_TIME} Hours Local Time

2.4.9 Record of Proposal opening	Available in submodule for Proposal Opening Report at <u>Tenders Closing Today NeST - National e-Procurement System of Tanzania</u>
2.4.10 Number of Proposals submitted	{SUBMITTED_TENDERS_NUMBER} proposals

2.5 Appendix V. Other information on miscellaneous documents that form evidences

Extract of other documents for evaluation {EXTRACT_EVIDENCE_FROM_EVALUATION_TEAM}

**Appendix 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

**Appendix VIII: Personal Covenant for Members of Tender
Boards**

THE PUBLIC PROCUREMENT ACT, Cap. 410

PERSONAL COVENANT

1. 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.

2. Signed by the said this day of
..... 20