Evaluation Practices for Technical Proposals
Consultants Contracts Rating System

Objective

• To provide guidance to Committee Members on Rating System for Evaluation of Technical Proposals in Consultancy Contracts
Evaluation of Technical Proposal

- Technical proposal – an intellectual product
- Evaluation of technical proposal: Not a purely mathematical exercise, but professional judgment of competent evaluators
- Judgment not to be exercised in an arbitrary manner
- Suitable rating system needed

What is Rating System?

- Five general criteria with points assigned and each proposal judged against assigned criteria/sub-criteria given in Request for Proposal Document
- Specific Experience of firms (5 to 10 points)
  (0-10 in May 2004 Guidelines)
- Adequacy of proposed methodology and work plan
What is Rating System?

- (20 to 50 points)
- Qualification and competence of key staff (30 to 60 Points)
- Suitability of transfer of knowledge(0 to 10 points)
- Local Participation (0 to 10 points)
- Total 100 points

Evaluation Committee

- Three to five qualified members
- Exercise highest ethical standard
- Committee to consist of individuals of comparable hierarchical level
- Members to confirm that they: (i) have no conflict of interest; (ii) understand the rating and scoring system; (iii) have been provided with evaluation work-sheet; and (iv) agree on how to evaluate proposals
Evaluation Committee

• Committee to carry out independent evaluation
• Members not to communicate with firms
• Members to reconcile scores in case of large differences before the report is sent as recommendation

Advantages of Rating System

• Shared definition of grades
• Evaluation easier (helpful for less experienced evaluators)
• Binds members to justify grades
• Adds transparency and fairness to evaluation process
Rating Scale for Specific Experience of Firms (5-10 points)

- **Satisfactory (70%)**: relevant experience
- **Good (90%)**: extensive experience
- **Very Good (100%)**: state-of-the-art, world class
- **Poor (40%)**: is to be used rarely

Methodology and Work Plan in Responding to TOR (20-50 points)

- **Poor (40%)**
- **Satisfactory (70%)**
- **Good (90%)**
- **Very Good (100%)**
- Divided into three sub-criteria: (i) Technical approach and methodology; (ii) Work Plan; and (iii) Organization and Staffing
Sub-criteria-Technical Approach and Methodology

- **Poor (40%)**: inappropriate, not tailored
- **Satisfactory (70%)**: standard, not tailored
- **Good (90%)**: Full details, methodology tailored
- **Very Good (100%)**: In addition, Innovative, outstanding knowledge of new solutions

Sub-criteria-Work Plan - Rating

- **Poor (40%)**: omits important task, timing of activities inconsistent
- **Satisfactory (70%)**: all key activities included but not detailed
- **Good (90%)**: Work plan fits TOR, interrelation between activities realistic
- **Very Good (100%)**: In addition, good optimization of resources
Sub-Criteria - Organization and Staffing - Rating

- **Poor (40%)**: Organization Chart sketchy, staffing schedule inconsistent with timing of the output
- **Satisfactory (70%)**: Organization chart complete, detailed definition of duties and responsibilities
- **Good (90%)**: In addition, precise matching of staff skill, not too many short term experts
- **Very Good (100%)**: In addition, members have worked earlier as a team, optimized resources

Qualification and Competence of Proposed Key Staff (30-60 points)

- Key professional staff: Points for qualification and competence to be divided; for example out of 55 points, Team Leader may be given 15 Points and 10 points each for four key experts.
- Each key staff to be judged on three Sub-criteria:
  (i) General qualification.
  (ii) Adequacy for the assignment.
  (iii) Experience in the region and language.
Sub- Criteria-General Qualification (20-30%)

- **Poor (40%)**: less experience than specified or less than 10 years of relevant experience
- **Satisfactory (70%)**: 10 years or more of experience with relevant academic education and training
- **Good (90%)**: More than 15 years substantial part on similar assignment, steady increase in responsibility in the past
- **Very Good (100%)**: More than 20 years of specialist experience, fully up to date in concerned discipline, and other attributes “Good”

Sub-Criteria-Adequacy for Assignment (50-60%)

- **Poor (40%)**: Expert occasionally worked in similar position, junior professional
- **Satisfactory (70%)**: experience fits the assigned position, completed at least one project of similar nature
- **Good (90%)**: In addition, held several similar positions in similar assignment
- **Very Good (100%)**: In addition, qualification and experience exceeds substantially the requirement
Sub-criteria - Experience in Region and Language (10-20%)

- **Poor (40%)** - never or occasionally worked in similar countries and language skills insufficient
- **Satisfactory (70%)** - Worked in similar cultural, administrative environment and has knowledge of one official language of the Bank
- **Good (90%)** - In addition, worked recently in the region, is fluent in more than one official language of the Bank
- **Very Good (100%)** - In addition, has detailed and direct knowledge of country through years of professional work

Criteria - Transfer of Knowledge

Knowledge – Training (0-10 points)

- **Poor** (40%)
- **Satisfactory** (70%)
- **Good** (90%)
- **Very Good** (100%)
- Should be developed on similar lines as in previous criteria/sub-criteria. A good training methodology is specifically tailored to the objective of the program and discussed exhaustively.
Criteria - Local Participation (0-10 points)

- As reflected as nationals among key staff presented by foreign and national firms
- Points to be allocated as a percentage of share of national key staff man-month
- Firm presenting the maximum man-month of national key staff shall score full points, others shall score in proportion
- Scores given by different evaluators for the same proposal should not vary
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DETAILED GUIDANCE