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# How to Use These Forms

1. This Standard Evaluation Form has been prepared by the Kurdistan Region of Iraq – Ministry of Planning, Public Contracting Directorate for use by it’s the Procuring Authorities in the evaluation of proposals, in accordance with the provisions of Public Procurement Regulation no (2) for the year 2016.
2. The evaluation forms contained in this document provide step-by-step procedures for the evaluation of proposals solicited through Quality and Cost Based Selection (QCBS), Least Cost Selection (LCS) process. In all instances, Request for Proposal (RFP) and evaluation procedures described in the Instructions to Consultants (ITC) of the actual RFP used should be followed.
3. The evaluation and the resulting report need not necessarily be lengthy. The forms should invariably accompany the evaluation report, but they may be adapted to suit specific requirements of the RFP. The report should include a number of attachments to explain details of proposals evaluation or to show specific controversial wording or numbers in a proposal. Cross-referencing should be used extensively, as well as references to pertinent clauses in the RFP.
4. Procuring Authority should study these evaluation forms and guide during project preparation, in order to properly assess the managerial and administrative conditions needed for bid evaluation.

##### **The evaluation report includes five sections:**

Section I. A Short Report Summarizing the Findings of the Technical Evaluation;

Section II. Technical Evaluation Report—Forms;

Section III. A Short Report Summarizing the Findings of the Financial Evaluation;

Section IV. Financial Evaluation Report—Forms;

Section V. Annexes:

Annex I. Individual Evaluations;

Annex II. Minutes of the Public Opening of the Financial Proposals;

# Cover Sheet

# Proposals Evaluation Report and Recommendation for Award of Contract

Procuring Authority:

Name of Consultancy Services

Identification Number in Budget Law:

Date of Report Submission:

# Memo of Transmittal

*[Insert short report summarizing the findings of the proposals evaluation report and recommendations to award]*

1. **Head of Evaluation Committee**: \_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_Title: \_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_

Signature: \_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_ Date: \_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_

1. **Evaluation Committee member**: \_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_Title: \_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_

Signature: \_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_ Date: \_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_

1. **Evaluation Committee member**: \_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_Title: \_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_

Signature: \_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_ Date: \_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_

# Section I. Technical Evaluation Report—Text[[1]](#footnote-1)

**1. Background**

Include a brief description, context, scope, and objectives of the services. *[Use about a quarter of a page]*.

**2. The Selection Process (Prior to Technical Evaluation)**

Elaborate on information provided in Form II (A).

Describe briefly the selection process, beginning with the advertising (if required), the establishment of the shortlist, expressions of interest, and withdrawals of firms before proposal submissions. Describe major events that may have affected the timing (delays, complaints from consultants, key correspondence with the Procuring Authority, Request for Proposals (RFP), extension of proposal submission date, and so on)*. [Use about one-half to one page].*

**3. Technical Evaluation**

Describe briefly the meetings and actions taken by the evaluation committee: formation of a technical evaluation team, outside assistance, evaluation guidelines, justification of sub-criteria and associated weightings as indicated in the Standard Request for Proposals; relevant correspondence with the Procuring Authority; and compliance of evaluation with RFP.

Present results of the technical evaluation: scores and the award recommendation. Highlight strengths and weaknesses of each proposal **(most important part of the report).**

(a) Strengths: Experience in very similar projects in Iraq or Kurdistan Region of Iraq; quality of the methodology, proving a clear understanding of the scope of the assignment; strengths of the local partner; and experience of proposed staff in similar assignments.

(b) Weaknesses: as examples to the weakness to particular component of the proposal; lack of experience in the Iraq or Kurdistan Region of Iraq; capacity of the local partner; lack of practical experience in implementation; staff experience and experience of the proposed individual e.g. team leader; lack of performance in previous contracts; issues of conflict of interest,

Comment on individual evaluators’ scores (discrepancies). Items requiring further negotiations

# Section II. Technical Evaluation Report—Forms

## Form II (A). Technical Evaluation - Basic Data

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
| 2.1 **Name of Procuring Authority** **Name of Project** |    |
| 2.2 **Type of assignment (feasibility study, pre-investment, preparation, or implementation), and brief description of sources** |      |
| 2.3 **Method of selection** | Quality Cost Based Selection (QCBS) \_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_Least-Cost (LCS) \_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_Qualifications (CQS) \_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_Single-Source (SSS) \_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_ |
| 2.4 **Request for expressions of interest:**1. **publication in *United Nations Development Business* (UNDB-online) and dgMarket as well as on e-portal**
2. **publication in national newspaper(s)**
3. **number of responses**
 | Yes No Yes No   |
| 2.5 **Shortlist:** **Names / nationality of firms / companies (mark domestic firms and companies that had expressed interest)**  | 1. 2. 3. 4. 5. 6.  |
| 2.6 **Issuance of Request for Proposals: to Consultants** | Reference: \_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_Date: \_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_ |
| 2.7 **Amendments and clarifications to the RFP (describe)** |    |
| 2.8 **Contract:**1. **Standard Time-Based**
2. **Standard Lump Sum**
3. **other (describe**)
 | Yes \_\_\_\_ Yes\_\_\_\_   |
| 2.9 **(a) Pre-proposal conference:****(b) minutes issued** | Yes No Yes No  |
| 2.10 **Proposal submission:**1. **two envelopes (technical and financial proposals)**
2. **original submission**

**(c) extensions(s)**  |  PointsYes Date Time Date Time  |
| 2.11 **Opening of Technical Proposals**  | Date Time  |
|  |  |
| 2.12 **Number of proposals submitted** |   |
| 2.13 **Evaluation committee:** **Members’ names and titles (normally three to five)** | 1. 2. 3. 4. 5.  |
| 2.14 **Proposal validity period (days):****(a) original expiration date****(b) extension(s), if any** | Date Time Date Time  |
| 2.15 **Evaluation Criteria/sub-criteria[[2]](#footnote-2):**1. **Consultants’ experience**
2.
3.
4. **methodology**
5.
6.

**(c) key staff/ individual(s)**1. \_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_
2. \_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_
3. \_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_
4. **training (optional)**
5.
6.
7. **Any additional criterion, if required**
 | Weight Weight Weight Weight Weight Weight Weight Weight Weight Weight  |
| 2.16 **Technical scores by Consultant** | Minimum qualifying score  |
| **Consultants’ names** | **Technical scores** |
| 1.  |   |
| 2.  |   |
| 3.  |   |
| 4.  |   |

## Form II (B). Evaluation Summary

**Technical Scores / Ranking**

|  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| **Consultants’ names** | ***[Insert name of Consultant 1]*** | ***[Insert name of Consultant 2]*** | ***[Insert name of Consultant 3]*** | ***[Insert name of Consultant 4]*** |
| **Criteria** | Scores | Scores | Scores | Scores |
| **Experience** |  |  |  |  |
| **Methodology** |  |  |  |  |
| **Proposed staff** |  |  |  |  |
| **Training**  |  |  |  |  |
| **Any additional criterion** |  |  |  |  |
| **Total score a** |  |  |  |  |
| **Rank** |  |  |  |  |
| a. Proposals scoring below the minimum qualifying score of [*number*] points have been rejected. |

## Form II (C). Individual Evaluations—Comparison

|  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| **Consultants’ Names** | ***[Insert name of Consultant 1]*** | ***[Insert name of Consultant 2]*** | ***[Insert name of Consultant 3]*** | ***[Insert name of Consultant 4]*** |
| **Criteria****Experience** | A BAV aC D |  |  |  |
| **Methodology** |  |  |  |  |
| **Key staff** |  |  |  |  |
| **Training**  |  |  |  |  |
| **Any additional criterion** |  |  |  |  |
| **Total** |  |  |  |  |
| a. A, B, C, and D = scores given by evaluators; AV = average score, see Annex I (a). |

# Section III. Financial Evaluation Report—Award Recommendation—Text[[3]](#footnote-3)

[The text will indicate:

1. Any issues faced during the evaluation;
2. Adjustments made to the prices of the proposal(s) (mainly to ensure consistency with the technical proposal) and determination of the evaluated price (does not apply to Selection Based on Qualifications (Qualifications), and Single-Source Selection (Single-Source));
3. Award recommendation; and
4. Any other important information.]

# Section IV. Financial Evaluation Report—Award Recommendation—Forms[[4]](#footnote-4)

## Form IV (A). Financial Evaluation—Basic Data

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
| 4.1 **Public opening of financial proposals:** **Names of all participating consultants and proposal prices (mark Consultants that attended public opening)** | Date Time 1. 2. 3. 4.  |
| 4.2 **Evaluation committee: members’**: **names and titles (if not the same as in the technical evaluation)** |      |
| 4.3 **Formula for evaluation of cost (QCBS only; cross as appropriate)** | Weight inversely proportional to cost \_\_\_\_\_Other  |
| 4.4 **QCBS****(a) Technical, financial and final scores**  | Consultants’ Technical Financial FinalName scores scores scores      |
| **(b) Award recommendation** |  |
| 4.5 **Least-Cost**(a) **Technical scores, proposal and evaluated prices** | Consultant’ Technical Proposal EvaluatedName scores prices prices      |
| **(b) Award recommendation for Least-Cost: lowest evaluated (price proposal above minimum qualifying score)** | Name  |

## Form IV (B). Adjustments—Evaluated Prices[[5]](#footnote-5)

|  |  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| **No** | **Consultants’ Names** | **Proposals’ prices** | **Adjustments** | **Evaluated price(s)** | **Financial scores** |
| **Currency** | **Amount (1)** | **(2)** | **(3) = (1) + (2)** |
|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
|  | a. Comments, if any.b. Arithmetical errors and omissions of items included in the technical proposals. Adjustments may be positive or negative.c. For QCBS only: 100 points to the lowest evaluated proposal; other scores to be determined in accordance with provisions of RFP. |  |

## Form IV (C). QCBS—Combined Technical/Financial Evaluation—Award Recommendation

|  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| **No** | **Consultants’ names** | **Technical Evaluation** | **Financial Evaluation** | **Combined Evaluation** |
| **TechnicalscoresS(t)** | **WeightedscoresS(t) × Tb** | **Technicalrank** | **FinancialscoresS(f)** | **WeightedscoresS(f) ×Fd** | **ScoresS(t) T + S(f) F** | **Rank** |
|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| **Award recommendation** | **To highest combined technical / financial score.Consultant’s name: \_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_** |
|  | a. See Form IIB.b. T = As per RFP.c. See Form IVB.d. F = as per RFP. |

1. **Head of Evaluation Committee**: \_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_ Signature: \_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_ Date: \_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_
2. **Evaluation Committee Member**: \_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_ Signature: \_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_ Date: \_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_
3. **Evaluation Committee Member**: \_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_ Signature: \_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_ Date: \_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_

## Form IV (D). Least-Cost Selection—Award Recommendation[[6]](#footnote-6)

|  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- |
| **No** | **Consultants’ names** | **Least-Cost Selection** |
| **Technical scores** | **Evaluated prices** |
|  |  |  |  |
|  |  |  |  |
|  |  |  |  |
|  |  |  |  |
|  |  |  |  |
|  |  |  |  |
| **Award recommendation** | **To lowest evaluated price above minimum qualifying score.Consultant’s name: \_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_** |

1. **Head of Evaluation Committee**: \_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_ Signature: \_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_ Date: \_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_
2. **Evaluation Committee Member**: \_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_ Signature: \_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_ Date: \_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_
3. **Evaluation Committee Member**: \_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_ Signature: \_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_ Date: \_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_

# Section V. Annexes[[7]](#footnote-7)

## Annex I (a). Individual Evaluations *(For each Committee member to evaluate each consultant)*

Consultant’s name: \_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_

|  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- |
| **Criteria/Sub-Criteria** | **Maximum Scores** | **Evaluators**  | **Average Scores** |
| **Head of Evaluation Committee 1** | **Evaluator 2** | **Evaluator 3** |
| **Experience** |  |  |  |  |  |
| **-** |  |  |  |  |  |
| **-** |  |  |  |  |  |
| **Methodology** |  |  |  |  |  |
| **-** |  |  |  |  |  |
| **-** |  |  |  |  |  |
|  |  |  |  |  |  |
| **Key Staff** |  |  |  |  |  |
| **-** |  |  |  |  |  |
| **-** |  |  |  |  |  |
| **-** |  |  |  |  |  |
| **Transfer of Knowledge (Training)** |  |  |  |  |  |
| **-** |  |  |  |  |  |
| - |  |  |  |  |  |
| **Any additional criterion** |  |  |  |  |  |
|  |  |  |  |  |  |
|  |  |  |  |  |  |
|  |  |  |  |  |  |
| **Total** | **100** |  |  |  |  |

1. **Head of Evaluation Committee**: \_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_ Signature: \_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_ Date: \_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_

2. **Evaluation Committee Member**: \_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_ Signature: \_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_ Date: \_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_

3. **Evaluation Committee Member**: \_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_Signature: \_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_ Date: \_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_

## Annex I (b) Individual Evaluations—Key Personnel[[8]](#footnote-8) *(For each Committee member to evaluate the key staff for each consultant)*

Consultant’s Name: \_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_

|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| **No** | **Key Staff Names** | **Maximum Scores** | **General Qualifications****( )9** | **Adequacy for the Assignment****( )10** | **Experience in Iraq or In the Kurdistan Region****( )11** | **Total Marks****(100)** | **Scores** |
|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| **Total** |  |  |  |  |  |  |
|  | a. Sometimes evaluations are made by groups instead of individuals. Each group (e.g. financial group) has a weight. The group score is obtained by the weighted scores of the members of the group. For example, the score of a group of three individuals scoring a, b, and c would be ax + by + cz with x, y, and z representing the respective weights of the members (x + y + z = 1) in this group.b. Maximum marks as per RFP |

Evaluation Committee Member: \_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_Signature: \_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_ Date: \_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_

## Annex II. Minutes of Public Opening of Financial Proposals

[*The minutes should indicate the names of all participants, the proposal prices, discounts, technical scores, and any details that the Procuring Authority, at its discretion, may consider appropriate. All attendees must sign the Minutes.*]

**Financial Proposals opening date, time: \_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_**

**Number of Opened Financial proposals:** \_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_

|  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- |
| **No** | **Consultant Identification** | **Read-out Price(s)** | **Modifications or discounts or****Comments** |
| **Name** | **Technical Proposal Score**  | **Currency** | **Amount** |
|  |  |  |  |  |  |
|  |  |  |  |  |  |
|  |  |  |  |  |  |
|  |  |  |  |  |  |
|  |  |  |  |  |  |

1. **Head of Financial Proposals Opening Committee:** \_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_Title: \_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_ Signature: \_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_
2. **Financial Proposals Opening Committee Member:** \_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_Title: \_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_ Signature: \_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_
3. **Financial Proposals Opening Committee Member:** \_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_Title: \_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_ Signature: \_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_
1. Section I applies to Quality- and Cost-Based Selection (QCBS), and Least-Cost Selection (Least-Cost). Provide appropriate information in the case of Selection Based on Qualifications (Qualifications) and Single-Source Selection (SS). [↑](#footnote-ref-1)
2. 2 Maximum of three sub-criteria per criterion [↑](#footnote-ref-2)
3. Applies to QCBS, and Least-Cost. For Qualifications, and Single-Source provide relevant information as indicated. [↑](#footnote-ref-3)
4. Applies to QCBS, and Least-Cost. For Qualifications, and Single-Source, provide relevant information as indicated. [↑](#footnote-ref-4)
5. For Least-Cost, Qualifications and Single-Source, fill out only up to column 3. [↑](#footnote-ref-5)
6. Fill in appropriate part of form. [↑](#footnote-ref-6)
7. Annex I applies to Quality-and Cost Based and Least-Cost. For Qualifications and Single-Source, it is replaced by a review of the strengths and weaknesses of the proposal, which may be amended by one or several evaluators. [↑](#footnote-ref-7)
8. There are secondary criteria for the key staff evaluation such as qualification and experience. [↑](#footnote-ref-8)