

Public-Private Partnership Center of the Philippines
Project Development and Monitoring Facility Service

CONSULTANT PERFORMANCE EVALUATION

March 2018 version

- I. Introduction
- II. Consulting Firms
- III. Closely Monitored Individual Experts

Appendix

- 1 Performance Evaluation Report Form 1
- 2 PERF 1-Narrative Descriptions of the Performance Evaluation Criteria
- 3 Performance Evaluation Report Form 2
- 4 PERF 2-Narrative Descriptions of the Performance Evaluation Criteria

I. INTRODUCTION

1. The Public-Private Partnership Center of the Philippines (PPP Center), through the Project Development and Monitoring Facility Service (PDMFS) monitors the performance of consultants/transaction advisors (TAs), *i.e.*, the firm as a whole, as well as its individual experts.
2. These guidelines provide policies and procedures for evaluation.

II. CONSULTING FIRMS

A. Policy

3. After a consulting firm contracted by the PPP Center, with *conforme* of the implementing agency (IA), completes an assignment (upon submission of the final report as defined in the contract), the concerned PPP Center Project Officer and the IA representative directly involved in the assignment evaluates the TA's performance. If the assignment will last 12 months or more, the TA's performance should also be evaluated at midterm of the assignment.
4. The PPP Center Project Officer and the IA representative directly involved in the assignment jointly evaluate the TA's performance and submit a single evaluation report.
5. The evaluation of performance applies to all TAs under an Indefinite Delivery Contract Assignment (IDCA) with the PPP Center.

B. Preparatory Actions

6. During contract negotiations with a consulting firm, the PPP Center, through the PDMFS, gives the TA copies of the Performance Evaluation Report (PER) Forms and the Narrative Descriptions of the Criteria (Appendix 1-4) for reference. PPP Center explains the evaluation procedures to the TA.
7. As may be required, the PDMFS determines the midterm of the TA's assignment.

C. Procedures for Evaluation

8. The evaluators, *i.e.* concerned PPPC Project Officer and the IA representative, should complete the evaluation of the TA's performance within one (1) month from (i) the date on which the TA submits the final report as scheduled in the Contract of Services for the Provision of Transaction Advisory Services¹; (ii) midterm of the TA's assignment; or (iii) PPP Center's termination of the TA's contract. Any expert replaced during the assignment period because of unsatisfactory performance will require detailed evaluation within one (1) month from the replacement date using the PER Form 2 (Appendix 3) for individual consultants. PERs not evaluated at the end of the one-month period will be automatically classified as "Not Rated". Once a PER is classified as "Not Rated", the PER rating cannot be changed.
9. At the expected date of the final report submission or at the midterm of an assignment

¹Or as indicated in the PSC resolutions/contract variation related documents as approved by the ADB.

lasting 12 months or more, the PDMFS sends an email message to the evaluators. The message includes guidelines for completing the evaluation. The evaluators, in preparing the report, seek comments from other PPP Center and/or IA staff who were involved in the implementation of the TA's services.

10. The evaluators complete the evaluation form by choosing one of five ratings (*i.e.*, excellent, satisfactory, generally satisfactory, unsatisfactory, or not applicable) for each performance criterion. In doing so, the evaluators refer to the narrative descriptions of the performance criteria shown in Appendix 2. If some criteria do not apply accurately to the assignment, a 'not applicable' rating may be given.
11. The evaluator first evaluates the TA's overall performance in the PER Form 1 Part A (Appendix 1). All the factors that affected the overall performance, including the extent to which the TA achieved the assignment's objectives, completed the terms of reference, and complied with its other contractual obligations; the experts' field performance and behavior; and the amount of assistance the IA provided are considered.
12. Next, the evaluator explains his/her ratings in the "Comments" column for each criterion of the form, particularly any ratings that are less than satisfactory (*i.e.* generally satisfactory, or unsatisfactory) or for a "not applicable" rating. The explanations are mandatory before the evaluators can proceed to the next step of the process. It is also important because, if PPP Center later finds the firm's overall performance to be unsatisfactory, it will use the PER to support any restrictions it imposes or other action it takes against the TA.
13. Third, the evaluator evaluates each individual expert, international and national, in the PER Form 1 Part B. The evaluator has to evaluate the team leader and all team members. Any expert with unsatisfactory rating will require detailed evaluation using the PER Form 2 (Appendix 3). The evaluator refers to the narrative description of the performance criteria presented in Appendix 4.
14. After the PER is completed, the evaluator forwards the PER to the PSC and PDMFS. An endorsement of the PER from the PSC to the PDMFS is needed to complete the process. In cases where the PSC fails to endorse the PER rating given by the evaluators within the specified period, such rating will be deemed final and included for PER purposes. PDMFS will record cases where the PSC failed to endorse the PER.
15. The PDMFS reviews the PER and decides whether follow-up action with the TA is needed. Follow-up action is always taken when the TA's overall performance and/or any expert is rated unsatisfactory. When PDMFS decides to take follow-up action, the PDMFS Director, after consulting with the PSC, writes to the TA listing the weaknesses identified in the PER and invites the TA to comment. The TA is given 7 days to reply in writing to PDMFS.
16. After PDMFS receives the TA's reply, the PDMFS reviews the PER; the TA's comments; and past PERs, if any.
17. Depending on the circumstances, the PDMFS may decide if the PER overall performance rating will stand or will be modified. If the overall performance rating of "unsatisfactory" is maintained, the PDMFS will next decide whether PPP Center will exclude the TA and/or any of the individual experts in the team from shortlistings for future IDCAs for a specified period effective from the date of the PDMFS decision. The PDMFS' decision is final, and PDMFS advises the consultant in writing of the

decision. If PDMFS decides to exclude the TA and/or any of the individual experts from shortlisting for IDCAs, the PPP Center Executive Director, signs the letter to the TA.

18. PDMFS maintains the files on the TA's and its experts' performance evaluation. When a TA or any of its experts is proposed for a shortlist by an IA or PPP Center, or if a TA or any of its experts is included in a winning firm's technical proposal, PDMFS reviews its files on performance evaluation for the purpose of taking into account in the evaluation process the performance evaluation ratings of the TA or its experts within the last five (5) years, as well as to determine whether or not the TA or any of its experts is under a suspension to undertake a contract with PPP Center.

III. CLOSELY MONITORED INDIVIDUAL EXPERTS

A. Policy

19. Individual experts recommended "for acceptance but will be closely monitored" will be evaluated every 2 months or as may be determined during contract negotiations as necessary using PER Form 2. The PPP Center Project Officer and the IA representative will jointly evaluate the expert's performance and submit a single evaluation report. This requirement applies to all experts who are recommended for acceptance but will be closely monitored.

B. Preparatory Actions

20. During the contract negotiations with a consulting firm, the PPP Center, through the PDMFS, gives the TA a copy of the PER Form 2 and the Narrative Description of the Criteria for reference. PPP Center explains the evaluation procedures to the TA.

C. Procedures for Evaluation

21. The evaluators (*i.e.*, concerned PPC Project Officer and the IA representative) should evaluate the expert's performance within two (2) months from the date of commencement and every two (2) months thereafter or as may be determined during contract negotiations. The evaluation should be completed within one (1) month. In preparing the PER, the evaluators shall also seek comments on the expert's performance from other PPP Center and/or IA staff who are involved in the assignment.
22. The evaluators rate the individual expert for each performance criterion by choosing one of five ratings, *i.e.*, excellent, satisfactory, generally satisfactory, unsatisfactory, not applicable. The evaluator refers to the narrative description of the performance criteria presented in Appendix 4. A "not applicable" rating may be given if the criteria do not apply accurately to the terms of reference of the expert.
23. After the PER is completed, the evaluator forwards the PER to the PSC and PDMFS. An endorsement of the PER from the PSC to the PDMFS is needed to complete the process. In cases where the PSC fails to endorse the PER rating given by the evaluators within the specified period, such rating will be deemed final and included for PER purposes. PDMFS will record cases where the PSC failed to endorse the PER.
24. The PDMFS reviews the PER and decides whether follow-up action with the TA is needed. Follow-up action is always taken when any evaluation criteria of the expert is rated unsatisfactory. When PDMFS decides to take follow-up action, the PDMFS

Director, after consulting with the PSC, writes to the TA listing the weaknesses identified in the PER and invites the TA to comment. The TA is given 7 days to reply in writing to PDMFS. After PDMFS receives the TA's reply, the PDMFS reviews the PER; the TA's comments; and past PERs, if any.

25. Depending on the circumstances, the PDMFS may decide if the PER overall performance rating will stand or will be modified. If the overall performance rating of "unsatisfactory" is maintained, the firm shall be asked to immediately replace the expert².
26. PDMFS maintains the files on the expert's performance evaluation. When the expert is included in a winning firm's technical proposal, PDMFS reviews its files on performance evaluation for the purpose of taking into account in the evaluation process the performance evaluation ratings of the expert within the last five (5) years, as well as to determine whether or not the expert is under a suspension to undertake a contract with PPP Center.

²Firms shall bear the cost of replacing individual experts and shall comply with rules and procedures for replacement CVs.

Appendix 1

PERFORMANCE EVALUATION REPORT FORM 1

Period of evaluation:	<input type="checkbox"/>	Mid-Term of Assignment	<input type="checkbox"/>	End of Assignment
------------------------------	--------------------------	------------------------	--------------------------	-------------------

Name of Firm/Consortium:	
---------------------------------	--

Project Name:			
Commencement Date:		Completion Date:	

Part A. Firm		
CRITERIA	RATING	COMMENT
I. Technical		
1. Analysis of Background Data		
2. Appropriateness of Methodology		
3. Initiative, Flexibility, Innovation		
4. Design Solutions		
5. Performance on Procurement		
II. Economic and Financial		
1. Cost Estimates Reliability		
2. Economic Analysis		
3. Financial Analysis		
III. Project Specific		
1. Technology Transfer		

Part A. Firm		
CRITERIA	RATING	COMMENT
2. Training Functions		
3. Advisory Functions		
4. Institutional/Management Analysis		
IV. Project Management		
1. Understanding Procedures		
2. Adherence to Terms of Reference		
3. Compliance with Work Program		
4. Presentation of Results		
5. Quality of Reports		
6. Personnel Stability		
7. Team Leadership		
8. Competence/Conduct of Experts		
9. Relations with PPP Center and Implementing Agency		
10. Contract Administration		
OVERALL PERFORMANCE		

Part B. Individual Experts		
NAME and POSITION	RATING	COMMENT
1.		
2.		
3.		

4.		
5.		
6.		
7.		

Other comments:

Evaluated by:	Date:
Name and Signature	

-----**To be filled-up by the PSC**-----

Action recommended by the PSC:

Endorsed by:	Date:
Name and Signature	

Appendix 2

PERFORMANCE EVALUATION REPORT FORM 1

Narrative Descriptions of the Performance Evaluation Criteria

A. Technical

1. Analysis of Background Data

Did the TA collect all the relevant background data, organize them properly, and analyze them with sufficient depth? Did the TA consider all the available data, or did it omit or overlook some? Did the TA competently investigate all the necessary issues and produce usable results? Did the TA establish the integrity of the data it assembled? Were the TA's assumptions realistic and satisfactory?

2. Appropriateness of Methodology

Was the TA's methodology or proposed methodology appropriate or too sophisticated? Did the methodology recognize the local people's abilities and standards?

3. Initiative, Flexibility, Innovation

Did the TA demonstrate initiative when dealing with problems and flexible methods of obtaining data and analyzing incomplete data? Give a higher rating if the TA showed innovation in carrying out the assignment, analyzing data that were not readily available, simplifying the design, increasing the project's benefits, or reducing the costs.

4. Design Solutions

Did the TA's design solutions show a proper appreciation of the methods, materials, and equipment available to, and used by, local contractors?

5. Performance on Procurement

Were the TA's tender documents simple and comprehensive? Were the specifications adequate and fair to all the prospective bidders? Were the evaluation criteria appropriate for thorough and equitable bid evaluations?

B. Economic and Financial

1. Cost Estimates Reliability

Were the TA's cost data accurate and comprehensive? Were the costs estimated or actual? Did the TA state the sources and dates of the data?

2. Economic Analysis

Was the TA's economic analysis comprehensive and was the standard satisfactory? Did the TA properly assess all the benefit and cost streams and include the relevant items?

3. Financial Analysis

Assess the quality and completeness of the TA's analysis. Did the TA include all the investment and operating charges? Did the financial analysis develop any questions for the economic analysis? If the TA studied tariffs and prepared recommendations, were they soundly based?

C. Project Specific

1. Technology Transfer

Did the TA effectively transfer all the required technology, including any required manuals, hardware, and software, to the counterpart staff, PPP Center and implementing agency? Did the TA fully explain all the methodologies, and was the transfer untied?

2. Training Functions

Did the TA fully train the counterpart staff as required in the terms of reference? Did the TA assess and evaluate the training to gauge its success? Were the counterpart staff fully competent and capable of operating any system or program the TA transferred?

3. Advisory Functions

Was the TA's advice practical, appropriate and effective? Did the PPP Center and implementing agency accept it?

4. Institutional/Management Analysis

Did the TA adequately consider all the relevant factors, including local protocols and sensitivities, and develop practical solutions to problems? Give a lower rating if the TA only adapted practices from elsewhere.

D. Project Management

1. Understanding of Procedures

Did the TA adequately understand PPP Center's and the implementing agency's procedures? Did it handle all the correspondence, reports, claims, and other procedural matters in a timely manner?

2. Adherence to Terms of Reference

Did the TA fully comply with all of the terms of reference or only with some of them?

3. Compliance with Work Program

Did the TA complete all the tasks and achieve all the deadlines in the work program? Did the TA give sound reasons for any deviations? Give a lower rating for erratic programming.

4. Presentation of Results

Were the TA's reports written in clear, succinct English and free of jargon? Were they grammatically and mathematically correct? Were they adequately organized and properly indexed?

5. Quality of Reports

Were the TA's reports comprehensive, logical, and persuasive? Were the reports useful?

6. Personnel Stability

Did the TA give adequate reasons for personnel changes, such as long-term illness or death?

7. Team Leadership

Was the team leader's leadership effective? Was the team cohesive, cooperative, and productive?

8. Competence/Conduct of Experts

Summarize your evaluations of the experts in Part B of the form.

9. Relations with the PPP Center and Implementing Agency

Were the TA's relations with the PPP Center and implementing agency cordial and cooperative, resulting in good working arrangements and supply of data, frank exchanges of views, and open discussions of sensitive issues?

10. Contract Administration

Did the TA ask for too many variations or variations that were too expensive? Did the TA justify its requests for contract variations? Give a lower rating if the TA, rather than PPP Center and/or the implementing agency, proposed to vary the work plan.

Appendix 3

PERFORMANCE EVALUATION REPORT FORM 2

Period of evaluation:	<input type="checkbox"/>	Mid-term of Assignment	<input type="checkbox"/>	End of Assignment
------------------------------	--------------------------	------------------------	--------------------------	-------------------

Name of Expert:	
Position:	
Name of Firm/Consortium:	

Project Name:			
Commencement Date:		Completion Date:	

Criteria	Rating	COMMENT
1. Practical knowledge and experience in the field concerned		
2. Ability to adapt knowledge and experience to assigned tasks		
3. Initiative		
4. Productivity		
5. Ability to work with others		
6. Adherence to PPP Center's and Implementing Agency's working regulations		

7. Quality of work completed		
8. Others		
OVERALL PERFORMANCE		

Other comments:

Evaluated by:	Date:
Name and Signature	

-----**To be filled-up by the PSC**-----

Action recommended by the PSC:

Endorsed by:	Date:
Name and Signature	

Appendix 4

PERFORMANCE EVALUATION REPORT FORM 2

Narrative Descriptions of the Performance Evaluation Criteria

1. Practical Knowledge of and Experience in the Field Concerned

Did the TA demonstrate practical knowledge and experience in the claimed areas of expertise? Were gaps apparent in the TA's knowledge, or did the TA lack experience in one or more areas? Did the TA demonstrate a professional appreciation of the problems that arose?

2. Ability to Adapt Knowledge and Experience to Assigned Tasks

Did the TA thoroughly investigate, understand, analyze, and report on all the aspects of the assignment? Was the counterpart staff involved confident that the TA would competently complete the assignment?

3. Initiative

Did the TA propose any sound innovations? Was the TA's method of searching for data practical? Did the TA need more or less assistance than usual with the arrangements?

4. Productivity

Did the TA complete all the tasks in the terms of reference? Were the TA's tables, calculations, and other written outputs complete?

5. Ability to Work with Others

Did the TA maintain cordial relations with PPP Center and implementing agency staff and counterpart officials? While on mission, did the TA work cooperatively with the group? Did the TA respect the local culture?

6. Adherence to PPP Center's and Implementing Agency's Working Regulations

Did the TA work within PPP Center's and the implementing agency's normal procedures and regulations?

7. Quality of Work Completed

Assess whether the quality of the outputs was fully satisfactory. Was the TA's report or contribution to the team's report well organized, clearly and simply written, without jargon? Did the TA present his/her conclusions logically and convincingly, with adequate references? Were the TA's inputs and outputs complete, covering all the requirements in the terms of reference? Did the TA's report cover all the issues raised?