Republic of the Philippines
DEPARTMENT OF PUBLIC WORKS AND HIGHWAYS
OFFICE OF THE SECRETARY
Manila

097.13 DPWH
07-01-2016

29 JUN 2016

DEPARTMENT ORDER NO. 145 Series of 2016 07.07.16

SUBJECT: Amending Department Order No. 20, Series of 2015, Prescribing a Consultant's Performance Evaluation System (ConsPES) for Locally-Funded Infrastructure Projects

In line with the continuing efforts of the DPWH to improve its infrastructure operations, Department Order No. 20, series of 2015, prescribing a Consultant's Performance Evaluation System (ConsPES) for locally-funded infrastructure projects, is hereby amended as follows, for compliance by all concerned:

A. Objectives of ConsPES

ConsPES seeks to achieve the following objectives:

1. To set an objective and consistent method to evaluate, measure, and rate a Consultant's performance in DPWH projects.

2. To provide the DPWH with a means to incentivize Consultants to perform good work.

3. To provide the DPWH essential inputs in the process of selecting Consultants for its future consulting services project.

4. To give Consultants the opportunity to improve their job performance from one ConsPES rating period to another.

B. Guidelines

1. ConsPES shall be used mainly for the most common types of consulting services engaged by the DPWH – Feasibility Study (FS), Detailed Engineering Design (DED), and Construction Supervision (CS). For other types of consulting services – e.g., preparation of Master Plan, specialized technical jobs such as geotechnical investigations, traffic surveys, parcellary surveys, and institutional capacity development - the Procurement Service (PrS) through its Consulting Services Division (PrS-CSD) - shall customize ConsPES to fit the specific requirements of those services, upon request of the concerned Implementing Unit (IU).

2. The evaluation and rating of a consultant's performance, using ConsPES, shall be done by a ConsPES Team to be formed by the Director of the PrS, with members from the following offices to be designated by their respective heads of office, on a project-to-project basis, depending on the type of consulting services involved:

FS	DED	CS
PrS–CSD	PrS–CSD	PrS–CSD

Planning Service – Project Preparation Division (PS-PPD)	Bureau of Design (BOD)	Concerned Cluster of Unified Project Management Office (UPMO)
BOD	BOC	BOC

3. For FS and DED, the evaluation of the consultant's performance, through ConsPES shall be carried out for every submission of deliverables stated in the Terms of Reference (TOR), using the criteria given in ANNEX A. For CS, the evaluation shall be carried out upon reaching the following milestones, considering approved contract time extensions, using the criteria given in ANNEX A:

    a. 25% of contract period
    b. 50% of contract period
    c. 75% of contract period
    d. 100% of contract period

4. As inputs for the evaluation by the ConsPES Team, the IU concerned shall request the following specialized offices to undertake the review of the specific aspects of the consultant's deliverables:

Specialized Offices	FS	DED	CS	Others
PS	x			
BOD	x	x		
BOC	x	x	x	
UPMO			x	
Bureau of Research and Standards			x	
Bureau of Quality and Safety			x	
Others				

5. For each consultant's deliverable (except for CS), the specialized offices (e.g., PS, BOD and BOC) responsible for reviewing the deliverable shall determine whether the defects/deficiencies in the deliverable are major or minor based on their respective checklists. The Director of the concerned specialized office shall synthesize the results of its evaluation of each deliverable in the Summary of Findings (ANNEX B) and submit this Summary to the ConsPES Team.

6. For FS and DED, based on the Summaries of Findings for each deliverable submitted by the concerned specialized offices, the ConsPES Team shall evaluate and rate the performance of the consultant using the criteria in ANNEX A.

7. The ConsPES Team shall submit the corresponding Intermediate Evaluation Report indicating its performance rating in ANNEX C to the Director of the PrS for review and notation. Intermediate Evaluation Report shall be submitted on the following milestones:

    a. 25% of contract period
    b. 50% of contract period
    c. 75% of contract period
    d. 100% of contract period

8. Upon completion of the consulting services, the ConsPES Team shall evaluate and give the final performance rating of the consultant using the same criteria in ANNEX A. The Team shall then submit its Final Evaluation Report (ANNEX D) to the PrS Director for review and approval.

9. The PrS, through the CSD, shall provide a copy of Final Evaluation Report to the consultant concerned for his review and concurrence

10. Upon the request of the concerned consultant, the ConsPES Team shall discuss with the consultant the Final Evaluation Report, including the performance ratings.

11. The PrS-CSD shall maintain a ConsPES database which shall include, among other things, the findings and performance ratings of the consultants evaluated.

C. Basic Criteria and Weights by Type of Consulting Services

ConsPES shall use the following basic criteria, with their corresponding weights, for the common types of consulting services – Feasibility Study, Detailed Engineering Design, and Construction Supervision:

Criteria	Feasibility Study (FS)	Detailed Engineering Design (DED)	Construction Supervision (CS)
Quality (of Output)	50%	60%	60%
Cost (of Output)	20%	20%	20%
Schedule (of Deliverables)	30%	20%	20%
Total	100%	100%	100%

D. Basic Rating System

ConsPES shall use the following numerical and adjectival ratings:

Numerical	Adjectival
100%	Very Satisfactory
85%	Satisfactory
70%	Fair
50%	Unsatisfactory

E. Specific Criteria, Indicators, and Rating System, by Type of Services

For each of the three types of consulting services, the specific ConsPES criteria and sub-criteria, together with their respective weights, indicators, and rating system specified in Annex A shall be used.

F. Application of ConsPES Ratings

The ConsPES ratings shall be used by the concerned Bids and Awards Committees as inputs in the shortlisting and the evaluation of technical proposals of consultants, as follows:

	PROPOSED WEIGHTS	
	With ConsPES	**Without ConsPES***
For Shortlisting:		
1. Applicable Experience of Firm	25%	35%
2. Qualification of Personnel of the entire Firm	30%	40%
3. Job Capacity	20%	25%
4. ConsPES Rating	25%	-
Total	100%	100%
For Evaluation of Technical Proposals		
1. Applicable Experience of Firm	10%	10%
2. Work Plan and Methodology	15%	20%
3. Qualification of Personnel to be assigned to the Project	55%	70%
4. ConsPES Rating	20%	-
Total	100%	100%

*For firms without ConsPES ratings, the weights in this column shall be used.

For the procurement - i.e., shortlisting or evaluation of technical proposals – of a specific consulting services contract, the ConsPES rating to be used shall be that for a similar completed services contract. In case the consultant has two or more ConsPES ratings, the average ConsPES rating of the last two similar consulting services contracts shall be used for shortlisting and evaluation of technical proposals.

This Order supersedes Department Order No. 20, Series of 2015, and Special Order No. 70, Series of 2015, and shall take effect immediately.

ROGELIO L. SINGSON
Secretary

12.1.2 JABS/MGNO

Department of Public Works and Highways
Office of the Secretary
WIN6XR01172

ANNEX A
DPWH CONSULTANT'S PERFORMANCE EVALUATION SYSTEM (ConsPES)
CRITERIA AND RATING SYSTEM BY TYPE OF SERVICES
March 2016

A. FEASIBILITY STUDY (FS)

Criteria	Weights
Quality	**50**
Cost (of Output)	**20**
Schedule	**30**
Total	**100**

1. Quality: Weight - 50%

Criteria	Weights	Indicators	Rating System	
			Errors/ Inaccuracies/ Deficiencies	**Resubmissions**
1.1 Adequacy and accuracy of FS assumptions, data, analyses, and outputs vs. Terms of Reference (TOR) covering the following: a. Engineering surveys (topo, geotechnical, hydrologic, etc.) b. Traffic/market surveys and analyses c. Prel. engg design (PED) including cost estimates d. Economic evaluation e. Environmental impact f. Social and GAD g. ROW Plan and RAP h. Value engineering i. Risk analysis j. Financial and Value for Money analyses for PPP k. Operational analysis l. Others	40%	a. Extent and impact of errors/ inaccuracies/ deficiencies in FS data, analyses, and outputs, based on DPWH review and validation. b. Number of resubmissions of corrected FS.	100%: Very Satisfactory – FS assumptions, data and outputs required no changes or only minor ones for clarity. No major technical errors/inaccuracies/deficiencies* that influenced quality of FS outputs. 85%: Satisfactory– 1-3 documented major errors/inaccuracies/ deficiencies. 70%: Fair– 4-6 documented major errors/inaccuracies/ deficiencies. 50%: Unsatisfactory– More than 6 documented major errors/inaccuracies/ deficiencies	100%: Very Satisfactory No resubmission required. 85%: Satisfactory– One (1) resubmission required to correct the work. 70%: Fair– Two (2) resubmissions required to correct the work. 50%: Unsatisfactory– Three (3) or more resubmissions to correct the work. --- *Under this criterion, tThe PS-PPD shall specify the weight/ multiplier for each item (column 1.1) as indicated in the TOR. The weights may vary*

			**see Notes on major FS defects/deficiencies.* --- 3 minor errors shall be equivalent to 1 major error.	*from one project to another.*
1.2 Cost-effectiveness of FS recommendation, including PED.	40%	a. Extent of DPWH comments on Consultant's evaluation of alternatives, based on value engineering (VE) and other relevant criteria, leading to recommended most cost-effective scheme. b. No. of revisions made	<u>100%: Very satisfactory</u> – a. Evaluation results readily accepted by DPWH management with very few minor/no adverse comments. b. No resubmission required. <u>85%: Satisfactory</u> – a. Evaluation results accepted by DPWH management with minimal/minor involvement/comments by DPWH staff. b. One (1) revision/ resubmission before being accepted by DPWH management. <u>70%: Fair</u> – a. Evaluation results required substantive involvement/comments by DPWH staff. b. Two (2) revisions/ resubmissions before being accepted by DPWH management. <u>50%: Unsatisfactory</u> – a. Evaluation results required extensive involvement/comments by DPWH staff. b. Three (3) or more revisions/ resubmissions before being accepted by DPWH management.	
1.3 Tenure of Consultant's key personnel	20%	Incidence of replacement of key personnel (weighted according to their roles) with or without valid reasons.	<u>100%: Very satisfactory</u> – No replacement of key personnel over the duration of the Consulting services. <u>85%: Satisfactory</u> – Replacement of less than 10% of the number of key personnel. <u>70%: Fair</u> – Replacement of 10-20% of the number of key personnel. <u>50%: Unsatisfactory</u> – Replacement of project manager and/or more than 20% of the number of key personnel. ---	

			Replacement (%) = (No. of Replacement ÷ Total Number of Key Personnel) x 100

2. <u>Cost of Output: Weight -20%</u>

Criteria	Weight	Indicators	Rating System
2.1 Completeness of FS/PED cost estimates vs. TOR	40%	Extent of coverage of FS/PED cost elements: materials, labor, equipment, indirect costs (cost of money, insurance, contingencies, taxes, etc.), ROW, etc., per DPWH guidelines.	<u>100%: Very Satisfactory</u> – Complete coverage of relevant cost items, in accordance with DPWH guidelines. <u>85%: Satisfactory</u> – Omissions/errors/inaccuracies in cost items, affecting less than 10% of total cost. <u>70%: Fair</u> – Omissions/errors/inaccuracies in some cost items, affecting 10-20% of total cost. <u>50%: Unsatisfactory</u> – Omissions/errors/inaccuracies in cost items, affecting more than 20% of total cost. ---------- Variance (%) = [(Total Actual Cost –Total Approved Cost) ÷ Total Approved Cost] x 100
2.2 Comparison of FS/PED cost estimates with accepted benchmarks	60%	Extent of variance of FS/PED cost estimates vs. accepted DPWH/industry benchmarks/standards (e.g., cost per km of road, cost/lineal meter of bridge, cost/sq. m of bldg.) and vs. required +/- 20% accuracy - adjusted for special characteristics.	<u>100%: Very Satisfactory</u> – Total variance less than 10%. <u>85%: Satisfactory</u> – Total variance within 10-15%. <u>70%: Fair</u> – Total variance within 15-20%, and/or variance for some major items more than 20%. <u>50%: Unsatisfactory</u> – Total variance more than 20%, and/or variance for major items more than 30%. ---------- Variance (%) = [(Actual Cost – Standard Cost) ÷ Standard Cost] x 100

3. <u>Schedule: Weight - 30%</u>

Criteria	Weight	Indicators	Rating System
Adherence to schedule of accepted FS deliverables	100%	Extent of actual time slippage (delay) vs. original/approved schedule for FS deliverables, due to the Consultant's fault.	<u>100%: Very Satisfactory</u> – FS deliverables completed/ submitted ahead of or on schedule. <u>85%: Satisfactory</u> – Slippage of less than 10% of original delivery period, due to Consultant's fault. <u>70%: Fair</u> – Slippage of 10-15%, due to Consultant's fault. <u>50%: Unsatisfactory</u> – Slippage of more than 15%, due to Consultant's fault. ---------- Time Slippage (%) = [(Contract Schedule – Actual Schedule) ÷ Contract Schedule] x 100

NOTES:

*<u>Major FS Errors/Deficiencies</u>:

- Use of "table" survey instead of actual field survey (e.g., traffic, socio-economic, road and river profile/cross-section surveys).
- Use of wrong benchmarks, coordinates.
- Use of inadequate/inappropriate assumptions (e.g., traffic parameters/adjustment factors, VOC, growth rates).
- Errors in geotechnical investigation such as inadequate spacing and depth of boreholes.
- Wrong preliminary design analysis on the main frame that will affect the structural integrity of the project (e.g., seismic coefficient, design flood level/return period).
- Inadequate preliminary design data used in structural analysis (e.g., thickness, materials).
- Inadequate value engineering to determine the most cost-effective design.
- Non-compliance with major environmental requirements for environmentally critical projects and projects in environmentally critical areas.
- Inappropriate cost estimate of right of way acquisition.
- *Other major FS errors/deficiencies, as may be added by PS, depending on the project.*

FS errors/deficiencies not stated above are considered minor FS errors/deficiencies.

ANNEX A
DPWH CONSULTANT'S PERFORMANCE EVALUATION SYSTEM (ConsPES)
CRITERIA AND RATING SYTEM BY TYPE OF SERVICES
March 2016

DETAILED ENGINEERING DESIGN

Criteria	Weights
Quality	**60**
Cost	**20**
Schedule	**20**
Total	**100**

1. Quality: Weight - 60%

Criteria	Weight	Indicators	Rating System
1.1 Adequacy and accuracy of DED surveys, analyses, and outputs vs. Terms of Reference (TOR) covering the following: a. Field investigations/ surveys (topographic, geotechnical, hydrolo-gic, parcellary, etc.) b. Design analyses (geometric, structural, seismic, hydro, etc.) c. Drawings d. Specifications e. Bidding documents f. Others	60%	a. Extent and impact of errors/inaccuracies/ deficiencies in DED surveys, analyses, and outputs, based on DPWH review and validation b. Number of resubmissions of corrected DED	100%: Very Satisfactory – DED surveys, analyses, and outputs required no/minor changes for clarity only. No major technical errors/inaccuracies/deficiencies* that influenced quality of DED outputs. 85%: Satisfactory–1-3 documented major errors/inaccuracies/deficiencies. One resubmission required to correct the work. 70%: Fair– 4-6 documented major errors/inaccuracies/deficiencies (e.g., wrong BM or seismic coefficient). Two resubmissions required to correct the work. 50%: Unsatisfactory– More than 6 documented major errors/ inaccuracies/deficiencies, and/or 3 or more resubmissions to correct the work. **See Notes on major errors/inaccuracies/deficiencies.*
1.2 Cost-effectiveness of DED	20%	a. Extent of DPWH comments on Consultant's evaluation of alternative schemes, using VE and other relevant criteria, leading to recommendation of most cost-	100%: Very Satisfactory – Evaluation adequately used VE and other relevant criteria, and recommended most cost-effective alternative readily accepted by DPWH management with no/minor adverse comments. 85%: Satisfactory – Evaluation used relevant criteria, and recommended alternative accepted by DPWH management, with minor comments by DPWH – with less than 10% cost savings

Criteria	Weight	Indicators	Rating System
		effective alternative. b. No. of revisions/ resubmissions made.	identified by DPWH but missed by consultant (thru VE). 70%: Fair – Evaluation required substantive/major comments/involvement by DPWH staff – with 10-20% cost savings identified by DPWH but missed by consultant (thru VE). One major revision required. 50%: Unsatisfactory – Evaluation required extensive involvement by DPWH staff and major reassessment with more than 20% cost savings identified by DPWH but missed by consultant (thru VE). Two or more major revisions required. Note: Add bonus points of 5-10% for cost-effective, innovative design accepted by DPWH management (but total rating shall not exceed 100%). Variance (%) = [(Budgetary Cost – Approved Cost per Alternative Scheme) ÷ Budgetary Cost] x 100
1.3 Tenure of Consultant's key personnel	20%	Incidence of replacement of key personnel (weighted according to their roles) with/without valid reasons	100%: Very Satisfactory – No replacement of key personnel over the duration of the Consulting services. 85%: Satisfactory – Replacement of less than 10% of the number of key personnel. 70%: Fair – Replacement of 10-20% of the number of key personnel. 50%: Unsatisfactory – Replacement of project manager and/or more than 20% of the number of key personnel.

2. Cost: Weight - 20%

Criteria	Weight	Indicators	Rating System
2.1 Completeness and accuracy of DED cost estimates vs. DPWH guidelines	40%	a. Extent of coverage of DED cost elements: materials, labor, equipment, indirect costs (cost of money, insurance, bonds, contingencies, profit, taxes, etc.), ROW, per DPWH guidelines.	100%: Very Satisfactory – Complete coverage of relevant cost items and adequate DUPA in accordance with DPWH guidelines. 85%: Satisfactory – Omissions of cost items and errors/deficiencies in DUPA, affecting less than 5% of total cost. 70%: Fair – Omissions of some cost items and errors/deficiencies in DUPA, affecting 5-10% of total cost.

Criteria	Weight	Indicators	Rating System
		b. Adequacy of Detailed Unit Price Analysis (DUPA)	50%: Unsatisfactory – Omissions of cost items and errors/deficiencies in DUPA, affecting more than 10% of total cost. Variance (%) = [(Total Actual Cost –Total Approved Cost) ÷ Total Approved Cost] x 100
2.2 Comparison of DED cost estimates with accepted benchmarks.	60%	Extent of variance of DED cost estimates vs. DPWH/industry benchmarks/standards (e.g., cost/km of road, cost/lineal m of bridge, cost/sq m of bldg.), and vs. required +/-5-10% accuracy - adjusted for special characteristics.	100%: Very Satisfactory – Total variance within 5%. 85%: Satisfactory – Total variance within 5-10%. 70%: Fair – Total variance within 10-15%, and/or variance for some major items more than 15%. 50%: Unsatisfactory – Total variance more than 15%, and/or variance for major items more than 20%. Variance (%) = [(Actual Cost – Standard Cost) ÷ Standard Cost] x 100

3. Schedule: Weight - 20%

Criteria	Weight	Indicators	Rating System
Adherence to schedule of accepted DED deliverables	100%	Extent of actual time slippage (delay) vs. original/approved schedule for deliverables, due to the Consultant's fault.	100%: Very Satisfactory – DED deliverables completed and submitted ahead of or on schedule. 85%: Satisfactory – Slippage of less than 10% of original delivery period, due to Consultant's fault. 70%: Fair – Slippage of 10-15%, due to the Consultant's fault. 50%: Unsatisfactory – Slippage of more than 15%, due to the Consultant's fault. Time Slippage (%) = [(Contract Schedule – Actual Schedule) ÷ Contract Schedule] x 100

NOTES:

*Major DED Errors/Deficiencies:

- Use of table survey instead of actual field survey.
- Use of wrong benchmarks, coordinates, topographical data, mean sea level elevation.
- Errors in geotechnical investigation, such as inadequate spacing and depth of boreholes, lack of understanding of subsurface condition.
- Wrong design analysis on the main frame that will affect structural integrity of the project (e.g., seismic coefficient, design flood return period, maximum experienced flood elevation).

– Inadequate design data used in structural analysis (e.g., thickness, materials).
– Inappropriate value engineering to determine the most cost-effective design.
– Non-consideration of socio-political issues – e.g., historical landmarks, densely populated area - resulting in non-implementation or major realignment/revision of project.
– *Other major DED errors/deficiencies, as may be added by BOD, depending on the project.*

DED errors/deficiencies not stated above are considered minor DED errors/deficiencies.

ANNEX A
DPWH CONSULTANT'S PERFORMANCE EVALUATION SYSTEM (ConsPES)
CRITERIA AND RATING SYTEM BY TYPE OF SERVICES
March 2016

CONSTRUCTION SUPERVISION

Criteria	Weights
Quality	**60**
Cost	**20**
Schedule	**20**
Total	**100**

1. Quality: Weight - 60%

Criteria	Weight	Indicators	Rating System
1.1 Consultant's efficiency in ensuring contractor's compliance of its construction work with the approved DED, particularly plans and specifications	50%	*Incidence of construction defects/deficiencies stated in the Statement of Works Accomplished (SWA) recommended by Consultant for payment,but found by DPWH to be not in accordance with the approved plans and specifications.*	100%: Very Satisfactory – *All workmanship stated in the SWA, carried out by the Contractor, and recommended by the Consultant for payment, are in accordance with the duly approved plans and specifications. Noted defects/deficiencies (if any) are within the acceptable tolerance set and prescribed in the monitoring/control matrix. (Please refer to Manual on Construction Supervision of Flood Control Projects, Annex 3, copy attached, in case of flood control projects)* 85%: Satisfactory – *SWA recommended by Consultant for payment is found by DPWH to have defects/deficiencies in major work items requiring rectification works and/or costing 10% and below of the aggregate works accomplished* 70%: Fair – *SWA recommended by Consultant for payment is found by DPWH to have defects/deficiencies in major work items requiring rectification works and/or costing 20% and below of the aggregate works accomplished* 50%: Unsatisfactory – *SWA recommended by Consultant for payment is found by DPWH to have defects/deficiencies in major work items requiring reconstruction and/or costing above 20% of the aggregate works accomplished* **See Notes on major construction defects.*
1.2 Quality of Consultant's const. supervision (CS) system:	40%	*Incidence of deficiencies in the Consultant's CS*	100%: Very Satisfactory – *All the five (5) criteria (column 1) are satisfactorily complied with.*

Criteria	Weight	Indicators	Rating System
a. Organization of key personnel b. Control of Work (Inspection and site instructions) c. Control of Materials (e.g., checking contractor's test procedures and results) d. Documentation [Reporting and records management (e.g., log book, test results, site instructions, progress reports, etc.)] e. Other Management Considerations • Construction Safety Management • Traffic Management • Labor Management • Environmental Management		*system, covering the five (5) criteria (column 1).*	85%: Satisfactory – Has incurred 1-2 cases of major infractions/deficiencies in any of the criteria 70%: Fair – Has incurred 3-4 cases of infractions/deficiencies in any of the criteria 50%: Unsatisfactory – Has incurred 5 or more cases of infractions/deficiencies in any of the criteria ***See Notes on major deficiencies in Consultant's CS system.*
1.3 Tenure of Consultant's key personnel	10%	Incidence of replacement of key personnel (weighted according to their roles) with/without valid reasons	100%: Very satisfactory – No replacement of key personnel over the duration of Consulting services. 85%: Satisfactory – Replacement of only 10% and below of the number of key personnel. 70%: Fair – Replacement of above 10% up to 20% of the number of key personnel. 50%: Unsatisfactory – Replacement of above 20% of the number of key personnel.

2. Cost: Weight - 20%

Criteria	Weight	Indicators	Rating System
Consultant's efficiency in controlling cost overruns.	100%	*Incidence of variation orders (VOs) with cost overruns, recommended by Consultant, but disapproved by DPWH, except VOs initiated itself by DPWH.*	100%: Very Satisfactory – *All VOs recommended by Consultant are approved by DPWH.* 85%: Satisfactory – *Has incurred 1-2 cases of VOs recommended by Consultant but disapproved by DPWH.* 70%: Fair – *Has incurred 3-4 cases of VOs recommended by Consultant but disapproved by DPWH.* 50%: Unsatisfactory – *Has incurred 5 or more cases of VOs recommended by Consultant but disapproved by DPWH.*

3. Schedule: Weight - 20%

Criteria	Weight	Indicators	Rating System
3.1 Consultant's efficiency in ensuring contractor's adherence to approved construction schedule.	40%	*Extent of slippage of planned accomplishment vs. actual accomplishment.*	100%: Very Satisfactory – *Work accomplishments are completed ahead of, or on schedule (+, or no slippage).* 85%: Satisfactory – *Has incurred 10% and below negative slippage due to Consultant's laxity/fault* 70%: Fair – *Has incurred above 10% up to 15% negative slippage due to Consultant's laxity/fault* 50%: Unsatisfactory – *Has incurred above 15% negative slippage due to Consultant's laxity/fault*
3.2 Consultant's prudent evaluation of proposed contract time extensions	30%	Incidence of contract time extensions recommended by Consultant but disapproved/reduced by DPWH – except time extensions for VOs due to faulty DED or for VOs initiated by DPWH.	100%: Very Satisfactory – *All proposed contract time extension recommended by Consultants are approved by DPWH* 85%: Satisfactory – *Has incurred 1 case of proposed contract time extension recommended by Consultant but disapproved by DPWH.* 70%: Fair – *Has incurred 2 cases of proposed contract time extension recommended by Consultant but disapproved by DPWH.* 50%: Unsatisfactory – *Has incurred more than 3 cases of proposed contract time extension recommended by Consultant but disapproved by DPWH.*
3.3 Consultant's timeliness in submitting required reports and documents	30%	Extent of Consultant's compliance with prescribed schedule	100%: Very Satisfactory – *All the required reports/documents are satisfactorily prepared and submitted within the prescribed schedule*

Criteria	Weight	Indicators	Rating System
		to submit project reports and other documents, e.g.: a. As-staked plans b. Progress reports c. Request for Payment of Materials on Hand d. Material Test results/report e. Site instructions f. Progress billings g. As-built plans h. Recommendations on VOs and time extensions	85%: Satisfactory – *All the required reports/documents are satisfactorily prepared and submitted within 1-2 days behind the prescribed schedule* 70%: Fair – *All the required reports/documents are satisfactorily prepared and submitted 3-4 days behind the prescribed schedule* 50%: Unsatisfactory – *All the required reports/documents are satisfactorily prepared and submitted above 5 days behind the prescribed schedule, and/or; Incomplete submission of reports/documents*

NOTES:

*Major Construction Defects:

General:
- Structural failure due to faulty construction.
- Inappropriate size and type of materials used for critical components of structures vs. plans and specifications.
- Inappropriate dimension of structures, such as insufficient thickness, width and/or depth.
- Inadequate concrete strength based on coring.

Roads and Bridges:
- Pavement or base failure, major cracks due to insufficient compaction, inadequate concrete mix, especially on structural and load bearing components (e.g., girders, columns, piles).
- Major scaling and faulting in PCCP.
- Asphalt raveling, shoving and corrugation.
- Scouring on bridge abutment.
- Erosion of earth materials from the top due to non-compliance with cut slope requirement.

Flood Control:
- Any/all deviation(s) determined to be beyond the tolerance set and prescribed in the monitoring/control matrix of the Manual on Construction Supervision of Flood Control Projects, shall be considered as major construction defects.
- Incurred damages to, and or failure of structure, due to fortuitous events (e.g.: flood occurrence with a magnitude below the designed safety level) is considered major construction defects.

Buildings and Other Infrastructure:
- Major cracks especially on structural and load bearing components (e.g., girders, columns, piles).

Other major construction defects, as may be added by BOC and IO, depending on the project.

Defects not stated above are considered minor construction defects.

**Major CS System Deficiencies:

- Mismatch of personnel assigned to supervise the project vs. requirements.
  - Lack of experience
  - Lack of dedication to work
  - Incompetent personnel
  - Prone to yield to undue external pressures (e.g., politicians, contractors, and other parties)
  - Insufficient number of personnel
  - Frequent absence from project site.
- Inadequate logistical resources for supervision (e.g., lack of testing equipment and service vehicles).
- Conflict between consultants and IO.
- Connivance with contractors resulting in undue claims for variation orders and time extensions.
- Poor construction records keeping, e.g., test results, defects noted and corrected.
- Laxity in enforcing health, safety, and environmental requirements.
- Others, as may be added by BOC and IO, depending on the project.

CS system deficiencies not stated above are considered minor CS system deficiencies.

Major Work Items – Construction cost of a particular work item is more than 20% of the contract cost.

ANNEX B

SUMMARY OF FINDINGS

(CONSULTANT'S PERFORMANCE EVALUATION SYSTEM)

PROJECT TYPE: Feasibility Study

NAME OF PROJECT:

CONSULTANT/S:

No.	DELIVERABLES	DATE OF SUBMISSION PER TOR	DATE RECEIVED BY UPMO/IU	DATE RECEIVED BY THE SPECIALIZED OFFICE	DATE RETURNED BY THE SPECIALIZED OFFICE	DATE RETURNED BY UPMO/IU	FINDINGS BY THE SPECIALIZED OFFICE		REMARKS / STATUS
							MAJOR ERROR / INACCURACIES / DEFICIENCIES	MINOR ERROR / INACCURACIES / DEFICIENCIES	
1	**Inception Report**								
	Inception Report No. __						1. 2.	1. 2.	
	Inception Report No. __						1. 2.	1. 2.	
2	**Capacity Improvement Study Report**								
	Capacity Improvement Study Report No. __						1. 2.	1. 2.	
	Capacity Improvement Study Report No. __						1. 2.	1. 2.	
3	**Traffic Survey and Analysis Report**								
	Traffic Survey and Analysis Report No. __						1. 2.	1. 2.	
	Traffic Survey and Analysis Report No. __						1. 2.	1. 2.	
4	**Topographic Survey Report**								
	Topographic Survey Report No. __						1. 2.	1. 2.	
	Topographic Survey Report No. __						1. 2.	1. 2.	
5	**Geotechnical and Geological Survey Report**								
	Geotechnical and Geological Survey Report No. __						1. 2.	1. 2.	

	Geotechnical and Geological Survey Report No. __						1. 2.	1. 2.	
6	**Hydrological Survey Report**								
	Hydrological Survey Report No. __						1. 2.	1. 2.	
	Hydrological Survey Report No. __						1. 2.	1. 2.	
7	**Utilities Survey Report**								
	Utilities Survey Report No. __						1. 2.	1. 2.	
	Utilities Survey Report No. __						1. 2.	1. 2.	
8	**Parcellary Survey Report**								
	Parcellary Survey Report No. __						1. 2.	1. 2.	
	Parcellary Survey Report No. __						1. 2.	1. 2.	
9	**Highway Design Report**								
	Highway Design Report No. __						1. 2.	1. 2.	
	Highway Design Report No. __						1. 2.	1. 2.	
10	**Bridge Design Report**								
	Bridge Design Report No. __						1. 2.	1. 2.	
	Bridge Design Report No. __						1. 2.	1. 2.	
11	**Drainage Design Report**								
	Drainage Design Report No. __						1. 2.	1. 2.	
	Drainage Design Report No. __						1. 2.	1. 2.	
12	**Cost Estimate**								
	Cost Estimate No. __						1. 2.	1. 2.	
	Cost Estimate No. __						1. 2.	1. 2.	

13	**Implementation Plan**								
	Implementation Plan No. __						1. 2.	1. 2.	
	Implementation Plan No. __						1. 2.	1. 2.	
14	**Environmental and Social Impact Assessment**								
	Environmental and Social Impact Assessment No. __						1. 2.	1. 2.	
	Environmental and Social Impact Assessment No. __						1. 2.	1. 2.	
15	**Resettlement Action Plan (RAP)**								
	Resettlement Action Plan (RAP) No. __						1. 2.	1. 2.	
	Resettlement Action Plan (RAP) No. __						1. 2.	1. 2.	
16	**Gender and Development (GAD) Plan No. __**								
	Gender and Development (GAD) Plan No. __						1. 2.	1. 2.	
	Gender and Development (GAD) Plan No. __						1. 2.	1. 2.	
17	**Interim Report**								
	Interim Report No. __						1. 2.	1. 2.	
	Interim Report No. __						1. 2.	1. 2.	
18	**Draft Final Report**								
	Draft Final Report No. __						1. 2.	1. 2.	
	Draft Final Report No. __						1. 2.	1. 2.	

19	**Final Report**								
	Final Report No. __						1. 2.	1. 2.	
	Final Report No. __						1. 2.	1. 2.	
20	**Drawing Volume**								
	Drawing Volume No. __						1. 2.	1. 2.	
	Drawing Volume No. __						1. 2.	1. 2.	
21	**Appendices**								
	Appendices No. __						1. 2.	1. 2.	
	Appendices No. __						1. 2.	1. 2.	
22	**Other Ancillary Works**								

Prepared by:

(Name)
Division Chief

Approved by:

(Name)
Director, *(Specialized Office)*

ANNEX B
SUMMARY OF FINDINGS

(CONSULTANT'S PERFORMANCE EVALUATION SYSTEM)

PROJECT TYPE: Detailed Engineering Design

NAME OF PROJECT:

CONSULTANT/S:

NO.	DELIVERABLES	DATE OF SUBMISSION PER TOR	DATE RECEIVED BY UPMO/IU	DATE RECEIVED BY THE SPECIALIZED OFFICE	DATE RETURNED BY THE SPECIALIZED OFFICE	DATE RETURNED BY UPMO/IU	FINDINGS BY THE SPECIALIZED OFFICE		REMARKS / STATUS
							MAJOR ERROR / INACCURACIES / DEFICIENCIES	MINOR ERROR / INACCURACIES / DEFICIENCIES	
A.	**REPORTS**								
A.1	**Inception Report**								
	Inception Report No.___						1. 2.	1. 2.	
	Inception Report No.___						1. 2.	1. 2.	
A.2	**Value Engineering Report**								
	Value Engineering Report No.___						1. 2.	1. 2.	
	Value Engineering Report No.___						1. 2.	1. 2.	
A.3	**Road Safety Audit Report (Preliminary)**								
	Road Safety Audit Report (Preliminary) No.___						1. 2.	1. 2.	
	Road Safety Audit Report (Preliminary) No.___						1. 2.	1. 2.	
A.4	**Road Safety Audit Report (Final)**								
	Road Safety Audit Report (Final) No.___						1. 2.	1. 2.	
	Road Safety Audit Report (Final) No.___						1. 2.	1. 2.	
A.5	**Geotechnical Investigation Report**								
	Geotechnical Investigation Report No___						1. 2.	1. 2.	
	Geotechnical Investigation Report No___						1. 2.	1. 2.	

A.6	**Preliminary Draft of Tender Documents**								
	Preliminary Draft of Tender Documents No.___						1. 2.	1. 2.	
	Preliminary Draft of Tender Documents No.___						1. 2.	1. 2.	
A.7	**Tender Documents (Final Form)**								
	Tender Documents (Final Form) No.___						1. 2.	1. 2.	
	Tender Documents (Final Form) No.___						1. 2.	1. 2.	
A.8	**Monthly Progress Report**								
	Monthly Progress Report No.___						1. 2.	1. 2.	
	Monthly Progress Report No.___						1. 2.	1. 2.	
A.9	**Resstlement Action Plan Report (Final Report)**								
	Resstlement Action Plan Report (Final Report) No.___						1. 2.	1. 2.	
	Resstlement Action Plan Report (Final Report) No.___						1. 2.	1. 2.	
A.10	**Utility Relocation Plans**								
	Utility Relocation Plans No.___						1. 2.	1. 2.	
	Utility Relocation Plans No.___						1. 2.	1. 2.	
A.11	**Other Ancillary Works**								
B.	**Design**								
B.1	**Hydrologic / Hydraulic Design Report**								
	Hydrologic / Hydraulic Design Report No.___						1. 2.	1. 2.	
	Hydrologic / Hydraulic Design Report No.___						1. 2.	1. 2.	

B.2	**Highway/Geometric Design and Calculation Report**								
	Highway/Geometric Design and Calculation Report No.___						1. 2.	1. 2.	
	Highway/Geometric Design and Calculation Report No.___						1. 2.	1. 2.	
B.3	**Study of Traffic Impact during Construction**								
	Study of Traffic Impact during Construction No.___						1. 2.	1. 2.	
	Study of Traffic Impact during Construction No.___						1. 2.	1. 2.	
B.4	**Quantity Calculations and Price Analysis**								
	Quantity Calculations and Price Analysis No.___						1. 2.	1. 2.	
	Quantity Calculations and Price Analysis No.___						1. 2.	1. 2.	
B.5	**Pavement Evaluation and Design Calculation Report**								
	Pavement Evaluation and Design Calculation Report No.___						1. 2.	1. 2.	
	Pavement Evaluation and Design Calculation Report No.___						1. 2.	1. 2.	
B.6	**Bridge Evaluaton and Design Report**								
	Bridge Evaluaton and Design Report No.___						1. 2.	1. 2.	
	Bridge Evaluaton and Design Report No.___						1. 2.	1. 2.	
B.7	**Structural Analyses and Design Calculation**								
	Structural Analyses and Design Calculation No.___						1. 2.	1. 2.	
	Structural Analyses and Design Calculation No.___						1. 2.	1. 2.	

B.8	**Cost Estimate**								
	Cost Estimate No.___						1. 2.	1. 2.	
	Cost Estimate No.___						1. 2.	1. 2.	
B.9	**Draft Final Design Report**								
	Draft Final Design Report No.___						1. 2.	1. 2.	
	Draft Final Design Report No.___						1. 2.	1. 2.	
B.10	**Final Design Report**								
	Final Design Report No.___						1. 2.	1. 2.	
	Final Design Report No.___						1. 2.	1. 2.	
B.11	**Other Ancillary Works**								
C.	**Drawings**								
C.1	**Detailed Preliminary Concept Design**								
	Detailed Preliminary Concept Design No.___						1. 2.	1. 2.	
	Detailed Preliminary Concept Design No.___						1. 2.	1. 2.	
C.2	**Topographic Plans**								
	Topographic Plans No.___						1. 2.	1. 2.	
	Topographic Plans No.___						1. 2.	1. 2.	
C.3	**Draft Final Design Drawings**								
	Draft Final Design Drawings No.___						1. 2.	1. 2.	
	Draft Final Design Drawings No.___						1. 2.	1. 2.	

C.4	**Final Design Drawings**								
	Final Design Drawings No.___						1. 2.	1. 2.	
	Final Design Drawings No.___						1. 2.	1. 2.	
C.5	**Right-of-Way Plans**								
	Right-of-Way Plans No.___						1. 2.	1. 2.	
	Right-of-Way Plans No.___						1. 2.	1. 2.	
C.6	**Parcellary and Subdivision Plans**								
	Parcellary and Subdivision Plans No.___						1. 2.	1. 2.	
	Parcellary and Subdivision Plans No.___						1. 2.	1. 2.	
C.7	**Other Ancillary Works**								

Prepared by:

(Name)
Division Chief

Approved by:

(Name)
Director, *(Specialized Office)*

ANNEX C
INTERMEDIATE REPORT/FORM
CONSULTANT'S PERFORMANCE EVALUATION FORM

I. Contract / Project Data

Contract No.:		Project No.:	
Project Type.:	*Feasibility Study*		
Project Name:	*(Complete Name of the Project)*		
Consultant:	*(Name of Firm)*		
Address:	*(Complete Mailing Address)*		
Telephone No.:		Fax No.:	
Project Manager:	*(Name)*		
Telephone No.:		Email Address:	
Contract Award Amount:		Date of Award:	
Project Cost:		Completion Date:	
Evaluation Rating:			

II. Performance Evaluation Summary

CRITERIA	INDICATOR	QUANTITY		RATING
1. QUALITY - 50		**Major**	**Minor**	
1.1 Adequacy and accuracy of FS assumptions, data, analyses, and outputs vs. Terms of Reference (TOR) covering the following:				
a. Engineering Surveys (Topo, Geotechnical, Hydrologic, etc.)	a. Extent and impact of errors/ inaccuracies/ deficiencies in FS data, analyses, and outputs, based on DPWH review and validation.			
	b. Number of resubmissions of corrected FS.			
b. Traffic/Market Surveys and Analyses	a. Extent and impact of errors/ inaccuracies/ deficiencies in FS data, analyses, and outputs, based on DPWH review and validation.			
	b. Number of resubmissions of corrected FS.			
c. Preliminary Engineering Design (PED) including cost estimates	a. Extent and impact of errors/ inaccuracies/ deficiencies in FS data, analyses, and outputs, based on DPWH review and validation.			
	b. Number of resubmissions of corrected FS.			

d. Economic Evaluation	a. Extent and impact of errors/ inaccuracies/ deficiencies in FS data, analyses, and outputs, based on DPWH review and validation.			
	b. Number of resubmissions of corrected FS.			
e. Environmental Impact	a. Extent and impact of errors/ inaccuracies/ deficiencies in FS data, analyses, and outputs, based on DPWH review and validation.			
	b. Number of resubmissions of corrected FS.			
f. Social GAD	a. Extent and impact of errors/ inaccuracies/ deficiencies in FS data, analyses, and outputs, based on DPWH review and validation.			
	b. Number of resubmissions of corrected FS.			
g. ROW Plan and RAP	a. Extent and impact of errors/ inaccuracies/ deficiencies in FS data, analyses, and outputs, based on DPWH review and validation.			
	b. Number of resubmissions of corrected FS.			
h. Value Engineering	a. Extent and impact of errors/ inaccuracies/ deficiencies in FS data, analyses, and outputs, based on DPWH review and validation.			
	b. Number of resubmissions of corrected FS.			
i. Risk Analyses	a. Extent and impact of errors/ inaccuracies/ deficiencies in FS data, analyses, and outputs, based on DPWH review and validation.			
	b. Number of resubmissions of corrected FS.			
j. Financial and Value for Money Analyses for PPP	a. Extent and impact of errors/ inaccuracies/ deficiencies in FS data, analyses, and outputs, based on DPWH review and validation.			
	b. Number of resubmissions of corrected FS.			
k. Operational Analyses	a. Extent and impact of errors/ inaccuracies/ deficiencies in FS data, analyses, and outputs, based on DPWH review and validation.			
	b. Number of resubmissions of corrected FS.			
l. Others				
Average Rating for Errors				
Average Rating for Resubmissions				
Rating = (Ave. Rating for Errors + Ave. Rating for Resubmissions) ÷ 2				
Rating x 40%				
Comments: *(Please note any specific information in determining performance level)*				

1.2 Cost-effectiveness of FS recommendation, including PED.	a. Extent of DPWH comments on Consultant's evaluation of alternatives, based on value engineering (VE) and other relevant criteria, leading to recommended most cost-effective			
	b. No. of revisions made		*[No. of revisions]*	*[Rating]*
Rating x 40%				
Comments: *(Please note any specific information in determining performance level)*				
1.3 Tenure of Consultant's key personnel	Incidence of replacement of key personnel (weighted according to their roles) with or without valid reasons.			
Rating x 20%				
Comments: *(Please note any specific information in determining performance level)*				
Rating (QUALITY) = Item 1.1(40%) + Item 1.2(40%) + Item 1.3(20%)				
TOTAL SCORE FOR QUALITY = Rating(QUALITY) x 0.50				
2. COST OF OUTPUT - 20				
2.1 Completeness of FS/PED cost estimates vs. TOR	Extent of coverage of FS/PED cost elements: materials, labor, equipment, indirect costs (cost of money, insurance, contingencies, taxes, etc.), ROW,etc., per DPWH guidelines.			
Rating x 40%				
Comments: *(Please note any specific information in determining performance level)*				
2.2 Comparison of FS/PED cost estimates with accepted benchmarks	Extent of variance of FS/PED cost estimates vs. accepted DPWH/industry benchmarks/standards (e.g., cost per km of road, cost/lineal meter of bridge, cost/sq. m of bldg.) and vs. required +/-20% accuracy - adjusted for special characteristics.			
Rating x 60%				
Comments: *(Please note any specific information in determining performance level)*				
Rating (COST OF OUTPUT) = Item 2.1(40%) + Item 2.2(60%)				
TOTAL SCORE FOR COST = Rating(COST OF OUTPUT) x 0.20				
3. SCHEDULE - 30				
3.1 Adherence to schedule of accepted FS deliverables	Extent of actual time slippage (delay) vs. original/approved schedule for FS deliverables, due to the Consultant's fault.		Time Slippage (%)	Rating
a. [Name of deliverable]	*[Expected date of submission as per TOR]*	*[Actual date of submission]*		
b. [Name of deliverable]	*[Expected date of submission as per TOR]*	*[Actual date of submission]*		
c. [Name of deliverable]	*[Expected date of submission as per TOR]*	*[Actual date of submission]*		

d. [Name of deliverable]	*[Expected date of submission as per TOR]*	*[Actual date of submission]*		
e. [Name of deliverable]	*[Expected date of submission as per TOR]*	*[Actual date of submission]*		
f. [Name of deliverable]	*[Expected date of submission as per TOR]*	*[Actual date of submission]*		
Rating				
Comments: *(Please note any specific information in determining performance level)*				
Rating (SCHEDULE)				
TOTAL SCORE FOR SCHEDULE = Rating(SCHEDULE) x 0.30				
Evaluation Rating = QUALITY(50%) + COST(20%) + SCHEDULE(30%)				

III. Recommendations

Evaluated by:

Designation

Designation

Designation

Noted by:

Designation

ANNEX C
INTERMEDIATE REPORT/FORM
CONSULTANT'S PERFORMANCE EVALUATION FORM

I. Contract / Project Data

Contract No.:		Project No.:	
Project Type.:	*Detailed Engineering Design*		
Project Name:	*(Complete Name of the Project)*		
Consultant:	*(Name of Firm)*		
Address:	*(Complete Mailing Address)*		
Telephone No.:		Fax No.:	
Project Manager:	*(Name)*		
Telephone No.:		Email Address:	
Contract Award Amount:		Date of Award:	
Project Cost:		Completion Date:	
Evaluation Rating:			

II. Performance Evaluation Summary

CRITERIA	INDICATOR	QUANTITY		RATING
1. QUALITY - 60		**Major**	**Minor**	
1.1 Adequacy and accuracy of DED surveys, analyses, and outputs vs. Terms of Reference (TOR) covering the following:				
a. Field investigations/ surveys (topographic, geotechnical, hydrolo-gic, parcellary, etc.)	a. Extent and impact of errors/inaccuracies/ deficiencies in DED surveys, analyses, and outputs, based on DPWH review and validation			
	b. Number of resubmissions of corrected DED			
b. Design analyses (geometric, structural, seismic, hydro, etc.)	a. Extent and impact of errors/ inaccuracies/ deficiencies in FS data, analyses, and outputs, based on DPWH review and validation.			
	b. Number of resubmissions of corrected FS.			
c. Drawings	a. Extent and impact of errors/ inaccuracies/ deficiencies in FS data, analyses, and outputs, based on DPWH review and validation.			
	b. Number of resubmissions of corrected FS.			

d. Specifications	a. Extent and impact of errors/ inaccuracies/ deficiencies in FS data, analyses, and outputs, based on DPWH review and validation.			
	b. Number of resubmissions of corrected FS.			
e. Bidding documents	a. Extent and impact of errors/ inaccuracies/ deficiencies in FS data, analyses, and outputs, based on DPWH review and validation.			
	b. Number of resubmissions of corrected FS.			
f. Others	a. Extent and impact of errors/ inaccuracies/ deficiencies in FS data, analyses, and outputs, based on DPWH review and validation.			
	b. Number of resubmissions of corrected FS.			
l. Others				
Average Rating for Errors				
Rating x 60%				
Comments: *(Please note any specific information in determining performance level)*				
1.2 Cost-effectiveness of DED	a. Extent of DPWH comments on Consultant's evaluation of alternative schemes, using VE and other relevant criteria, leading to recommendation of most cost-effective alternative.			
	b. No. of revisions/ resubmissions made.	*[No. of revisions]*		*[Rating]*
Rating x 20%				
Comments: *(Please note any specific information in determining performance level)*				
1.3 Tenure of Consultant's key personnel	Incidence of replacement of key personnel (weighted according to their roles) with/without valid reasons			
Rating x 20%				
Comments: *(Please note any specific information in determining performance level)*				
Rating (QUALITY) = Item 1.1(60%) + Item 1.2(20%) + Item 1.3(20%)				
TOTAL SCORE FOR QUALITY = Rating(QUALITY) x 0.60				
2. COST OF OUTPUT - 20				
2.1 Completeness and accuracy of DED cost estimates vs. DPWH guidelines	a. Extent of coverage of DED cost elements: materials, labor, equipment, indirect costs (cost of money, insurance, bonds, contingencies, profit, taxes, etc.), ROW, per DPWH guidelines.	*[Variance]*		*[Rating]*
	b. Adequacy of Detailed Unit Price Analysis (DUPA)			

Rating x 40%				
Comments: *(Please note any specific information in determining performance level)*				
2.2 Comparison of DED cost estimates with accepted benchmarks.	Extent of variance of DED cost estimates vs. DPWH/industry benchmarks/standards (e.g., cost/km of road, cost/lineal m of bridge, cost/sq m of bldg.), and vs. required +/-5-10% accuracy - adjusted for special characteristics.		[Variance]	[Rating]
Rating x 60%				
Comments: *(Please note any specific information in determining performance level)*				
Rating (COST OF OUTPUT) = Item 2.1(40%) + Item 2.2(60%)				
TOTAL SCORE FOR COST = Rating(COST OF OUTPUT) x 0.20				
3. SCHEDULE - 20				
3.1 Adherence to schedule of accepted DED deliverables	Extent of actual time slippage (delay) vs. original/approved schedule for deliverables, due to the Consultant's fault.		Time Slippage (%)	Rating
a. [Name of deliverable]	*[Expected date of submission as per TOR]*	*[Actual date of submission]*		
b. [Name of deliverable]	*[Expected date of submission as per TOR]*	*[Actual date of submission]*		
c. [Name of deliverable]	*[Expected date of submission as per TOR]*	*[Actual date of submission]*		
d. [Name of deliverable]	*[Expected date of submission as per TOR]*	*[Actual date of submission]*		
e. [Name of deliverable]	*[Expected date of submission as per TOR]*	*[Actual date of submission]*		
f. [Name of deliverable]	*[Expected date of submission as per TOR]*	*[Actual date of submission]*		
Rating				
Comments: *(Please note any specific information in determining performance level)*				
Rating (SCHEDULE)				
TOTAL SCORE FOR SCHEDULE = Rating(SCHEDULE) x 0.20				
Evaluation Rating = QUALITY(50%) + COST(20%) + SCHEDULE(30%)				

III. Recommendations

Evaluated by:

Designation	Designation
Designation	

Noted by:

Designation

ANNEX C
INTERMEDIATE REPORT/FORM
CONSULTANT'S PERFORMANCE EVALUATION FORM

I. Contract / Project Data

Contract No.:		Project No.:	
Project Type.:	*Construction Supervision*		
Project Name:	*(Complete Name of the Project)*		
Consultant:	*(Name of Firm)*		
Address:	*(Complete Mailing Address)*		
Telephone No.:		Fax No.:	
Project Manager:	*(Name)*		
Telephone No.:		Email Address:	
Contract Award Amount:		Date of Award:	
Project Cost:		Completion Date:	
Evaluation Rating:			

II. Performance Evaluation Summary

CRITERIA	INDICATOR	QUANTITY		RATING
1. QUALITY - 60		**Major**	**Minor**	
1.1 Consultant's efficiency in ensuring contractor's compliance of its construction work with the approved DED, particularly plans and specifications	Incidence of construction defects/deficiencies stated in the Statement of Works Accomplished (SWA) recommended by Consultant for payment,but found by DPWH to be not in accordance with the approved plans and specifications.	[Variance]		[Rating]
Comments: *(Please note any specific information in determining performance level)*				
Rating x 50%				
1.2 Quality of Consultant's const. supervision (CS) system:				
a. Organization of key personnel	Incidence of deficiencies in the Consultant's CS system, covering the five (5) criteria (column 1).			

b. Control of Materials (e.g., checking contractor's test procedures and results)	Incidence of deficiencies in the Consultant's CS system, covering the five (5) criteria (column 1).			
c. Documentation [Reporting and records management (e.g., log book, test results, site instructions, progress reports, etc.)]	Incidence of deficiencies in the Consultant's CS system, covering the five (5) criteria (column 1).			
d. Other Management Considerations				
• Construction Safety Management	Incidence of deficiencies in the Consultant's CS system, covering the five (5) criteria (column 1).			
• Traffic Management	Incidence of deficiencies in the Consultant's CS system, covering the five (5) criteria (column 1).			
• Labor Management	Incidence of deficiencies in the Consultant's CS system, covering the five (5) criteria (column 1).			
• Environmental Management	Incidence of deficiencies in the Consultant's CS system, covering the five (5) criteria (column 1).			
Average Rating for Errors				
Rating x 40%				
Comments: *(Please note any specific information in determining performance level)*				
1.3 Tenure of Consultant's key personnel	Incidence of replacement of key personnel (weighted according to their roles) with/without valid reasons			
Rating x 10%				
Comments: *(Please note any specific information in determining performance level)*				
Rating (QUALITY) = Item 1.1(50%) + Item 1.2(40%) + Item 1.3(10%)				
TOTAL SCORE FOR QUALITY = Rating(QUALITY) x 0.60				
2. COST OF OUTPUT - 20				
2.Consultant's efficiency in controlling cost overruns.	Incidence of variation orders (VOs) with cost overruns, recommended by Consultant, but disapproved by DPWH, except VOs initiated itself by DPWH.	*[No. of Cases]*		*[Rating]*

Comments: *(Please note any specific information in determining performance level)*				
Rating (COST OF OUTPUT)				
TOTAL SCORE FOR COST = Rating(COST OF OUTPUT) x 0.20				
3. SCHEDULE - 20				
3.1 Consultant's efficiency in ensuring contractor's adherence to approved construction schedule.	Extent of slippage of planned accomplishment vs. actual accomplishment.		*[Variance]*	*[Rating]*
Rating x 40%				
Comments: *(Please note any specific information in determining performance level)*				
3.2 Consultant's prudent evaluation of proposed contract time extensions	Incidence of contract time extensions recommended by Consultant but disapproved/reduced by DPWH – except time extensions for VOs due to faulty DED or for VOs initiated by DPWH.		*[No. of Cases]*	*[Rating]*
Rating x 30%				
Comments: *(Please note any specific information in determining performance level)*				
3.3 Consultant's timeliness in submitting required reports and documents	Extent of Consultant's compliance with prescribed schedule to submit project reports and other documents		No. of Days	Rating
a. [Name of deliverable]	*[Expected date of submission as per TOR]*	*[Actual date of submission]*		
b. [Name of deliverable]	*[Expected date of submission as per TOR]*	*[Actual date of submission]*		
c. [Name of deliverable]	*[Expected date of submission as per TOR]*	*[Actual date of submission]*		
d. [Name of deliverable]	*[Expected date of submission as per TOR]*	*[Actual date of submission]*		
e. [Name of deliverable]	*[Expected date of submission as per TOR]*	*[Actual date of submission]*		
f. [Name of deliverable]	*[Expected date of submission as per TOR]*	*[Actual date of submission]*		
Rating x 30%				
Comments: *(Please note any specific information in determining performance level)*				
Average Rating for Errors				
Rating (Schedule) = Item 3.1(40%) + Item 3.2(30%) + Item 3.3(30%)				
TOTAL SCORE FOR SCHEDULE = Rating(SCHEDULE) x 0.20				
Evaluation Rating = QUALITY(60%) + COST(20%) + SCHEDULE(20%)				

III. Recommendations

Evaluated by:

Designation	Designation
Designation	

Noted by:

Designation

ANNEX D
FINAL REPORT/FORM
CONSULTANT'S PERFORMANCE EVALUATION FORM

I. Contract / Project Data

Contract No.:		Project No.:	
Project Type.:	*Feasibility Study*		
Project Name:	*(Complete Name of the Project)*		
Consultant:	*(Name of Firm)*		
Address:	*(Complete Mailing Address)*		
Telephone No.:		Fax No.:	
Project Manager:	*(Name)*		
Telephone No.:		Email Address:	
Contract Award Amount:		Date of Award:	
Project Cost:		Completion Date:	
Evaluation Rating:			

II. Performance Evaluation Summary

CRITERIA	INDICATOR	QUANTITY		RATING
1. QUALITY - 50		**Major**	**Minor**	
1.1 Adequacy and accuracy of FS assumptions, data, analyses, and outputs vs. Terms of Reference (TOR) covering the following:				
a. Engineering Surveys (Topo, Geotechnical, Hydrologic, etc.)	a. Extent and impact of errors/ inaccuracies/ deficiencies in FS data, analyses, and outputs, based on DPWH review and validation.			
	b. Number of resubmissions of corrected FS.			
b. Traffic/Market Surveys and Analyses	a. Extent and impact of errors/ inaccuracies/ deficiencies in FS data, analyses, and outputs, based on DPWH review and validation.			
	b. Number of resubmissions of corrected FS.			
c. Preliminary Engineering Design (PED) including cost estimates	a. Extent and impact of errors/ inaccuracies/ deficiencies in FS data, analyses, and outputs, based on DPWH review and validation.			
	b. Number of resubmissions of corrected FS.			

d. Economic Evaluation	a. Extent and impact of errors/ inaccuracies/ deficiencies in FS data, analyses, and outputs, based on DPWH review and validation.			
	b. Number of resubmissions of corrected FS.			
e. Environmental Impact	a. Extent and impact of errors/ inaccuracies/ deficiencies in FS data, analyses, and outputs, based on DPWH review and validation.			
	b. Number of resubmissions of corrected FS.			
f. Social GAD	a. Extent and impact of errors/ inaccuracies/ deficiencies in FS data, analyses, and outputs, based on DPWH review and validation.			
	b. Number of resubmissions of corrected FS.			
g. ROW Plan and RAP	a. Extent and impact of errors/ inaccuracies/ deficiencies in FS data, analyses, and outputs, based on DPWH review and validation.			
	b. Number of resubmissions of corrected FS.			
h. Value Engineering	a. Extent and impact of errors/ inaccuracies/ deficiencies in FS data, analyses, and outputs, based on DPWH review and validation.			
	b. Number of resubmissions of corrected FS.			
i. Risk Analyses	a. Extent and impact of errors/ inaccuracies/ deficiencies in FS data, analyses, and outputs, based on DPWH review and validation.			
	b. Number of resubmissions of corrected FS.			
j. Financial and Value for Money Analyses for PPP	a. Extent and impact of errors/ inaccuracies/ deficiencies in FS data, analyses, and outputs, based on DPWH review and validation.			
	b. Number of resubmissions of corrected FS.			
k. Operational Analyses	a. Extent and impact of errors/ inaccuracies/ deficiencies in FS data, analyses, and outputs, based on DPWH review and validation.			
	b. Number of resubmissions of corrected FS.			
l. Others				
Average Rating for Errors				
Average Rating for Resubmissions				
Rating = (Ave. Rating for Errors + Ave. Rating for Resubmissions) ÷ 2				
Rating x 40%				
Comments: *(Please note any specific information in determining performance level)*				

1.2 Cost-effectiveness of FS recommendation, including PED.	a. Extent of DPWH comments on Consultant's evaluation of alternatives, based on value engineering (VE) and other relevant criteria, leading to recommended most cost-effective			
	b. No. of revisions made		*[No. of revisions]*	*[Rating]*
Rating x 40%				
Comments: *(Please note any specific information in determining performance level)*				
1.3 Tenure of Consultant's key personnel	Incidence of replacement of key personnel (weighted according to their roles) with or without valid reasons.			
Rating x 20%				
Comments: *(Please note any specific information in determining performance level)*				
Rating (QUALITY) = Item 1.1(40%) + Item 1.2(40%) + Item 1.3(20%)				
TOTAL SCORE FOR QUALITY = Rating(QUALITY) x 0.50				
2. COST OF OUTPUT - 20				
2.1 Completeness of FS/PED cost estimates vs. TOR	Extent of coverage of FS/PED cost elements: materials, labor, equipment, indirect costs (cost of money, insurance, contingencies, taxes, etc.), ROW,etc., per DPWH guidelines.			
Rating x 40%				
Comments: *(Please note any specific information in determining performance level)*				
2.2 Comparison of FS/PED cost estimates with accepted benchmarks	Extent of variance of FS/PED cost estimates vs. accepted DPWH/industry benchmarks/standards (e.g., cost per km of road, cost/lineal meter of bridge, cost/sq. m of bldg.) and vs. required +/-20% accuracy - adjusted for special characteristics.			
Rating x 60%				
Comments: *(Please note any specific information in determining performance level)*				
Rating (COST OF OUTPUT) = Item 2.1(40%) + Item 2.2(60%)				
TOTAL SCORE FOR COST = Rating(COST OF OUTPUT) x 0.20				
3. SCHEDULE - 30				
3.1 Adherence to schedule of accepted FS deliverables	Extent of actual time slippage (delay) vs. original/approved schedule for FS deliverables, due to the Consultant's fault.		Time Slippage (%)	Rating
a. [Name of deliverable]	*[Expected date of submission as per TOR]*	*[Actual date of submission]*		
b. [Name of deliverable]	*[Expected date of submission as per TOR]*	*[Actual date of submission]*		
c. [Name of deliverable]	*[Expected date of submission as per TOR]*	*[Actual date of submission]*		

d. [Name of deliverable]	*[Expected date of submission as per TOR]*	*[Actual date of submission]*		
e. [Name of deliverable]	*[Expected date of submission as per TOR]*	*[Actual date of submission]*		
f. [Name of deliverable]	*[Expected date of submission as per TOR]*	*[Actual date of submission]*		
Rating				
Comments: *(Please note any specific information in determining performance level)*				
Rating (SCHEDULE)				
TOTAL SCORE FOR SCHEDULE = Rating(SCHEDULE) x 0.30				
Evaluation Rating = QUALITY(50%) + COST(20%) + SCHEDULE(30%)				

III. Recommendations

Evaluated by:

Designation

Designation

Designation

Approved by:

Designation

Concurred by:

(Name of Consultant)

Designation

ANNEX D
FINAL REPORT/FORM
CONSULTANT'S PERFORMANCE EVALUATION FORM

I. Contract / Project Data

Contract No.:		Project No.:	
Project Type.:	*Detailed Engineering Design*		
Project Name:	*(Complete Name of the Project)*		
Consultant:	*(Name of Firm)*		
Address:	*(Complete Mailing Address)*		
Telephone No.:		Fax No.:	
Project Manager:	*(Name)*		
Telephone No.:		Email Address:	
Contract Award Amount:		Date of Award:	
Project Cost:		Completion Date:	
Evaluation Rating:			

II. Performance Evaluation Summary

CRITERIA	INDICATOR	QUANTITY		RATING
1. QUALITY - 60		**Major**	**Minor**	
1.1 Adequacy and accuracy of DED surveys, analyses, and outputs vs. Terms of Reference (TOR) covering the following:				
a. Field investigations/ surveys (topographic, geotechnical, hydrolo-gic, parcellary, etc.)	a. Extent and impact of errors/inaccuracies/ deficiencies in DED surveys, analyses, and outputs, based on DPWH review and validation			
	b. Number of resubmissions of corrected DED			
b. Design analyses (geometric, structural, seismic, hydro, etc.)	a. Extent and impact of errors/ inaccuracies/ deficiencies in FS data, analyses, and outputs, based on DPWH review and validation.			
	b. Number of resubmissions of corrected FS.			
c. Drawings	a. Extent and impact of errors/ inaccuracies/ deficiencies in FS data, analyses, and outputs, based on DPWH review and validation.			
	b. Number of resubmissions of corrected FS.			

d. Specifications	a. Extent and impact of errors/ inaccuracies/ deficiencies in FS data, analyses, and outputs, based on DPWH review and validation.			
	b. Number of resubmissions of corrected FS.			
e. Bidding documents	a. Extent and impact of errors/ inaccuracies/ deficiencies in FS data, analyses, and outputs, based on DPWH review and validation.			
	b. Number of resubmissions of corrected FS.			
f. Others	a. Extent and impact of errors/ inaccuracies/ deficiencies in FS data, analyses, and outputs, based on DPWH review and validation.			
	b. Number of resubmissions of corrected FS.			
l. Others				
Average Rating for Errors				
Rating x 60%				
Comments: *(Please note any specific information in determining performance level)*				
1.2 Cost-effectiveness of DED	a. Extent of DPWH comments on Consultant's evaluation of alternative schemes, using VE and other relevant criteria, leading to recommendation of most cost-effective alternative.			
	b. No. of revisions/ resubmissions made.	*[No. of revisions]*		*[Rating]*
Rating x 20%				
Comments: *(Please note any specific information in determining performance level)*				
1.3 Tenure of Consultant's key personnel	Incidence of replacement of key personnel (weighted according to their roles) with/without valid reasons			
Rating x 20%				
Comments: *(Please note any specific information in determining performance level)*				
Rating (QUALITY) = Item 1.1(60%) + Item 1.2(20%) + Item 1.3(20%)				
TOTAL SCORE FOR QUALITY = Rating(QUALITY) x 0.60				
2. COST OF OUTPUT - 20				
2.1 Completeness and accuracy of DED cost estimates vs. DPWH guidelines	a. Extent of coverage of DED cost elements: materials, labor, equipment, indirect costs (cost of money, insurance, bonds, contingencies, profit, taxes, etc.), ROW, per DPWH guidelines.	*[Variance]*		*[Rating]*
	b. Adequacy of Detailed Unit Price Analysis (DUPA)			
Rating x 40%				

Comments: *(Please note any specific information in determining performance level)*				
2.2 Comparison of DED cost estimates with accepted benchmarks.	Extent of variance of DED cost estimates vs. DPWH/industry benchmarks/standards (e.g., cost/km of road, cost/lineal m of bridge, cost/sq m of bldg.), and vs. required +/-5-10% accuracy - adjusted for special characteristics.		[Variance]	[Rating]
Rating x 60%				
Comments: *(Please note any specific information in determining performance level)*				
Rating (COST OF OUTPUT) = Item 2.1(40%) + Item 2.2(60%)				
TOTAL SCORE FOR COST = Rating(COST OF OUTPUT) x 0.20				
3. SCHEDULE - 20				
3.1 Adherence to schedule of accepted DED deliverables	Extent of actual time slippage (delay) vs. original/approved schedule for deliverables, due to the Consultant's fault.		Time Slippage (%)	Rating
a. [Name of deliverable]	*[Expected date of submission as per TOR]*	*[Actual date of submission]*		
b. [Name of deliverable]	*[Expected date of submission as per TOR]*	*[Actual date of submission]*		
c. [Name of deliverable]	*[Expected date of submission as per TOR]*	*[Actual date of submission]*		
d. [Name of deliverable]	*[Expected date of submission as per TOR]*	*[Actual date of submission]*		
e. [Name of deliverable]	*[Expected date of submission as per TOR]*	*[Actual date of submission]*		
f. [Name of deliverable]	*[Expected date of submission as per TOR]*	*[Actual date of submission]*		
Rating				
Comments: *(Please note any specific information in determining performance level)*				
Rating (SCHEDULE)				
TOTAL SCORE FOR SCHEDULE = Rating(SCHEDULE) x 0.20				
Evaluation Rating = QUALITY(50%) + COST(20%) + SCHEDULE(30%)				

III. Recommendations

Evaluated by:

Designation	Designation
Designation	

Noted by:

Designation

Concurred by:

(Name of Consultant)
Designation

ANNEX D
FINAL REPORT/FORM
CONSULTANT'S PERFORMANCE EVALUATION FORM

I. Contract / Project Data

Contract No.:		Project No.:	
Project Type.:	*Construction Supervision*		
Project Name:	*(Complete Name of the Project)*		
Consultant:	*(Name of Firm)*		
Address:	*(Complete Mailing Address)*		
Telephone No.:		Fax No.:	
Project Manager:	*(Name)*		
Telephone No.:		Email Address:	
Contract Award Amount:		Date of Award:	
Project Cost:		Completion Date:	
Evaluation Rating:			

II. Performance Evaluation Summary

CRITERIA	INDICATOR	QUANTITY		RATING
1. QUALITY - 60		**Major**	**Minor**	
1.1 Consultant's efficiency in ensuring contractor's compliance of its construction work with the approved DED, particularly plans and specifications	Incidence of construction defects/deficiencies stated in the Statement of Works Accomplished (SWA) recommended by Consultant for payment,but found by DPWH to be not in accordance with the approved plans and specifications.	[Variance]		[Rating]
Comments: *(Please note any specific information in determining performance level)*				
Rating x 50%				
1.2 Quality of Consultant's const. supervision (CS) system:				
a. Organization of key personnel	Incidence of deficiencies in the Consultant's CS system, covering the five (5) criteria (column 1).			

b. Control of Materials (e.g., checking contractor's test procedures and results)	Incidence of deficiencies in the Consultant's CS system, covering the five (5) criteria (column 1).			
c. Documentation [Reporting and records management (e.g., log book, test results, site instructions, progress reports, etc.)]	Incidence of deficiencies in the Consultant's CS system, covering the five (5) criteria (column 1).			
d. Other Management Considerations				
• Construction Safety Management	Incidence of deficiencies in the Consultant's CS system, covering the five (5) criteria (column 1).			
• Traffic Management	Incidence of deficiencies in the Consultant's CS system, covering the five (5) criteria (column 1).			
• Labor Management	Incidence of deficiencies in the Consultant's CS system, covering the five (5) criteria (column 1).			
• Environmental Management	Incidence of deficiencies in the Consultant's CS system, covering the five (5) criteria (column 1).			
Average Rating for Errors				
Rating x 40%				
Comments: *(Please note any specific information in determining performance level)*				
1.3 Tenure of Consultant's key personnel	Incidence of replacement of key personnel (weighted according to their roles) with/without valid reasons			
Rating x 10%				
Comments: *(Please note any specific information in determining performance level)*				
Rating (QUALITY) = Item 1.1(50%) + Item 1.2(40%) + Item 1.3(10%)				
TOTAL SCORE FOR QUALITY = Rating(QUALITY) x 0.60				
2. COST OF OUTPUT - 20				
2.Consultant's efficiency in controlling cost overruns.	Incidence of variation orders (VOs) with cost overruns, recommended by Consultant, but disapproved by DPWH, except VOs initiated itself by DPWH.	*[No. of Cases]*		*[Rating]*

Comments: *(Please note any specific information in determining performance level)*				
Rating (COST OF OUTPUT)				
TOTAL SCORE FOR COST = Rating(COST OF OUTPUT) x 0.20				
3. SCHEDULE - 20				
3.1 Consultant's efficiency in ensuring contractor's adherence to approved construction schedule.	Extent of slippage of planned accomplishment vs. actual accomplishment.		*[Variance]*	*[Rating]*
Rating x 40%				
Comments: *(Please note any specific information in determining performance level)*				
3.2 Consultant's prudent evaluation of proposed contract time extensions	Incidence of contract time extensions recommended by Consultant but disapproved/reduced by DPWH – except time extensions for VOs due to faulty DED or for VOs initiated by DPWH.		*[No. of Cases]*	*[Rating]*
Rating x 30%				
Comments: *(Please note any specific information in determining performance level)*				
3.3 Consultant's timeliness in submitting required reports and documents	Extent of Consultant's compliance with prescribed schedule to submit project reports and other documents		No. of Days	Rating
a. [Name of deliverable]	*[Expected date of submission as per TOR]*	*[Actual date of submission]*		
b. [Name of deliverable]	*[Expected date of submission as per TOR]*	*[Actual date of submission]*		
c. [Name of deliverable]	*[Expected date of submission as per TOR]*	*[Actual date of submission]*		
d. [Name of deliverable]	*[Expected date of submission as per TOR]*	*[Actual date of submission]*		
e. [Name of deliverable]	*[Expected date of submission as per TOR]*	*[Actual date of submission]*		
f. [Name of deliverable]	*[Expected date of submission as per TOR]*	*[Actual date of submission]*		
Rating x 30%				
Comments: *(Please note any specific information in determining performance level)*				
Average Rating for Errors				
Rating (Schedule) = Item 3.1(40%) + Item 3.2(30%) + Item 3.3(30%)				
TOTAL SCORE FOR SCHEDULE = Rating(SCHEDULE) x 0.20				
Evaluation Rating = QUALITY(60%) + COST(20%) + SCHEDULE(20%)				

III. Recommendations

Evaluated by:

Designation

Designation

Designation

Noted by:

Designation

Concurred by:

(Name of Consultant)
Designation