

NATIONAL AGRICULTURAL HIGHER EDUCATION PROJECT

(Project Implementation Unit)

INDIAN COUNCIL OF AGRICULTURAL RESEARCH

KRISHI ANUSANDHAN BHAWAN-II, NEW DELHI-12



Website: www.icar.org.in/nahep.icar.gov.in

Country: India

Name of the Project: National Agricultural Higher Education Project (NAHEP)

Loan No.: 8776-IN

Sector: Agriculture

Project ID No.: P151072

Assignment Title: Post Procurement Review (PPR)

EXPRESSION OF INTEREST

1. The Government of India (GOI) has received a loan from the International Bank for Reconstruction and Development (IBRD) for funding the National Agricultural Higher Education Project (NAHEP) of the Indian Council of Agricultural Research (ICAR) and intends to apply part of the proceeds towards a consultancy for conducting Post Procurement Review (PPR) of the funded contracts under NAHEP.

2. The services include:

- verify that the procurement procedures followed for the project comply with the requirements of the legal agreement, and identify any non-compliance with the legal agreement and applicable procurement arrangements;
- check that the procurement arrangements agreed with the Borrower are still in place;
- identify and report any contract management issues;
- check that the Borrower has carried out technical compliance reviews and physical completion reviews for implemented contracts;
- identify and report any indications of possible Fraud and Corruption;
- identify mitigating measures to correct procurement deficiencies or deter future deficiencies and recommend them to the Borrower;
- identify good practices and lessons learned from implementing procurement;
- rate the performance of sampled contracts (procurement process and contract implementation) on compliance with the legal agreement and agreed procedures and contribute to the overall procurement performance rating of the implementing agency based on the rating of the PPR; and
- provide a basis for updating the project procurement risk and the risk mitigation plan.

Implementation period: up to March 2024

Monitoring Organization: PIU, NAHEP, ICAR, New Delhi

3. PIU, NAHEP invites eligible consultants to indicate their interest in providing the services indicated at para 2 above. Interested consultant must provide the following information along with documentary evidence indicating that they are qualified to perform the services:
 - a. Company profile with organization setup, details of experiences in audit of public procurement, turnover of last three financial years (i.e., FY 2019-20, 2020-21 & 2021-22), staff strength of the firm, geographical spread (i.e., no. of office in different cities, etc.).
 - b. Core business of the firm and number of years in business.
 - c. General qualifications and number of professional staff (list to be attached).
 - d. No. of staff having procurement audit experience with World Bank assignment (list to be attached).
 - e. Experiences showing handling of similar nature of assignments during the last five financial years (i.e., FY 2017-18, 2018-19, 2019-20, 2020-21 & 2021-22).
4. A consultant will be selected in accordance with the procedures set out in the World Bank's Guidelines: Selection and Employment of Consultants by World Bank Borrowers, January 2011 (revised July 2014) under "Selection based on Consultants' Qualification" method.
5. Interested consultants may obtain further information at the address given below on any working days from 1000 to 1700 hours.
6. Expression of Interest must be submitted in hard copy to the address given below by 06th Feb, 2023 till 16.00 hours.

Rajesh Kumar Jha
Deputy Secretary & Procurement Officer, PIU-NAHEP
Room No.503, 5th Floor, KAB-II, Pusa Campus, New Delhi-110012, India
Telephone: 011-2584 8772, Email: piunahep1822@gmail.com

TERMS OF REFERENCE

FOR CONDUCTING POST PROCUREMENT REVIEWS OF CONTRACTS FUNDED UNDER WORLD BANK-FINANCED NATIONAL AGRICULTURAL HIGHER EDUCATION PROJECT

1. Background

For each project, one or more implementing agencies (IA) of the borrower, located at various levels throughout the country (central, state, district, etc.) manage the project's procurement-related aspects including goods, works, and consulting and other services.

Depending on the Bank's assessment of the procurement capacity of the IA and other fiduciary factors, contracts awarded by the borrower are separated into two categories by a monetary threshold established in the Loan, Credit or Trust Fund Agreement. Contracts above this threshold are subject to prior review and must be cleared by the Bank at the key procurement processing milestones defined in the Bank's Guidelines for Procurement under IBRD Loans and Credits and the Guidelines for Selection and Employment of Consultants by World Bank Borrowers ("Guidelines") before the borrower proceeds to the next milestone. Contracts below this threshold are subject to post review, which means that the IA may conduct the entire procurement process without the Bank's prior review and clearance. However, the procurement process for contracts subject to post review is essentially the same as that for contracts subject to prior review, namely:

- a. the agreed procurement procedures must be followed as per the specific procurement arrangements in the Loan, Credit or Trust Fund Agreement, including the Project Procurement Plan and relevant provisions of the Guidelines;
- b. all documentation related to the contract must be retained by the IA for a minimum of two years after the project closing date; and
- c. the documentation must be readily accessible and made available upon the Bank's request.

2. Introduction

Conducting a procurement post review (PPR) includes: (i) selecting a representative sample of contracts randomly from the total volume of post review contracts recorded in the Project Procurement Plan as having been awarded, (ii) performing a detailed review of the procurement procedures followed, in order to determine compliance with the agreed procedures and (iii) physical verification of the procured goods and works.

The project nodal agency is primarily responsible for ensuring that PPRs are conducted as required, presenting the findings to Bank, reviewing the findings of completed PPRs and for following up on recommended actions.

In order to meet this requirement, the PIU/NAHEP requires the services of Consultant (firm) that is fully qualified to undertake such PPRs at the location of IAs.

3. Main Objectives

The main objectives of the Consultant's services are to:

- a. verify that the procurement procedures followed for the project comply with the requirements of the legal agreement, and identify any noncompliance with the legal agreement and applicable procurement arrangements;

- b. check that the procurement arrangements agreed with the Borrower are still in place;
- c. identify and report any contract management issues;
- d. check that the Borrower has carried out technical compliance reviews and physical completion reviews for implemented contracts;
- e. identify and report any indications of possible Fraud and Corruption;
- f. identify mitigating measures to correct procurement deficiencies or deter future deficiencies and recommend them to the Borrower;
- g. identify good practices and lessons learned from implementing procurement;
- h. rate the performance of sampled contracts (procurement process and contract implementation) on compliance with the legal agreement and agreed procedures and contribute to the overall procurement performance rating of the implementing agency based on the rating of the PPR; and
- i. provide a basis for updating the project procurement risk and the risk mitigation plan.

4. Scope of Review

(a) Preparation. The scope of the PPR for which the Consultants services are required encompasses the universe of post-review contracts for the given time period across the participating Agricultural Universities (AUs) and other Implementing Agencies (IAs) under NAHEP.

The ICAR/NAHEP will provide the Consultant, on request, the following documents:

- Names and addresses of participating AUs, IAs and responsible officials and staff;
- Loan, Credit or Trust Fund Agreement
- Contract list of all post-review contracts which are eligible for Bank-financing
- Project Appraisal Document (PAD)

The Consultant is further directed to refer to the “South Asia Region Procurement Post Review Guidance Note”, which is attached to and made a part of these Terms of Reference (TOR), and to the website of the Bank’s Operations Policy and Services Group (OPCPR) which offers access to the Guidelines, standard bidding and bid evaluation documents and more.

The PPR will be based on the Consultant’s review of a representative sample of contracts that are subject to post review under the Loan Agreement. The Consultant will select this representative sample on a random basis from the latest, updated Project Procurement Plan in STEP.¹The Bank will provide a verified list of post review contracts. The Consultant may use either the sampling methodology set out in the Guidance Note or their own methodology. The size of the representative sample of contracts should generally not be less than (a) one in five contracts for high-risk agencies, (b) one in ten contracts for substantial risk agencies, (c) one in fifteen contracts for moderate risk agencies, and (d)one in twenty contracts for low-risk agencies.

Post Review Cycle

PPR is conducted annually.

Planning. The Consultant’s contract price will initially be based on ICAR/NAHEP’s own estimate of the scope and complexity of the services required. The Consultant will be expected to commence his/ her services on that basis.

Similarly, the Consultant’s schedule for completing the work under the contract will initially be based

¹ System for Tracking Expenditures and Procurement

on the Bank's estimate of the time required, the projected schedule of supervision missions (SPN) and other operational deadlines. This Consultant should notify the National Director, ICAR/NAHEP as soon as it has determined that this schedule should be extended for reasons beyond the Consultant's control.

The Consultant should inquire about the office hours of the participating AUs and IAs and the availability of the appropriate AU/ IA staff with whom they would have to work to complete the PPR. Any impediments in this regard should be brought to the attention of the National Director, ICAR/NAHEP.

In line with the completion schedule agreed between the Consultant and ICAR/NAHEP, the Consultant should prepare a review schedule to be shared and agreed with the participating AUs/ IAs at the first work session. This will give early recognition to the availability of the AU/IA staff who have been assigned to work with the Consultant; alternatively, the Consultant should advise the National Director, ICAR/NAHEP of any problems with the availability of the AU/IA staff requiring their assistance.

The Consultant will ensure that the draft PPR report is **sent to the National Director, ICAR/NAHEP within 2 weeks** of completion of the PPR.

Sampling of Contracts

- Before sampling, the Consultant checks the list of signed contracts (register) received from the Borrower against the Procurement Plan, the disbursement reports, periodic procurement reports prepared by the Borrower, and any available payment records to ensure the completeness of the list, and then selects the sample of contracts to be reviewed.
- The selection of contracts for review is critical for the success of the PPR, as post-reviewed contracts provide evidence of the Borrower's procurement performance. The sampling is risk-based and takes into consideration: (i) the project procurement risk rating, with the riskier projects having a larger sample, and (ii) the contract risk rating, to ensure that riskier contracts constitute a higher proportion of the sample.
- The sampling of contracts for a project is done through a combination of: (i) purposive sampling—that is, focusing on contracts with certain risk factors, such as:
 - contracts against which a complaint has been submitted;
 - contracts for which rebidding/cancellation of the procurement took place;
 - contracts with price modifications of 15% or more of the original contract price;
 - contracts not listed in the Procurement Plan (except community-driven development, or other contracts that are demand-driven and cannot be identified up front);
 - contracts awarded without competition (direct procurement);
 - contracts with estimated costs above the set prior review thresholds, but subject to post review given their low risk; and/or
 - contracts with cost estimates below the Bank's Prior Review thresholds, if the final price of the contract exceeds those thresholds.
- When the number of contracts meeting the above characteristics exceeds the assigned sample size, the sample size may be increased (if resources allow), or a smaller representative sample may be drawn from these contracts depending on the reasons for this elevated level of risk.
- The balance of contracts on the register is stratified by procurement method or approach to the market, and the sample is drawn from each method to the extent possible. Selection also takes into consideration the contract size, with the higher-value contracts targeted for review. However, risky smaller contracts may also be part of the sample.

- For a project like NAHEP with a large number of contracts, the sample may be adjusted to include specific types of procurement and not necessarily cover a large number of contracts. For such projects, a ceiling on the number of contracts to be reviewed may be established.
- Upon completion of the sample selection, the reviewer conducts the review.

Conducting the PPR

Preparatory Activities

- The reviewer checks the list of contracts to identify any patterns indicating risky activities – for example, splitting of contracts, repetitive contracts, orders of the same items from the same firms (except under framework agreements), or multiple contracts just below the Prior Review thresholds or other thresholds for competitive procurement. Contracts exhibiting such patterns may be added to the sample of contracts to be reviewed.
- The reviewer also reviews the previous PPR and aide-mémoire to assess the issues raised in the last review and how they have been addressed, as well as any outstanding mitigation actions and other issues from implementation support and monitoring. The progress with pending actions is discussed with the Borrower as part of the review.

PPR Risk Ratings

- The reviewer assigns an overall risk rating for the PPR taking into consideration the findings from the review. The reviewer follows the risk rating guide in Annex A.
- The ratings assigned include: (i) an overall risk rating; (ii) a risk rating of the procurement system; (iii) a risk rating of the procurement process and (iv) risk rating of contract administration. The risk rating assigned is determined based on the reviewer's professional judgment. The risk ratings are updated in the Post Review module of the project portal when the PPR is finalized.

Applying Professional Judgment

- The reviewer conducts the PPR using the forms in Annex A. While these forms contain guiding questions, the reviewer is expected to exercise professional judgment in assessing the adequacy of the procurement and how it was conducted. Therefore, beyond reporting the findings of the review, the report should also contain the reviewer's judgment/analysis.
- For example, the reviewer should not simply report that bidders were given less time to prepare and submit bids but should additionally assess whether under the circumstances of the particular contract, the time was reasonable or adequate to enable bidders to prepare and submit responsive bids as well as the reasons for this.

Collecting Evidence

- For contracts rated unsatisfactory or those in which the reviewer observes significant noncompliance that may require actions by the Bank pursuant to Section III of the Procurement Procedure, the reviewer may gather evidence of some of the records that reflect the noncompliance—for example, extracts of evaluation reports, solicitation documents, or payment records. This mitigates the risk of records tampering after the review. The reviewer collects copies of the records and the Borrower retains the original records.

Handling Cases of Suspected Fraud and Corruption

- When any suspected cases of Fraud and Corruption are identified through the PPR, they should be recorded in the review and reported to INT in accordance with the Bank Procedure “Working Arrangements among Global Practices, Regions, INT and OPCS concerning Fraud and Corruption. The reviewer does not conduct any investigations on the Fraud and Corruption but may collect documentation as indicated above.
- While the databases at the time of the review may vary from those at the time of contract signature, the reviewer checks against the lists at the time of the review.

Status of Mitigation Actions

- The review includes an update on the progress of implementation of the risk mitigation and corrective actions from the previous review, as identified in the PAD, previous reports and aide-mémoire. When corrective actions remain unfinished beyond their due date, the reviewer discusses whether the actions are still relevant and records any reasons why the actions were not implemented. When the measures were implemented, the reviewer assesses whether they effectively mitigated the identified risks.

Review of Contract Implementation

- In reviewing contract implementation, the reviewer checks whether the work was done according to the contract terms and specifications. The reviewer assesses whether the Borrower adequately checked the quality and quantity of work. The reviewer also checks the timeliness of contract performance and timeliness of payment. The objective of this assessment is to reach an opinion as to whether the services were rendered, goods supplied, and works completed according to the contract and that payments were completed on time and according to the contract. The review may include site visits, physical inspections or inventory checks carried out by a technical specialist.

Review of the Adequacy of Procurement Arrangements

- In conducting the review, the reviewer assesses whether the Borrower continues to comply with the agreed procurement arrangements and whether the arrangements are still adequate or timely and effective implementation of procurement.
- When the reviewer observes cases of potential noncompliance, he/she conducts further assessments, including discussions with project staff, to establish any underlying causes or system failures. This may require reviewing other reports, such as internal audit reports. For example, when several instances of non-compliance are observed, it could be as a result of bypassing a procurement approval committee in the Borrower’s agency—a system failure. For system failures, the PPR recommends corrective actions to strengthen the system.

Rating Contracts on Performance

- Each contract reviewed is rated on performance, combining: (i) management of the procurement process with regard to compliance with the applicable procedures, and (ii) implementation of the contract up to the date of the review with regard to adherence to the conditions of contract.

- The report includes the justification for each contract rating, especially those that are less than satisfactory. The rating is expressed in the following scale: U =Unsatisfactory; MU = Moderately Unsatisfactory; MS = Moderately Satisfactory and S =Satisfactory.

Discussing the Findings

- Before completing the review, the Consultant discusses the findings with the Borrower. This provides the Borrower's staff the opportunity to clarify any aspects and helps gain the Borrower's acceptance of the conclusions and recommendations in the report. While the clarifications and discussions may be carried out with the Borrower's procurement staff, they should include the National Director, ICAR/NAHEP to give him/her an overview of the agency's procurement performance.
- When mitigation or strengthening, actions are necessary, the reviewer discusses these potential actions and their target dates to improve the chances of effective implementation. When recommendations from previous PPRs are still outstanding, the reviewer discusses the reasons, reflects them in the report, and considers them in developing any new actions.

Reporting Findings

- Noncompliance is reported observing the procedural instructions set out in Section III of the Procurement Procedure. Findings on noncompliance form part of the key recommendations for corrective action.
- Reporting on good practices is useful for collecting and disseminating innovations and good practices from Borrowers.
- Once the reviewer prepares the report, it is shared with the Borrower for their feedback and factual corrections, if any. The final report is shared with Bank with findings and recommendations for discussion with the Borrower and needful action, as appropriate.

Actions on Noncompliance

- Pursuant to Section III of the Procurement Procedure, in cases where the procurement review identifies procurement noncompliance, the Bank's Procurement Specialist prepares a memorandum to the TTL describing the facts, findings and provides advice regarding the recommended actions.
- Follow-up actions, in particular to apply remedies, are taken by the TTL, assisted by the APS/PAS and in consultation with the APM. When Bank action on identified noncompliance is required, it is done in accordance with the Section III of the Procurement Procedure and the Guidance "Procurement Noncompliance in IPF Operations".

PPR Reporting and Filing

- Once the report is final, the APS/PAS (i) reports to the TTL the PPR ratings for the project, as input to the ISR, (ii) sends a copy of the PPR report to the APM, and (iii) files the PPR report, along with supervision results, in the Post Review module of the project portal. In filing the PPR, the APS/PAS updates the risk ratings on procurement and contract administration, and risk management measures.

Procedures. The Bank expects the Consultant to apply his best professional practices and judgment in performing the PPR services. For further information, the “Bank guidance on Procurement Post Review, September 2016” represents the Bank’s performance standard for PPRs.

Typically, the following documents are examined in conducting the PPR:

- Invitation for bids, advertising procedures and bidding period
- Bidding documents and addenda if any
- Sale of bidding documents, pre-bid meeting (wherever applicable)
- Receipt and opening of bids.
- Bid evaluation and recommendation for award of the contract
- Draft contract in the bidding documents versus the awarded contract
- Timeliness of payment to contractors/suppliers/consultants
- Projected versus actual completion schedule
- Variation orders and time extensions
- Acceptance or substantial completion certificate

The consultant will use the PPR review module enclosed with this TOR to carry out the PPR.

Useful indicators to assess compliance with the agreed procurement procedures are summarized in the following matrix, which shall be augmented as necessary to capture the salient features of each project. In addition and as specified in the minutes on submission of inception report Bank shall be providing certain indicators for appropriate incorporation.

<u>CATEGORIES</u>	<u>SUB-AREAS</u>	<u>INDICATORS</u>
1. Systems	Legal Framework	Suitability of the laws, rules and regulations applicable to the implementing agency
	Organization/Staffing	Organization of the procurement unit and allocation of functions; quality and adequacy of procurement staff
	Controls/Manuals	Quality of internal administrative practices, including special anticorruption initiatives, existence of dispute resolution systems, internal procedural manuals and instructions, oversight and auditing practices, and code of professional behavior and ethics
	Record-keeping	Availability, quality, security and completeness of procurement records and files
A procurement plan for the projects signed on or after FY 2018-19 are to be looked into to see whether these are being updated regularly and the Bank’s approval obtained when these were modified/updated		

2. Procurement Process	Publications	Assessment of quality of, and adherence to, advertising and contract award publication requirements for applicable contracts
	Bidding/RFP Document	Assessment of quality of, and adherence to, requirements for bidding documents, including RFP's, LOI's, short lists, terms of reference, and other applicable documents
	Evaluation	Assessment of quality of, and adherence to, bid evaluation requirements/criteria, including draft contracts, technical and financial evaluation reports, and bid amendments, if applicable
	Awards	Assessment of quality of, and adherence to, contract award requirements and criteria, including amendments, variation orders, and extensions.
3. Contract Administration	Implementation	Assessment of quality of, and adherence to, contract implementation criteria and scope of work (in the case of consulting services), including results of physical inspections
	Payments	Assessment of adherence to contract payment schedules, including timeliness of payments to contractors
	Compliance	Assessment of adherence to all contractual compliance with agreed provisions; adherence to all related anti-corruption practices

(b) Physical Inspection. The physical inspection of goods and works and, where applicable, non-consulting services resulting in a physical output, is an indispensable part of the PPR. It should draw attention to missing, diverted or relocated assets procured through Bank financing. The Consultant will be expected to visit the locations of about 20% of the assets covered in the selected representative sample of post review contracts and report the presence and condition of these assets. The Consultant is encouraged to illustrate his findings with photos of these assets. Any insurmountable impediments in gaining access for physical inspection should be detailed in the PPR.

The Consultant should also review the IA's inventory system, in order to ascertain whether or not each asset is properly accounted for in the asset accounting records and being used for the intended purpose under the project.

The draft PPR Report should include follow up on findings of previous PPR and retain recommended actions not yet implemented.

Besides the above, the Consultant shall also consider the following:

- Going beyond checking the box: reviewers may add any important observation even if it is not mandated in the PPR format.

- Same issues appear year-after-year: Please discuss with participating AUs/ IAs to find out whether adequate remedial actions were taken by them on finding of previous PPRs and record the same in detail.
- Quality of Physical inspection: If there are subject experts in PPR team, they should be used for carrying physical inspections.
- Sample: High-value contracts are to be given preference while proposing the sample for the PPR.
- Report of Auditors: Please also look at major audit observations (in previous years financial audit report) as they may include observations on procurement process. This may be added in list of documents required as well as should be recorded in PPR report.

6. Required Outputs

The Sample Format for Post Review Reports is annexed

- (i) **The Inception Report** shall be submitted by the Consultant within 30 days of signing the contract. The Inception Report shall describe the Consultant's review schedule, including his/her mission to the participating AUs/ IAs and staffing arrangements. It shall also explain the methodology for sampling the contracts and for reviewing the corresponding information and documentation at the participating AU/ IA locations and elsewhere, if necessary. The National Director, ICAR/NAHEP will review and clear the Consultant's Inception Report and share it with his team, in order to coordinate their respective schedules.
- (ii) **Project PPR reports (Draft/Final):** The Consultant will submit the draft PPR report to the ICAR/NAHEP within 3 weeks of completion of review. The draft report shall be submitted in the required format shown above and will be shared with the participating AUs/ IAs to obtain feedback. ICAR/NAHEP shall provide comments within 3 weeks of submission of report and consultant will proceed with preparation of the Final Report, taking into account the total feedback received on the Draft Report, especially, the comments from participating AUs/ IAs. However, having exercised due diligence, the Consultant's professional judgment shall prevail in preparing and presenting the Final PPR Report.

7. Reporting Arrangement

- The Consultant shall report to and work under the supervision of the National Director, ICAR/NAHEP. The National Director, ICAR/NAHEP may delegate responsibility for day-to-day supervision of the Consultant's services to the Procurement official.

8. Minimum Qualifications of the Consultant's Key Staff

S. No.	Key Position	Experience Requirements	Professional Requirements

1.	Team Leader	<p>Minimum 5 years of experience in compliance audit of public procurement.</p> <p>Trained in handling Procurement post review of Bank projects and familiarity with Bank procurement processes and procedures.</p> <p>Prior experience in carrying out audits and reviews.</p>	A University degree in Engineering/ Business Administration/ Accounting/ Materials management.
2.	Procurement Specialist [Minimum four consultants]	<p>Minimum of 2 years of experience in public procurement.</p> <p>Prior experience in carrying out procurement reviews/ audits.</p>	A University degree in Engineering/ Business Administration/ Accounting/ Materials management.
3.	Analyst [Minimum three consultants]	<p>Experience of at least 3 previous assignments involving review of large volume of documents, data extraction and spreadsheet entry.</p> <p>Demonstrated computer skills.</p>	A university degree in Engg (IT/ Computer Science)/ Commerce/ Economics/ Statistics/ Data Science (BA)

9. Contract Terms

The Consultant's services will be required for FY 2023-24. However, selection/sampling of contracts for PPR can be from any duration of NAHEP at AU level, as suggested by the World Bank from time to time.

The size of the representative sample of contracts should generally not be less than 15% of the contracts and broadly as follows:

For Goods and Works		
1.	RFB	One in five contracts or 20% whichever is higher
2.	RFQ	>Rs. 25,00,000 – one in five contracts or 20% whichever is higher
3.	RFQ	<Rs. 25,00,000 – one in six contracts or 15% whichever is higher
For Consultancies		
1.	QCBS/QBS/LCS etc.	One in five contracts or 20% whichever is higher
2.	Individual Consultant	One in six contracts or 15% whichever is higher

Estimated number of contracts to be audited under NAHEP is likely to be 300+10%, based on the number procurement planned in STEP at present (3300 app.).

As part of reaching agreement on the Contract with the Consultant, this period will be divided into the progress milestones and actual number of contracts may also vary depending upon the selection of contracts by the WB.

Annex A. Templates for the Procurement Post Review Report

Country	
Loan / Credit / Trust Fund #:	
Project name*:	
Project ID:	
Name (s) of Implementing Agency (ies):	
TL:	
Bank Procurement Specialist:	
Post Review conducted by*:	
No. of contracts since last review	
No. of contracts reviewed	
Total value of contracts reviewed	
% no. of contracts reviewed	

[Report Cover page]

Country	
Credit No	
Project Name	
Project ID:	
Names of participating AUs/ IAs	

General Procurement Information

1. Executive Summary

Provide a brief description of Post Review objective, key findings/issues, and recommendations. The key objective to review if the procurement has been carried out as per the agreed processes and procedures and if there are any F&C or systemic issue .

2. Discussion on the Selection of the Contract Samples Reviewed

Provide a brief description of the selection of the contract sample and summary list of the contracts reviewed, including procurement category, procurement method, contract number, contract date, short contract description, name of contracting agency, name of contractor/supplier/consultant, contract amount.

3. Findings on the Review of the Procurement Arrangements Agreed with the Borrower

Staffing, unit organization, internal controls, project manual, etc.

4. Findings on the Review of Procurement Processes

Provide a brief description of findings on procurement processes, including procurement planning, publications, bidding, evaluation, complaints handling, awards and timeliness of procurement.

5. Findings on the Review of Contract Administration & Management

Provide a brief description of findings on contract administration, including implementation, payments, disputes resolution, and compliance.

6. Indication of Possible Governance Issues

Provide a brief description of any findings on red flags that could indicate possible fraud or corruption related to the procurement processes, contract administration, or any other related issues at contract, project, sector, or country level.

8. Mitigating Measures or Corrective Actions

Identify mitigating measures or actions to correct procurement deficiencies, and recommend them to the Borrower and its executing agency(ies).

9. Possible Indication of Noncompliance requiring Bank Action (including misprocurement)

Report reasons for potential actions on noncompliance

10. Risk Rating & Recommendation

Definitions of Post Review Risk Ratings

Low Risk (LR)	Borrower systems, procurement processes, and/or contract administration are of highest quality; are fit for purpose in achieving value for money, economy, efficiency, effectiveness, integrity, fairness, transparency, and accountability; and require little or no corrective action by the Bank.
Moderate Risk (MR)	Borrower systems, procurement processes, and/or contract administration are of generally good quality and are reliable in achieving value for money, economy, efficiency, effectiveness, integrity, fairness, transparency, and accountability, with minor corrective actions needed by the Bank.
Substantial Risk (SR)	Moderate shortcomings in Borrower systems, procurement processes, and/or contract administration have limited or jeopardized the timely or efficient achievement of one or more major outputs and/or limited achievement of value for money, economy, efficiency, effectiveness, integrity, fairness, transparency, and accountability, but resolution(s) is/are likely.
High Risk (HR)	Significant shortcomings in Borrower systems, procurement processes, and/or contract administration have limited or jeopardized the timely or efficient achievement of one or more major outputs and compromised achievement of value for money, economy, efficiency, effectiveness, integrity, fairness, transparency, and accountability. Resolution is uncertain or unlikely.

Overall risk rating:	<div style="display: flex; justify-content: space-around; align-items: center;"> <div style="text-align: center;"><input type="checkbox"/> Low</div> <div style="text-align: center;"><input type="checkbox"/> Moderate</div> <div style="text-align: center;"><input type="checkbox"/> Substantial</div> <div style="text-align: center;"><input type="checkbox"/> High</div> </div> <p><i>(Overall rating for a report is not an average rating of all indicators combined but rather a final rating based on reviewer's objective conclusions about the findings as a whole, including performance ratings of contracts.)</i></p>
Overall recommendations:	

Risk rating of procurement system:	<div style="display: flex; justify-content: space-around; align-items: center;"> <div style="text-align: center;"><input type="checkbox"/> Low</div> <div style="text-align: center;"><input type="checkbox"/> Moderate</div> <div style="text-align: center;"><input type="checkbox"/> Substantial</div> <div style="text-align: center;"><input type="checkbox"/> High</div> </div> <p><i>Indicators to consider:</i></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ○ Legal Framework: Suitability of the laws, rules, and regulations applicable to the implementing agency with respect to the requirements for national procurement in the Procurement Regulations for Borrowers. ○ Organization/Staffing: Organization of the procurement unit and allocation of functions; quality and adequacy of procurement staff. ○ Controls/Manuals: Quality of internal administrative practices, including special anticorruption initiatives, complaints handling, existence of dispute resolution systems, internal procedural manuals and instructions, oversight and auditing practices, and code of professional behavior and ethics. ○ Record-keeping: Availability, quality, security, and completeness of procurement records and files.
Recommendations:	
Risk rating of procurement processes:	<div style="display: flex; justify-content: space-around; align-items: center;"> <div style="text-align: center;"><input type="checkbox"/> Low</div> <div style="text-align: center;"><input type="checkbox"/> Moderate</div> <div style="text-align: center;"><input type="checkbox"/> Substantial</div> <div style="text-align: center;"><input type="checkbox"/> High</div> </div> <p><i>Indicators to consider:</i></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ○ Procurement Planning: Assessment of adherence to the Procurement Plan, including any changes/updates. ○ Publications: Assessment of adherence to advertising and contract award publication requirements for applicable contracts. ○ Bidding: Assessment of adherence to requirements for bidding documents, including RFPs, LOIs, shortlists, terms of reference, invoices, and other applicable documents. ○ Evaluation: Assessment of adherence to bid evaluation requirements/criteria, including draft contracts, technical and financial evaluation reports, and any bid amendments. ○ Awards: Assessment of adherence to contract award requirements, including complaints handling, amendments, variation orders, and extensions.
Recommendations:	

<p>Risk rating of contract administration:</p>	<div style="display: flex; justify-content: space-around; align-items: center;"> <div style="text-align: center;"><input type="checkbox"/> Low</div> <div style="text-align: center;"><input type="checkbox"/> Moderate</div> <div style="text-align: center;"><input type="checkbox"/> Substantial</div> <div style="text-align: center;"><input type="checkbox"/> High</div> </div> <p><i>Indicators to consider:</i></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ○ Implementation: Assessment of adherence to contract implementation criteria, including results of physical inspections. ○ Payments: Assessment of adherence to contract payment schedules, including timeliness of payments to contractors. ○ Compliance: Assessment of adherence to all contractual provisions; adherence to all related anticorruption practices. ○ Disputes: Assessment of promptness and equity in resolving contractual
<p>Recommendations:</p>	

Annex A.2. Profile of Procurement Items

Category	Prior Review threshold in US\$	Proposed revised Prior Review thresholds (to be completed by Bank Procurement Specialist, if required)
Works		
Goods		
Consulting firms		
Individual consultants		

Procurement method	Civil works	Goods
Open International Competition		
National Competition		
Request for		

Category	No. of contracts awarded in review period					Total
	<i>Review period is (mm/dd/yyyy) to (mm/dd/yyyy)</i>					
	IC	NC	RFQ	DC/SS	Others (Competitive Selection of	
Works						
Goods						
Services						
Consulting firms						
Individual consultants						
Total						

Category	No. of procurements reviewed					Total
	IC	NC	RFQ	DC/SS	Others (Competitive Selection of Consultants)	
Works						
Goods						
Services						
Consulting firms						
Individual consultants						
Total						

AnnexA.3.WorksheetforCompetitiveProcedures(RequestforBids)

Part A.General

Date of review:		Name of reviewer:		
Contract no.:		Contract date(dd/mm/yy):		
Contract description:		Contract amount(US\$):		
Contractor / Supplier name and address:		Category <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Goods <input type="checkbox"/> Works <input type="checkbox"/> Non-consulting services		
Market approach option	<input type="checkbox"/> International Competition	<input type="checkbox"/> Limited Competition	<input type="checkbox"/> National Market	<input type="checkbox"/> Prequalification
	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Single-Stage	<input type="checkbox"/> Multi-Stage	<input type="checkbox"/> BAFO	<input type="checkbox"/> Negotiations
Selection method/arrangement	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> RFB			
	<input type="checkbox"/> Leasing	<input type="checkbox"/> PPP	<input type="checkbox"/> Imports	<input type="checkbox"/> Used Goods
	<input type="checkbox"/> E-Auctions	<input type="checkbox"/> Commodities		

Part B. Process Review

<i>Aspects reviewed</i>	<i>Findings and comments</i>
Procurement Documentation(Filing)	
Reference in Procurement Plan or STEP	
Use of e-procurement system	
Advertising: Newspapers /date	
Pre-bid meeting	
Pre/post qualification and criteria	
Bidding Document	
Time allowed for submission of bids	
Bid opening and minutes of bid opening	
Bid security records	
Bid evaluation report	
Negotiations (if applicable)	
Publication of Notice of intention toward contract and standstill period(if applicable)	NA guideline applicable
Debriefing (if applicable)	
Publication of contract award	

Complaints and results	
------------------------	--

Part C. Contract Administration

<i>Aspects reviewed</i>	<i>Findings and comments</i>
Contract document: Available /date of signing	
Advance payment guaranteed details and records	
Insurance	
Performance security details and records	
Bill of lading, customs clearance, license and permits if required	
Inspection of supervision records and reports	
Planned contractual completion date	
Provisional acceptance or testing	
Actual completion date	

Delivery receipt or similar instrument	
Liquidated damages, details and enforcement for delays	
Warehousing and inventory	
Timeliness of payments	
Amendments or contract modifications: number, amounts, %	
Contractual disputes and resolution, if any	
Cost overruns reasons and explanations	
Adjudication and arbitration	
Closing of contract	

Part D. Others

<i>Aspects reviewed</i>	<i>Findings and comments</i>			
Indication of possible fraud or corruption				
Physical inspection				
Involvement of beneficiaries or users				
Total duration from advertisement to contract signature				
Final cost compared to cost estimate				
Additional observations				
Contract rating (covering procurement and contract administration)	<input type="checkbox"/> Satisfactory	<input type="checkbox"/> Moderately Satisfactory	<input type="checkbox"/> Moderately	<input type="checkbox"/> Unsatisfactory
Rating explanation				

<i>Aspects reviewed</i>	<i>Findings and comments</i>			
Contract rating (covering procurement and contract administration)	<input type="checkbox"/> Satisfactory	<input type="checkbox"/> Moderately Satisfactory	<input type="checkbox"/> Moderately Unsatisfactory	<input type="checkbox"/> Unsatisfactory
Rating explanation				

Annex A.4. Worksheet for Direct Selection Procedure

Part A. General

Date of review:	Name of reviewer:
Contract no.:	Contract date (dd/mm/yy):
Contract description:	Contract amount (US\$):
Contractor / Supplier name and address:	Category <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Goods <input type="checkbox"/> Works <input type="checkbox"/> Non-consultingservices

Part B. Process Review

<i>Aspects reviewed</i>	<i>Findings and comments</i>
Procurement Documentation (Filing)	
Reference in Procurement Plan or STEP	
Adequacy of justification for direct selection	
Use of e-procurement system	
Negotiations	
Publication of contract award	
Complaints and results	
Justification for direct selection	

Part C. Contract Administration

<i>Aspects reviewed</i>	<i>Findings and comments</i>
-------------------------	------------------------------

Contract document	
Advance payment guarantee details and records	
Insurance	
Performance security details and records	
Bill of lading, customs clearance, license and permits if required	
Inspection of supervision records and reports	
Planned contractual completion date	
Provisional acceptance or testing	
Actual completion date	
Delivery receipt or similar instrument	
Liquidated damages, details and enforcement for delays	
Timeliness of payments	
Amendments or contract modifications: number, amounts, and %	
Contractual disputes and resolution, if any	
Cost overruns reasons and explanations	
Adjudication and arbitration	

<i>Aspects reviewed</i>	<i>Findings and comments</i>
Closing of contract	

Part D. Others

<i>Aspects reviewed</i>	<i>Findings and comments</i>
Indication of possible fraud or corruption	
Physical inspection	
Involvement of beneficiaries or users	
Total duration from advertisement to contract signature	

Final cost compared to cost estimate				
Additional observations				
Contract rating (covering procurement and contract administration)	<input type="checkbox"/> Satisfactory	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Moderately Satisfactory	<input type="checkbox"/> Moderately Unsatisfactory	<input type="checkbox"/> Unsatisfactory
Rating explanation				

Annex A.5. Worksheet for Competitive Procedures(Request for Proposals)

Part A. General

Date of review:		Name of reviewer:		
Contract no.:		Contract date (dd/mm/yy):		
Contract description:		Contract amount (US\$):		
Contractor / Supplier name and address:		Category <input type="checkbox"/> Goods <input type="checkbox"/> Works <input type="checkbox"/> Non-consultingservices		
Market approach option	<input type="checkbox"/> International Competition	<input type="checkbox"/> Limited Competition	<input type="checkbox"/> National Market	<input type="checkbox"/> Initial Selection
	<input type="checkbox"/> Single-Stage	<input type="checkbox"/> Multi-Stage	<input type="checkbox"/> BAFO	<input type="checkbox"/> Negotiations
Selection method / arrangement	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> RFP			
	<input type="checkbox"/> Leasing	<input type="checkbox"/> PPP		

Part B. Process Review

<i>Aspects</i>	<i>Findings and comments</i>
Procurement documentation and records	
Procurement Plan or STEP reference	
Use of e-procurement system	
Advertising for Initial Selection	
Initial selection qualification criteria and rated criteria and requirements	
Response to SPN for initial Selection	

Evaluation of Applications and comments, if any (Verify existence of applications)	
Initially selected applicants (number, names etc.)	
Review of Request for Technical Proposals	

Aspects	Findings and comments
Technical proposal evaluation	
Management of discovery stage (including meetings, clarifications and addendum of changes)	
Request for Financial Proposals and Revised Technical proposals	
Time allowed for submission of proposals	
Weights in evaluation criteria	
Evaluation of Technical part and Report	
Financial proposal opening	
Minutes of financial proposal opening	
Evaluation of Financial part and Combined evaluation	
Publication of Notice of Intention to award contract	
Standstill period and debriefing (if applicable)	
Complaints handling (if any)	
Notification of award	
Publication of contract award	

Part C. Contract Administration

Aspects reviewed	Findings and comments
Contract document	
Advance payment guarantee details and records	
Insurance	
Performance security details and records	
Bill of lading, customs clearance, license and	
Inspection of supervision or testing records and reports	
Planned contractual completion date	
Provisional acceptance or testing	
Actual completion date	
Delivery receipt or similar instrument	
Liquidated damages, details and enforcement	
Timeliness of payments	
Amendments or contract modifications: number, amounts and	
Contractual disputes and resolution, if any	
Cost overruns reasons and explanations	
Adjudication and arbitration	

<i>Aspects reviewed</i>	<i>Findings and comments</i>
Closing of contract	

Part D. Others

<i>Aspects reviewed</i>	<i>Findings and comments</i>			
Indication of possible fraud or corruption				
Involvement of beneficiaries or users				
Total duration from advertisement to contract signature				
Additional observations				
Contract rating (covering procurement and contract administration)	<input type="checkbox"/> Satisfactory	<input type="checkbox"/> Moderately	<input type="checkbox"/> Moderately Unsatisfactory	<input type="checkbox"/> Unsatisfactory
Rating explanation				

Annex A.6. Worksheet for Request for Quotations Procedures

Part A. General

Date of review:	Name of reviewer:
Contract no.:	Contract date (dd/mm/yy):
Contract description:	Contract amount (US\$):
Contractor / Supplier name and address:	Category <input type="checkbox"/> Goods <input type="checkbox"/> Works <input type="checkbox"/> Non-consultingservices

Part B: Process Review

<i>Aspects reviewed</i>	<i>Findings and comments</i>
Procurement Documentation (Filing)	
Reference in Procurement Plan or STEP	
Use of e-procurement system	
Advertising or direct invitation	
Source of suppliers invited	
Time allowed for submission of quotations	
Bid opening and minutes of bid opening: indicate number of participants, names, and prices per lot	
Adequacy of reason for any disqualifications	
Bid evaluation report and award	
Reasonableness of cost	

Part C. Contract Administration

<i>Aspects reviewed</i>	<i>Findings and comments</i>
Contract document or purchase order	
Bill of lading, if any	
Planned contractual completion date	
Actual completion date	
Delivery receipt or similar instrument	
Timeliness of payments	
Amendments or contract modifications: number, amounts, and %	
Contractual disputes and resolution, if any	
Cost overruns reasons and explanations	

Closing of contract	
---------------------	--

Part D. Others

<i>Aspects reviewed</i>		<i>Findings and comments</i>			
Indication of possible fraud or corruption					
Physical inspection					
Involvement of beneficiaries or users					
Total duration from advertisement to contract signature					
Final cost compared to cost estimate					
Additional observations					
<i>Aspects reviewed</i>		<i>Findings and comments</i>			
Contract rating (covering procurement and contract administration)	<input type="checkbox"/> Satisfactory	<input type="checkbox"/> Moderately Satisfactory	<input type="checkbox"/> Moderately Unsatisfactory	<input type="checkbox"/> Unsatisfactory	
Rating explanation					

Annex A.7. Worksheet for Consultant Firms Contracts Award

Part A. General

Date of review:		Name of reviewer:			
Contract no.:		Contract date (dd/mm/yy):			
Contract description:		Contract amount (US\$):			
Consultant name and address:		Cost estimate (US\$):			
Market approach option	<input type="checkbox"/> International Competition	<input type="checkbox"/> National Approaches	<input type="checkbox"/> Limited Competition	<input type="checkbox"/> Shortlist	
Selection method	<input type="checkbox"/> QCBS	<input type="checkbox"/> FBS	<input type="checkbox"/> LCS	<input type="checkbox"/> QBS	
	<input type="checkbox"/> CQS				

Part B. Process Review

<i>Aspects</i>	<i>Findings and comments</i>
Procurement documentation and records	
Procurement Plan or STEP reference	
Use of e-procurement system	
Advertising for Expressions of Interest	
Response to Request for Expression of Interest	
Review of Request for Proposals	
Describe shortlist	
Time allowed for submission of proposals	
Weights in evaluation criteria	
Technical evaluation: separate reviews and average	
Technical evaluation report	
<i>Aspects</i>	<i>Findings and comments</i>
Financial proposal opening	
Minutes of financial proposal opening	
Combined quality and cost evaluation	
Negotiations	
Complaints handling (if any)	

Publication of Notice of intention of to award contract and standstill period (if applicable)	
Debriefing (if applicable)	
Publication of contract award	

Part C. Contract Administration

<i>Aspects</i>	<i>Findings and comments</i>
Signed contract document	
Advance payment guarantee details and records	
Monitoring and reporting	
Changes of key personnel, if any	
Planned contractual completion date	
Actual completion date	
Outputs; final report acceptance	
Timeliness of payments	

<i>Aspects</i>	<i>Findings and comments</i>
Amendments or contract modifications: number, amount and %	
Contractual disputes and resolution, if any	
Cost overruns reasons and	
Closing of contract	

Part D. Others

<i>Aspects reviewed</i>	<i>Findings and comments</i>			
Indication of possible fraud or corruption				
Involvement of beneficiaries or users				
Total duration from advertisement to contract signature				
Additional observations				
Contract rating (covering procurement and contract administration)	<input type="checkbox"/> Satisfactory	<input type="checkbox"/> Moderately	<input type="checkbox"/> Moderately Unsatisfactory	<input type="checkbox"/> Unsatisfactory
Rating explanation				

Annex A.8. Worksheet for Individual Consultant Contracts Award

Part A. General

Date of review:		Name of reviewer:	
Contract no.:		Contract date (dd/mm/yy):	
Contract description:		Contract amount (US\$):	
Consultant name and address:		Cost estimate (US\$):	
Selection method:	<input type="checkbox"/> Comparison of CVs	<input type="checkbox"/> Direct Selection	

Part B. Process Review

<i>Aspects</i>	<i>Findings and comments</i>
Procurement documentation and records	
Procurement Plan or STEP reference	
Use of e-procurement system	
Justification for Direct Selection if applicable	
Advertising for Expressions of Interest	
Response to Request for Expression of Interest	
Describe shortlist	
Evaluation report	
Negotiations	
Publication of contract award	

Part C. Contract Administration

Aspects	Findings and comments
Signed contract document	
Advance payment guarantee details and records	
Monitoring and reporting	
Planned contractual completion date	
Actual completion date	
Outputs; final report acceptance	
Timeliness of payments	
Amendments or contract modifications: number, amounts, and %	
Contractual disputes and resolution, if any	
Cost overruns reasons and explanations	
Closing of contract	

Part D. Others

<i>Aspects reviewed</i>	<i>Findings and comments</i>			
Indication of possible fraud or corruption				
Involvement of beneficiaries or users where applicable				
Total duration from advertisement to contract signature				
Final cost compared to cost estimate				
Additional observations				
Contract rating (covering procurement and contract administration)	<input type="checkbox"/> Satisfactory	<input type="checkbox"/> Moderately Satisfactory	<input type="checkbox"/> Moderately Unsatisfactory	<input type="checkbox"/> Unsatisfactory
Rating explanation				