

Application of Quality and Cost Based method for Consultant's Selection for Roads and Bridges Selection Method in Khartoum State

Omer Khider¹

School of Civil Engineering . Sudan University of Science and Technology ,Khartoum ,Sudan,
omer.khidir@yahoo.com

Osama M. Ahmed¹ , Mudthir Bakri¹

School of Civil Engineering . Sudan University of Science and Technology ,Khartoum ,Sudan,
Osamam.osama.ahmed3@gmail.com

Abstract—Consultant's selection is highly critical to the success of a project over its complete life-cycle. One of the most important procurement methods used around the world is the "Quality and Cost Based Selection" (QCBS) method. The objective of this paper is to evaluate and examine the implementation and conformity of the QCBS method and the process for the selection of Consultants to provide consultancy services for roads and bridges projects in the Khartoum State. To achieve this objective, a series of influenced factors are modeled and deployed into questionnaire, professionals from Consultancy firms and the Ministry of infrastructure were invited to participate in a questionnaire survey. The results obtained were analyzed using statistical descriptive methods, showed some deficiencies in the procurement processes and completeness of the bidding documents. Others aspects of the method of the consultants' selection procedure lack in the provision of documents from the Client is amounts to than 40 percent, and only 37% of the necessary information are included in the bidding documents. The study has shown that improvement is needed in the procurement management process by establishing the standard bidding documents, required information for proposals preparation which also includes clear evaluation criteria.

Keywords—component; : *Khartoum State, Quality and Cost Based Selection Method, Consultancy Services*

Introduction

Engaging the professional services of a consultant to execute a project or assignment is an important decision which can have far reaching consequences for the client. The selection of the competent professional services of a consultant who is right for the assignment is pivotal because the selection of the consultant is an infrequent or one-time responsibility for the Client; formal procedures have involved helping clients to procure professional service effectively⁽¹⁾.

Competition between consulting firms result in improvement in design or delivery of the service is of

benefit to the client and the public. This competition however, should ideally be based on competence and qualifications. However many clients select consultants based on combination of quality and price. Fair compensation professional is best determined when the full extent of the assignment is understood by the consultant and the client⁽¹⁾.

Quality and cost based selection (QCBS) method is widely used to select the consultant; QCBS method uses a competitive process among short-listed firms that takes into account the quality of the proposal and the cost of the services in the selection of the successful firm through the request for proposal (RFP). Cost as a factor of selection shall be used judiciously. The relative weight to be given to the quality and cost shall be determined for each case depending on the nature of the assignment.

QCBS method is recently used in Khartoum State for the procurement of the consulting services for roads and bridges projects.

Problem Statement:

selection of the Consultant has a critical role to play in successful or failure of projects, it is the most critical aspect for timely and successful implementation of project and the "SELECTION PROCEDURE" is a key factor to running a successful project. Most organizations are aware of the selection Rules and its requirements. The different views in how to implement the selection process between clients and consultants should be clearly identified and corrected and this can be achieved by formulating the standard steps and make it clear to all concerned parties either from the Consultants' side or Clients.

The documents and its availability on time and the announcement of the selection phases should be developed and standard procedure to become known to the consultants and the client. The transparency and equal basis for selection through the selection process should also be developed and known to the concerned parties during the tendering period to reduce selection challenge or successful tender.

It has been found throughout the experience that the majority of challenges brought against the selection process are due to a few common mistakes. Ensuring these "selection pitfalls" are

avoided goes a long way to minimizing the risk of a selection challenge.

Objectives: the objective of this study is to examine the competence of the request for proposal documents which contain all information and the criteria required for the selection process and the guidance for the consultants to understand the assignment and prepare a responsive proposal. The study will also examine the process used for the selection from the initial stage to final stage of awarding the contract, it also raises awareness among both Client and consultants regarding the rules applicable to the QCBS of Consultants in order to avoid pitfalls in the awarding the Consulting Services Contracts and to help enhance knowledge of the selection rules.

To achieve the above objectives, professionals in the Sudanese Consultancy industry and from the stakeholders were invited to participate in a questionnaire survey. The questionnaire survey was distributed to 40 of Sudanese professionals and received 33 responses representing 82.5% of the total distributed questionnaire.

This paper present a literature review of the relevant procurement methods for the selection of consulting firms in general and in detail for QCBS method together with important issues affecting the selection process. A description of the survey methodology, followed by a presentation of the survey findings (results) is further described the main findings and drawn conclusions.

Literature review

1.1. Consultant's Selection methods

With reference to the International Federation of Consulting Engineers (FIDIC) there are elaborated various consultants' selection methodologies which are briefly described hereunder:

1.1.1. Quality Based Selection (QBS) method:

QBS is a selection process to determine the most appropriately qualified consultant based on the quality (Technical) competitiveness attributes, leading to a negotiated award of services on a fair and reasonable price basis. This method is used for very complex and highly specialized projects where particular preparation of the terms of reference (TOR) is very difficult and the consultant is required to provide output to the client at an early stage of the project. A typical example is the requirement of the client to an innovative solution included to a lower phase of the project preparation such as city master plans including respective service segments, security projects, big dams etc ⁽²⁾.

1.1.2. Quality and Cost Based Selection (QCBS) method:

The most recommended method is the Quality- and Cost-Based Selection (QCBS) method and it is been used by the borrowers from international banks such as World Bank (WB), African Development Bank

(AfDB) and Islamic Development Bank (IDB). These banks have established their own guidelines for the selection process for use in projects finance through them. This method determined the best possible quality or services taking into account the related price. More details of this method is presented separately hereinafter as its the method being examined in this study.

1.1.3. The Budget method (Target price Method):

The Budget method is usually adopted where outputs are difficult for the client to specify or quantify. The client specifies a budget figure to short listed firms accompanied by outlining the consultancy services required. The TOR needs to be flexible enough to enable consultants to meet the requirement of the client in an optimum way and they should clearly state what the client expects the consultant proposal to contain ⁽³⁾.

1.1.4. Price negotiation method :

In this method small group of consultancy firms is short listed on quality and then invited to negotiate fees. The method often results in an auction on which the quoted prices are reduced successively until all ,but one consultant, drop out.

1.1.5. Cost based Selection (CBS) (Lowest price conforming method) :

This system ,if used, ought only to apply in cases dealing with very small simple and well defined projects. The client directly calls for proposals, usually through advertisement in local newspapers, the firms are given a deadline to submit their price proposal, all the envelopes are opened at a pre-determined time in front of the competitors and the consultant with lowest priced proposal is normally invited to sign an agreement with the client⁽⁵⁾.

1.1.6. Single source Selection:

In this method the national polices or law allow for the last tracking of certain type of tender, usually up to a certain cost limit. Consultants approached to submit proposals under this method will normally be known to the client. This method is not permitted in many countries and open bidding is required for every project ⁽¹⁾.

1.2. Quality and Cost Based Selection (QCBS) method

As mentioned above this method is a competitive method and the procedure for this method is explained under the following ⁽⁶⁾:

- a) **Announcement and pre-qualification:** The establishments of a list of consultants, who are potentially qualified for the project form the constants who have submitted their expression of interest (EOI) in response to the clients advertisement for seeking consulting firms for a specific assignment. When it can be

expected that several competing consulting firms are fully capable of providing the services, the client normally advertises in one or more national newspaper and this exact practice is followed in Khartoum State for procurement public tenders.

b) Short listing:

The client shall examine the EOI submitted by consultants and prepare a short list.

c) Preparation of terms of reference (TOR):

The client is responsible for drafting the TOR which shall include the necessary information to help the consultants to prepare their proposals the necessary information are detailed scope of the services, expected input of the key staff and their required qualifications, expected deliverables and client contribution.

d) Preparation and issuance of the request for proposal RFP Which should include:

- i. The Letter of Invitation (LOI): the necessary information should be included in the LOI are:

The name of the project, list of invited consultants, list of the Request for proposal (RFP) documents and the deadline of proposal submission.

- ii. Instructions to Consultants (ITC): the necessary information should be included in the ITC are:

Clarifications and amendment of RFP documents process, Guidance for the preparation of the technical and financial proposal, Evaluation criteria, Minimum passing score for quality, details of the two stages evaluation process and Terms of payments.

- iii. The Terms of Reference (TOR)
- iv. Technical and financial standard forms:

These forms are to guide the consultants in the proposal preparation and to enable the client to evaluate the proposals in equal basis

- v. The proposed draft contract, which include standard general and special conditions of contract

e) Preparation and submission of the proposal:

The client shall allow enough time for the consulting firms to prepare proposals which shall be prepared according to the RFP documents.

f) Receipt and opening of proposals:

The consultant shall be invited to attend the opening and minute of meeting shall be recorded.

g) Evaluation of proposals:

The client shall evaluate and rank each proposal against the basis of the selection criteria outlined in the RFP. This process helps to maintain the integrity of the selection process and can involve formation of a selection committee, a weighting or score for each criteria as set in the ITC and independent evaluation of the firms by each member of the selection committee. The evaluation of the proposals shall be carried out in three stages:

- i. Evaluation of the technical proposals (quality "T"):

The client shall make this evaluation taking into account several criteria as set in the RFP:

- The consultant's relevant experience for the assignment
- The quality of the methodology proposed
- The qualifications of the key staff
- The schedule of activities and personnel to carry out the assignment.

At this stage the client shall rank the proposals taking into account the minimum percentage for the firm to pass the quality as defined in the RFP and the technical score (T) for each firms shall be recorded .

- ii. Evaluation of the financial proposals (cost "F"):

After the completion of the technical proposals the client shall notify those consultants did not pass the minimum score for technical and informing them that their financial proposal will be returned sealed and unopened. The client shall notify the consultants who pass the minimum score indicating the score for each firm.

A public opening for the financial proposals for the firms that passed the minimum technical scores shall be conducted. The name of the consultant, their technical score and the proposed cost (including and excluding tax if any) shall be read and recorded.

The financial proposal shall be corrected as required for any deviations and/or arithmetic errors.

- iii. Combined technical and financial evaluation (Score), the total score shall be obtained by weighting the technical and financial scores as specified in the RFP, the following equation can be applied to obtain the combined score for each firm:

$$\text{Combined Score} = (1-W) T + WF$$

Whereas:

W= Financial Weighting factor

T= Technical score

F= Financial score

- h) **Selection of the consultancy firm and negotiations:**

The firm which obtains the highest combined score shall be called for negotiations. The staff rates and reimbursable cost shall not be part of the negotiations.

i) Agreement:

The proposed agreement shall be filled, rearranged and the point negotiated shall be modified as appropriate and the contract shall be signed and to include the TOR, proposed methodology and the consultant financial offer.

j) Notification:

When the agreement is finalized and signed all other firms who submitted proposals should be informed that their proposals were not successful.

k) Debriefing:

If any of the unsuccessful firm wishes to ascertain the grounds on which its proposal was not selected then the client shall give sufficient information for that firm indicating their weak points in the technical offer.

1.3. Transparency

Maximum degree of transparency is be maintained during the consultant selection process which can be achieved by provision of clear and well defined scope of work at the tendering stage, the risk between parties shall be faired allocated and details of the evaluation system including weighting shall be included in the RFP ⁽³⁾.

Methodology

To achieve the objective of this study professional involved in the procurement and proposals preparation were invited to participate in a questionnaire survey.

The questionnaire was prepared and reviewed by subject matter expert as a tool for data collection for this study. The questionnaire was divided into three main parts as (1) general information, (2) questions about the completeness of the RFP documents and the necessary information to be included in the RFP documents, and (3) The transparency.

The questionnaires were distributed among 40 professional engineers completed responses received from 33 respondents representing 82.5 % .

Survey findings

The information was collected, organized and analyzed using a statistical computer software programme SPSS. The outcomes are as follows:

Part 1: General information

Table 1 show that the participation of the consultancy firms is 85% and the remainder 15% is for the governmental firms, 36% of respondents have years of experience between 10 to 20 years and 33% more than 20 years. The majority of respondents achieved Master and bachelor degree.

Part (2) - Section (1): Completeness of Request for Proposal (RFP) Documents

As can be seen in table 2 the total provision of RFP documents is 58% and it is clear that there the lack in the provision of important documents 64%, are

contract conditions , 67% in the technical Standard forms and 64% in the financial Standard forms which are usually provided by the client.

Table 1: General information

	Sub Information	Frequency	Percent
Firm type	Consultancy	28	85
	Governmental	5	15
Years of experience	2 to 10	10	30
	10 to 20	12	36
	20 to30	6	18
	30 to 40	2	6
	Above 40	3	9
Qualifications	PHD	6	18
	MSC	18	55
	BSc	9	27

Table 2: completeness of RFP Documents

	Status	Frequency	Percent
Letter Of Invitation	PROVIDED	29	88
	NOT PROVIDED	4	12
Instructions To Consultant	PROVIDED	18	55
	NOT PROVIDED	15	45
Technical Standards Form	PROVIDED	11	33
	NOT PROVIDED	22	67
Financial Standards Form	PROVIDED	12	36
	NOT PROVIDED	21	64
Terms Of Reference	PROVIDED	32	97
	NOT PROVIDED	1	3
Contract Conditions	PROVIDED	12	36
	NOT PROVIDED	21	64
Total of RFP Documents	PROVIDED	114	58
	NOT PROVIDED	84	42

Cross tabulation as illustrated in table.3 showed that there is a different views between the consultancy firm professionals and governmental professionals as 55% from consultants confirmed that the RFP document are provided while 73% respondents from Governmental confirmed the provision of such documents. Tables 1.1 and 1.2 illustrated the provision of documents verses the qualifications and years of experience respectively.

Part (2) - Section (2): Necessary information to be included in the Request for Proposal (RFP) Documents

Table 3 shows that the necessary information for the proposal preparation and evaluation are included are only 37%

Table 3: Information to be included in RFP documents - Frequencies

	N	Percent
PROVIDED	222	37%
NOT PROVIDED	372	63%

Frequencies for each of the necessary information to be included RFP documents and in which document is presented in attachment 1 table 2.

As most of the critical information which affect the tendering process are included in the ITC document, cross tabulation analysis was performed and the results are illustrated in the attachment (1) table 3 between the information to be included in the ITC and the provision of the ITC. As it can be seen that 81% of information regarding the details of the two stages evaluation process are not included.

Part (3) – Transparency

Table 4 shows that more than 60% of the participants agreed that there is no transparency maintained during the Consultant’s selection process

Table 4: Transparency

	Frequency	Percent
Maintained	13	39
Not Maintained	20	61
Total	33	100.0

Cross tabulation analysis between transparency and firm type shows that 80% of Governmental firms and 57% of consultancy firms confirmed that there is no transparency maintained during the selection process as illustrated in attachment (1) table 4.1 .

Conclusions

This paper studied the application of QCBS method for the Consultant selection and examined the completion of the RFP document and the information which shall be included in the RFP documents and the following points can be concluded:

- There is a lack of provision of the RFP documents especially the standard forms for

technical and financial offers and the draft contract at the bidding stage.

- Lack of information that must be included in the RFP especially the information regarding the evaluation process.
- Lack of transparency during the evaluation process.
- Different views between the Consultant professionals and governmental professionals in the provision of the RFP documents

To eliminate and avoid the deficiencies for the application of the QCBS methods it is recommended that following be undertaken:

- Establishing a standard RFP documents and the steps for bidding be clearly indicated.
- TOR shall be prepared with full information that can help both the consultants and Client to well understand the assignment.
- The client seek help by appointing independent consultant for advising in the establishment of the QCBS system that will be used in the future tenders.
- Training and awareness of the selection process be conducted by the consultants and clients.
- To maintain maximum degree of transparency, all stages of the selection process shall be opened to all competitors and brief report of the technical evaluation is to be recorded and distributed to all bidders.

References:

1. FIDIC GUIDE TO PRACTICE, The Business of a Professional Services Firm, 2015 Edition, <http://fidic.org/books/fidic->
2. FIDIC Quality Based Consultant Selection Guide, September 2011
3. FIDIC Guidelines for the Selection of Consultants, 2nd Edition, 2013
4. Consulting services manual 2006: a comprehensive guide to the selection of consultants at the World Bank, ISBN-10: 0-8213-6523-1 ,World Bank, Washington, 2006
5. Guidelines for the Use of Consultants Under ISLAMIC DEVELOPMENT BANK FINANCING, 2005
6. Rules and Procedures for the Use of Consultants African Development Bank, May 2008 Edition, Revised July 2012

[1] chitz-Hankel type involving products of Bessel functions,” Phil. Trans. Roy. Soc. London, vol. A247, pp. 529-551, April 1955. (references)

[2] J. Clerk Maxwell, A Treatise on Electricity and Magnetism, 3rd ed., vol. 2. Oxford: Clarendon, 1892, pp.68-73.

[3] I.S. Jacobs and C.P. Bean, "Fine particles, thin films and exchange anisotropy," in Magnetism, vol. III, G.T. Rado and H. Suhl, Eds. New York: Academic, 1963, pp. 271-350.

[4] K. Elissa, "Title of paper if known," unpublished.

[5] R. Nicole, "Title of paper with only first word capitalized," J. Name Stand. Abbrev., in press.

[6] Y. Yorozu, M. Hirano, K. Oka, and Y. Tagawa, "Electron spectroscopy studies on magneto-optical

Attachment 1

Tables 1.1, 1.2 and 1.3: Cross tabulation: Provision of Document tables 1.1, 1.2 and 1.3

Table 1.1 RFP*Qualifications Cross tabulation

			Qualifications			Total
			PhD	MSC	BSc	
Provision of RFP Documents	Count		22	61	31	114
	PROVIDED	% within Qualifications	61%	56%	57%	
		% of Total	11%	31%	16%	58%
	Count		14	47	23	84
	NOT PROVIDED	% within Qualifications	39%	44%	43%	
		% of Total	7%	24%	12%	42%
Total	Count		36	108	54	198
		% of Total	18%	55%	27%	100%

Table 1.2 RFP*Years Of Experience Cross tabulation

			Years of experience					Total
			2 to 10	10 to 20	20 to30	30 to 40	40 above	
Provision of RFP Documents	Count		37	42	22	7	6	114
	PROVIDED	% within YOE	62%	58%	61%	58%	33%	
		% of Total	19%	21%	11%	4%	3%	58%
	Count		23	30	14	5	12	84
	NOT PROVIDED	% within YOE	38%	42%	39%	42%	67%	
		% of Total	12%	15%	7%	3%	6%	42%
Total	Count		60	72	36	12	18	198
		% of Total	30%	36%	18%	6%	9%	100.0%

Table 1.3 RFP*Firm Type Cross tabulation

			Firm type		Total
			Consultancy	Governmental	
Provision of RFP Documents	Count		92	22	114
	PROVIDED	% within Firm	54.8%	73.3%	
		% of Total	46.5%	11.1%	57.6%
	Count		76	8	84
	NOT PROVIDED	% within Firm	45.2%	26.7%	
		% of Total	38.4%	4.0%	42.4%
Total	Count		168	30	198
		% of Total	84.8%	15.2%	100.0%

Tables 2: frequency of each information to be included in the RFP documents

2.1 Information to be included in the letter of invitation(LOI)

2.1.1. Deadline for proposal submission

	Frequency	Percent
INCLUDED	27	82
NOT INCLUDED	6	18

2.1.2 Forms for team composition, assignment and key staff inputs

	Frequency	Percent
INCLUDED	7	21
NOT INCLUDED	26	79

2.2 Information to be included in the Instruction to consultant (ITC)

2.2.1 Clarifications and amendment of RFP documents process

	Frequency	Percent
INCLUDED	8	24
NOT INCLUDED	25	76

2.2.2 Guidance for the preparation of the technical and Financial proposal

	Frequency	Percent
INCLUDED	14	42.4
NOT INCLUDED	19	57.6

2.2.3 Evaluation criteria

	Frequency	Percent
INCLUDED	15	45
NOT INCLUDED	18	55

2.2.4 Minimum required Staff inputs (Staff- time)

	Frequency	Percent
INCLUDED	15	45
NOT INCLUDED	18	55

2.2.5 Information for Submission, Receipt, No. of copies and opening of the proposal

	Frequency	Percent
INCLUDED	23	70
NOT INCLUDED	10	30

2.2 .6 Minimum passing score for quality

	Frequency	Percent
INCLUDED	7	21
NOT INCLUDED	26	79

2.2.7 Details of the two stages evaluation process

	Frequency	Percent
INCLUDED	6	18
NOT INCLUDED	27	82

2.3 Information to be included in the Terms of reference (TOR)

2.3.1 Expected input of key staff (staff time)

	Frequency	Percent
INCLUDED	14	42
NOT INCLUDED	19	58

2.3.2 Qualification of the consultant's key staff proposed for the assignment

	Frequency	Percent
INCLUDED	15	45.5
NOT INCLUDED	18	54.5

2.3.3 Client contribution to the assignment

	Frequency	Percent
INCLUDED	14	42
NOT INCLUDED	19	58

2.4 Information to be included Contract conditions**2.4.1 General conditions of contract**

	Frequency	Percent
INCLUDED	13	39
NOT INCLUDED	20	61

2.5 Information to be included Technical Standard forms**2.5.1 Guide to prepare Approach, methodology and work plan**

	Frequency	Percent
INCLUDED	7	21
NOT INCLUDED	26	79

2.5.2 Forms for work schedule and planning for deliverables

	Frequency	Percent
INCLUDED	9	27
NOT INCLUDED	24	73

2.6 Information to be included Financial Standard forms**2.6.1 Forms for the remuneration breakdown**

	Frequency	Percent
INCLUDED	10	30
NOT INCLUDED	23	70

2.6.2 Forms for reimbursable expenses

	Frequency	Percent
INCLUDED	11	33
NOT INCLUDED	22	67

Table 3.1: Instructions To Consultant * Guidance for the preparation of the technical and Financial proposal Cross tabulation

			Guidance for the preparation of the technical and Financial proposal		Total
			INCLUDED	NOT INCLUDED	
Instructions To Consultant	PROVIDED	Count	11	7	18
		% within Guidance for the preparation of the technical and Financial proposal	78.6%	36.8%	54.5%
		% of Total	33.3%	21.2%	54.5%
	NOT PROVIDED	Count	3	12	15
		% within Guidance for the preparation of the technical and Financial proposal	21.4%	63.2%	45.5%
		% of Total	9.1%	36.4%	45.5%
Total	Count	14	19	33	
	% within Guidance for the preparation of the technical and Financial proposal	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	
	% of Total	42.4%	57.6%	100.0%	

Table 3.1 to 3.6: Crosstab, Information to be included in the ITC vs. the provision of the ITC

Table 3.2: Instructions To Consultant * Evaluation criteria Cross tabulation

			Evaluation criteria		Total
			INCLUDED	NOT INCLUDED	
Instructions To Consultant	PROVIDED	Count	12	6	18
		% within Evaluation criteria	80.0%	33.3%	54.5%
		% of Total	36.4%	18.2%	54.5%
	NOT PROVIDED	Count	3	12	15
		% within Evaluation criteria	20.0%	66.7%	45.5%
		% of Total	9.1%	36.4%	45.5%
Total	Count	15	18	33	
	% within Evaluation criteria	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	
	% of Total	45.5%	54.5%	100.0%	

Table 3.3 Instructions To Consultant * Minimum required Staff inputs (Staff- time) Cross tabulation

			Minimum required Staff inputs (Staff-time)		Total
			INCLUDED	NOT INCLUDED	
Instructions To Consultant	PROVIDED	Count	13	5	18
		% within Minimum required Staff inputs (Staff- time)	86.7%	27.8%	54.5%
		% of Total	39.4%	15.2%	54.5%
	NOT PROVIDED	Count	2	13	15
		% within Minimum required Staff inputs (Staff- time)	13.3%	72.2%	45.5%
		% of Total	6.1%	39.4%	45.5%
Total	Count	15	18	33	
	% within Minimum required Staff inputs (Staff- time)	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	
	% of Total	45.5%	54.5%	100.0%	

Table 3.4 Instructions To Consultant * Information for Submission, Receipt, No. of copies and opening of the proposal Cross tabulation

			Information for Submission, Receipt, No. of copies and opening of the proposal		Total
			INCLUDED	NOT INCLUDED	
Instructions To Consultant	PROVIDED	Count	15	3	18
		% within Information for Submission, Receipt, No. of copies and opening of the proposal	65.2%	30.0%	54.5%
		% of Total	45.5%	9.1%	54.5%
	NOT PROVIDED	Count	8	7	15
		% within Information for Submission, Receipt, No. of copies and opening of the proposal	34.8%	70.0%	45.5%
		% of Total	24.2%	21.2%	45.5%
Total	Count	23	10	33	
	% within Information for Submission, Receipt, No. of copies and opening of the proposal	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	
	% of Total	69.7%	30.3%	100.0%	

Table 3.5 Instructions To Consultant * Minimum passing score for quality Cross tabulation

			Minimum passing score for quality		Total
			INCLUDED	NOT INCLUDED	
Instructions To Consultant	PROVIDED	Count	5	13	18
		% within Minimum passing score for quality	71.4%	50.0%	54.5%
		% of Total	15.2%	39.4%	54.5%
	NOT PROVIDED	Count	2	13	15
		% within Minimum passing score for quality	28.6%	50.0%	45.5%
		% of Total	6.1%	39.4%	45.5%
Total		Count	7	26	33
		% within Minimum passing score for quality	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%
		% of Total	21.2%	78.8%	100.0%

Table 3.6 Instructions To Consultant * Details of the two stages evaluation process Cross tabulation

			Details of the two stages evaluation process		Total
			INCLUDED	NOT INCLUDED	
Instructions To Consultant	PROVIDED	Count	6	12	18
		% within Details of the two stages evaluation process	100.0%	44.4%	54.5%
		% of Total	18.2%	36.4%	54.5%
	NOT PROVIDED	Count	0	15	15
		% within Details of the two stages evaluation process	0.0%	55.6%	45.5%
		% of Total	0.0%	45.5%	45.5%
Total		Count	6	27	33
		% within Details of the two stages evaluation process	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%
		% of Total	18.2%	81.8%	100.0%

Table 4 Transparency Cross tabulation

Table 4.1 Transparency * Firm type Cross tabulation

			Firm type		Total
			Consultancy	Governmental	
Transparency	YES	Count	12	1	13
		% within Firm type	42.9%	20.0%	39.4%
		% of Total	36.4%	3.0%	39.4%
	NO	Count	16	4	20
		% within Firm type	57.1%	80.0%	60.6%
		% of Total	48.5%	12.1%	60.6%
Total		Count	28	5	33
		% within Firm type	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%
		% of Total	84.8%	15.2%	100.0%