**GUIDE FOR INTERPRETATION OF SUB-CRITERIA FOR EVALUATION OF TECHNICAL PROPOSALS**

1. **Specific experience of the Consultants / Firm relevant to the assignment: [10 Points]**
	1. *Experience in similar projects, areas and conditions*
	2. *Specialization*
	3. *Quality Management*

**Scoring**

* **Satisfactory [max. 5]:** Adequate experience in field, conditions and general approaches relevant to the assignment.
* **Good [max. 7]:** Extensive experience in field, similar conditions and issues; experience with relevant advanced approaches & methodologies
* **Very Good [max. 10]**: Outstanding, advanced expertise in similar issues; world class specialists in relevant approaches & methodologies; well established *Quality Management* procedures
1. **Adequacy of the proposed methodology and work plan in responding to the Terms of Reference: [45 Points]**
2. Technical Approach and Methodology. [25]
3. *The understanding of the objectives of the assignment - problems being addressed and their importance;*
4. *The approach for carrying out the activities and obtaining the expected output,*
5. *The explanation of the methodologies to be adopted, including their compatibility the proposed approach.*

**Scoring:**

* **Poor [max. 10]:** Method of approach inappropriate or very poorly presented; misunderstood the scope of work.
* **Satisfactory [max. 15]:** Standard / generic approach relevant to the assignment.
* **Good [max. 20]:** Method of approach includes reasonable degree of detail; specifically tailored and flexible.
* **Very Good [max. 25]**: In addition to “**good**” - important issues approached efficiently, outstanding knowledge of new solutions, and use of state-of-the-art approaches, methodologies and knowledge.
1. Work Plan. [15]
	1. *Identifies the main activities of the assignment - their content and duration;*
	2. *Timing, durations, phasing and interrelations, milestones, approvals;*
	3. *Consistency with the technical approach and methodology and Form TECH-8;*
	4. *List of deliverables and delivery dates.*

**Scoring:**

* **Poor [max. 4]:** Omits important tasks; timing of activities inconsistent with the proposed method of approach; lack *of* clarity and logic in the sequencing.
* **Satisfactory [max. 9]:** All key activities are included, with some detailed; minor inconsistencies between timing, outputs and approach.
* **Good [max. 12]:** Work plan responds well to TOR; all important activities indicated; timing appropriate and consistent with outputs; interrelation between the activities are realistic and consistent with approach; reasonable degree of detail.
* **Very Good [max. 15]:** In addition to “**good**” - decision points, sequence and timing very well-defined, optimized the use of resources; fully detailed; flexibility to accommodate contingencies
1. Organization and Staffing. [5]
2. *Team structure and composition – including the following considerations:*
3. *Main disciplines and expert responsibilities – including the following considerations:*
4. *Technical and support staff – including the following consideration:*

**Scoring:**

* **Poor [max. 1]:** Organization chart sketchy; staffing plan weak; staffing schedule inconsistent with timing of key outputs; no clarity in allocation of tasks and responsibilities; specialists never worked as a team; implementation schedule not well defined; timing of outputs open-ended.
* **Satisfactory [max. 3]:** organization chart complete and detailed; technical level and composition of staffing adequate; staffing consistent with timing and outputs; implementation schedule reasonably well defined.
* **Good [max. 4]:** In addition to “**satisfactory**” - staff well-coordinated; clear and detailed duties and responsibilities; precise matching of staff skills and needs; efficient logistic support; team has worked well together; implementation schedule well defined.
* **Very Good [max. 5]:** In addition to “**good**” - team is integrated and has worked together extensively; very good optimization in use and deployment of staff (efficiency and economy); timely outputs.
1. **Key professional staff qualifications and competence for the assignment: [30 Points = 100%]**
2. General Qualifications [20%]
3. *Level of education and training*
4. *Positions held*
5. *Years of experience*
6. *Professional publications and presentation*

**Scoring:**

* **Poor [max. 7%]:** less experience than specified in TOR/RFP
* **Satisfactory [max. 12%]:** meets minimum experience; relevant academic education and training.
* **Good [max. 15%]:** exceeds minimum experience; creditable professional achievements, e.g., positions andlevels of responsibility
* **Very Good [max. 20%]:** extensive experience; recognized as a top expert in specialty; up to date in relevant state-of-the-art expertise / tools.
1. Adequacy for the Assignment [60%]
2. *Relevance of education and training*
3. *Specific and practical experience in similar assignment*

**Scoring:**

* **Poor [max. 15%]:** No / occasional work in similar position; qualifications not relevant / specific to assignment.
* **Satisfactory [max. 30%]:** experience fits assigned position; recently & successfully held similar position / assignment; skills adequate for the job.
* **Good [max. 45%]:** qualifications suitable for position; recently & successfully held several similar positions / assignments; skills fully consistent with assignment.
* **Very Good [max. 60%]:** In addition to “**good**” - qualifications and experience substantially exceed specific requirements.
1. Experience in the Region [20%]
2. *Knowledge of local conditions and key stakeholders (culture, administrative systems, OECS procedure, OECS organization)*
3. *Ability to communicate in the local language*

 **Scoring:**

* **Poor [max. 7%]:** No / occasional work in similar countries; English insufficient
* **Satisfactory [max. 12%]:** worked in countries with similar cultural, administrative andgovernmental systems; English adequate.
* **Good [max. 15%]:** Recent work in similar countries in same region; fluent in English.
* **Very Good [max. 20%]**: In addition to “**good**” - detailed knowledge of countries and language through years of direct professional work.
1. **Capacity building for vulnerable groups: [15 Points]**

**Scoring:**

* **Poor [max. 5]:** Firm shows very limited evidence of sensitivity to specific needs of vulnerable groups in the implementation strategies for capacity building initiatives for vulnerable groups.
* **Good [max. 10]:** Implementation strategies identified by the firm give clear evidence of experience, knowledge or awareness of specific needs of vulnerable groups in providing capacity building for them.
* **Very Good [max. 15]**: The implementation strategies proposed by the firm for all programme components, clearly demonstrates significant knowledge, experience and awareness of specific needs of vulnerable groups in designing and implementing capacity building for vulnerable groups.