

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

i. Specific experience of the Consultant relevant to the assignment: [10 Points]

- a) Experience in similar projects, areas and conditions*
- b) Specialization*
- c) 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

ii. Adequacy of the proposed methodology and work plan in responding to the Terms of Reference: [45 Points]

1) Technical Approach and Methodology. [25]

- 1) The understanding of the objectives of the assignment - problems being addressed and their importance;*
- 2) The approach for carrying out the activities and obtaining the expected output,*
- 3) 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.

2) Work Plan. [20]

- a) Identifies the main activities of the assignment - their content and duration;*
- b) Timing, durations, phasing and interrelations, milestones, approvals;*
- c) Clearly developed technical approach and methodology;*
- d) List of deliverables and delivery dates.*

Scoring:

- **Poor [max. 5]:** Omits important tasks; timing of activities inconsistent with the proposed method of approach; lack of clarity and logic in the sequencing.
- **Satisfactory [max. 10]:** All key activities are included, with some detailed; minor inconsistencies between timing, outputs and approach.

- **Good [max. 15]:** 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. 20]:** In addition to “good” - decision points, sequence and timing very well-defined, optimized the use of resources; fully detailed; flexibility to accommodate contingencies

iii. Consultant’s qualifications and competence for the assignment: [45 Points = 100%]

a) General Qualifications [20%]

- 1) *Level of education and training*
- 2) *Positions held*
- 3) *Years of experience*
- 4) *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 and levels 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.

b) Experience in the Region [15%]

- 1) *Knowledge of local conditions and key stakeholders (culture, administrative systems, OECS procedure, OECS organization)*
- 2) *Ability to communicate in the local language*

Scoring:

- **Poor [max. 5%]:** No / occasional work in similar countries; English insufficient
- **Satisfactory [max. 8%]:** worked in countries with similar cultural, administrative and governmental systems; English adequate.
- **Good [max. 10%]:** Recent work in similar countries in same region; fluent in English.
- **Very Good [max. 15%]:** In addition to “good” - detailed knowledge of countries and language through years of direct professional work.

c) Familiarity with qualitative research and/or Participatory Action Research: [15 Points]

Scoring:

- **Poor [max. 5%]:** Consultant shows very limited evidence of experience or qualifications in qualitative or participatory action research.
- **Satisfactory [max. 8%]:** Consultant shows some degree of experience or qualifications in qualitative or participatory action research.
- **Good [max. 10%]:** Consultant shows clear evidence of experience, knowledge or awareness of qualitative or participatory action research.
- **Very Good [max. 15%]:** Consultant clearly demonstrate significant experience, knowledge or

awareness of qualitative research and more specifically participatory action research. The implementation strategies proposed for all programme components, clearly demonstrate significant knowledge, experience and awareness of specific needs of vulnerable groups.

d) Experience/training in multidimensional measurement [15%]

- 1) *Relevant education or training in multidimensional poverty approaches*
- 2) *Specific and practical experience in multidimensional poverty*

Scoring:

- **Poor [max. 5%]:** No / occasional work in this area; qualifications not relevant / specific to assignment.
- **Satisfactory [max. 8%]:** experience fits assigned position; recently & successfully held similar position / assignment on multidimensional poverty issues; specialized skills.
- **Good [max. 12%]:** qualifications suitable for work on multidimensional poverty; recently & successfully held several similar positions / assignments; skills fully consistent with assignment.
- **Very Good [max. 15%]:** In addition to “good” - qualifications and experience substantially exceed specific requirements.

e) Oral and written communications skills: [10 Points]

Scoring:

- **Poor [max. 4%]:** Consultant shows very limited capacity in written and oral communications skills.
- **Satisfactory [max. 6%]:** Consultant shows some degree of capacity to express his/herself in written and oral forms of communication.
- **Good [max. 8%]:** There is clear evidence of sound skills and experience in written and oral communication strategies.
- **Very Good [max. 10%]:** The consultant demonstrates an advanced capacity and significant experience with written and oral communications.

f) Capacity building (training) experience [15%]

- 3) *Relevant education or training in training adults*
- 4) *Specific and practical experience in training adults*

Scoring:

- **Poor [max. 5%]:** No / occasional work in this area; qualifications not relevant / specific to training of adults.
- **Satisfactory [max. 8%]:** experience fits assigned position; recently & successfully held similar position / assignment involving the transfer of skills/knowledge to adults.
- **Good [max. 12%]:** qualifications suitable for work in training of trainers; recently & successfully held several similar positions / assignments; skills fully consistent with assignment.
- **Very Good [max. 15%]:** In addition to “good” - qualifications and experience substantially exceed specific requirements.

g) Sensitivity to the needs of vulnerable groups: [10 Points]

Scoring:

- **Poor [max. 4%]:** Consultant shows very limited evidence of sensitivity to specific needs of vulnerable

groups and relevant strategies for engaging them.

- **Satisfactory [max. 6%]:** Consultant shows some degree of sensitivity to specific needs of vulnerable groups and relevant strategies for engaging them.
- **Good [max. 8%]:** Implementation strategies identified give clear evidence of experience, knowledge or awareness of specific needs of vulnerable groups.
- **Very Good [max. 10%]:** The implementation strategies proposed for all programme components, clearly demonstrate significant knowledge, experience and awareness of specific needs of vulnerable groups.