

The maximum scores must correspond to the evaluation grid included in the tender dossier

### EVALUATOR'S GRID

To be completed for each tender by each evaluator

	Maximum	Initial assessment	Revised assessment
<b>Organisation and methodology</b>			
Rationale	[20] [<other>]		
Strategy	[40] [<other>]		
Back-up function	[10] [<other>]		
Involvement of all members of the consortium	[10] [<other>]		
Timetable of activities	[20] [<other>]		
<b>Total score for Organisation and methodology</b>	<b>100</b>		
<b>Overall total score</b>	<b>100</b>		

<b>Strengths</b>	
<b>Weaknesses</b>	

Evaluation performed by:

<b>Name</b>	
<b>Signature</b>	
<b>Date</b>	

## **INSTRUCTIONS AND GUIDELINES TO EVALUATORS FOR A GLOBAL PRICE CONTRACT**

Each evaluator must make an initial assessment of the technical offers and award scores on each sub-criterion according to his/her assessment.

To this end, all evaluators should independently from each other carry out the evaluation of the technical offers in a consistent manner by applying the same methodology, interpretation and understanding. This does not necessarily mean that the scores of two different evaluators are expected to be identical, but rather that each evaluator applies the same standards and provides a well substantiated opinion supporting his/her individual scores. To their assistance the guidelines below should be used.

Each evaluator should be able to justify his/her assessment and scores in a meeting of the Evaluation Committee. The justifications must relate to the description of the project needs in the terms of reference. Evaluators must therefore make comments in the strengths and weaknesses boxes.

The assessments made will be discussed in the evaluation meeting(s) and each evaluator may make adjustments to the initial assessments after this discussion.

### **Evaluation of the involvement of all members of the consortium:**

The tender shall include a description of the input from each member of the consortium and the distribution and interaction of tasks and responsibilities between them. If a tender is made by an individual company and not by a consortium, the maximum points should be allocated to "involvement of the consortium".

### **Evaluation of the back-up function:**

The tenderer shall give a description of the support facilities (back-stopping) that they will provide to their team of experts during the implementation of the contract. The description of the back-up function should include a list of staff, units, capacity of permanent staff regularly intervening as experts on similar projects, provision of expertise in the region/country of origin as well as partner countries, organisational structure, etc. which are supposed to ensure that function, as well as the available quality systems and knowledge capitalisation methods and tools, within the respective members of the consortium

A permanent capacity of staff regularly intervening as experts on similar projects should be considered as an advantage for providing support to experts on the ground. By contrast, a service contractor which is exclusively employing free-lance experts (i.e. non-permanent) should be considered to have a less robust backstopping capacity.

If the tenderer is providing expertise in its region/country of origin as well as in partner countries it may be considered as an ability to disseminate innovation.

If the tenderer has design, research, laboratory or even innovation function, or whether it collaborates with academic research centre, it may be considered an advantage.

### **Evaluation of experts:**

Even if exceptionally key experts are required there is no specific evaluation criterion for the key experts but the assessment is part of the strategy. The key experts shall generally not be interviewed.

Note that civil servants and other staff of the public administration of the partner country shall only be approved to work as experts if well justified. The justification should be submitted with the tender and shall include information on the added value the expert will bring, on any potential interference or conflict of interest of the proposed expert in his/her function as expert and his/her present or previous functions working as civil servant as well as proof that the expert is detached or on personal leave.

The summary table below should be understood as a guideline for the evaluator's judgement on an individual line of the evaluation grid.

Note that only tenders with average scores of **75** points or more are considered technically acceptable and qualify for the financial evaluation.

Deleted: 80

total points	average 60 %	> good > 80 %	excellent >95 %
30	18 - 23	24 - 28	29 - 30
25	15 - 19	20 - 23	24 - 25
24	15 - 19	20 - 22	23 - 24
23	14 - 18	19 - 21	22 - 23
22	14 - 17	18 - 20	21 - 22
21	13 - 16	17 - 19	20 - 21
20	12 - 15	16 - 18	19 - 20
19	12 - 15	16 - 18	19
18	11 - 14	15 - 17	18
17	11 - 13	14 - 16	17
16	10 - 13	13 - 15	16
15	9 - 11	12 - 14	15
14	9 - 11	12 - 13	14
13	8 - 10	11 - 12	13
12	8 - 9	10 - 11	12
11	7 - 8	9 - 10	11
10	6 - 7	8 - 9	10
9	6 - 7	8	9
8	5 - 6	7	8
7	5	6	7
6	4	5	6
5	3	4	5
4	3	4	4
3	2	3	3
2	2	2	2

Deleted: b12b\_evaluatorsgrid\_global\_en.doc