Evaluation methodology and criteria for the review of the bids and award

Only proposals received within the stipulated time period will be accepted. To select the proposal, a "Competitive Screening Evaluation Team" (CSET) has been established. After the <u>eligibility</u> (please refer to the Applicant's Self-Certification form) of the applicant is confirmed, CSET examines all proposals against the following criteria:

| Criteria | Weight |
|--|--------|
| <u>Technical</u> | 50% |
| <u>General description</u> Consistency of the proposal with the Concept Note and the Project Descriptio Document, clarity and pertinence of the linkages between the identified issue and opportunities, and the objectives proposed to tackle them, the components and activities proposed to achieve the objectives, and the output and outcomes expected to be obtained as a result of implementing the activities. | |
| <u>Specific evaluation questions</u> 1 - Is the proposal aligned with the Concept Note and Additional Information? Max 9 points | |
| 2 - Is the proposal properly focussed on activities to be undertaken (for each component) to reach the intended objectives, expected results and deliverables? Max 9 points | |
| 3 - Does the applicant and its implementation partners (if applicable) have demonstrated/track record of technical expertise in financial management? Max 8 points | |
| 4 - Is the proposal properly set-up to reach the target group? Max 8 points | |
| 5 - Is the proposal innovative? Max 8 points | |
| 6 - Is the proposal feasible within the planned project implementation period? Max 8 points | |

| Institutional | 20% |
|---|-----|
| General Description Experience of proponent (and of any possible associated implementation partner) in the training/capacity building area and in the specific theme, availability or possibility to avail required language skills. Implementation capacity, both technical and for financial management Sustainability/ Scaling-up of the proposal after project completion | |
| Specific evaluation questions 1 - Does the applicant and its implementing partners (if applicable) have the organizational capacity to implement projects on a global scale in all regions? Max 5 points | |
| 2 - Does the applicant and its implementing partners (if applicable) have the financial capacity and solid financial conditions for project implementation? Max 5 points | |
| 3 - Does the proposal have a high potential for scaling-up the results after termination and does the proposal include any strategy for institutional arrangements and/or financial support for continuation after termination? Max 5 points | |
| 4 – Does the applicant and its implementing partners (if applicable) have demonstrated experience working together with international institutions? Max 5 points | |
| Financial | 15% |
| <u>General description</u> Value for money, which does not necessarily mean going for the cheapest option, but making sure that IFAD gets the desired technical quality at the bes price. This requires a judgment on whether the expected development benefi justify the costs. Budget: - Adequate balance among components, overheads within the limits of 8% - Co-financing proposed by the recipient, if any, even in kind - Possibility to mobilize co-financing from other institutions | |
| Specific evaluation questions | |
| 1 - Is the budget appropriately related to the objectives and does it reflect an efficient cost structure (cost-benefit ratio)? Max 5 points | |

| 2 - Is the proportion of total project costs and administrative overhead | |
|--|-----|
| adequate? | |
| Max 5 points | |
| | |
| 3 - Does the proposal include co-financing or mobilization of co-funding? | |
| Max 5 points | |
| | |
| | |
| | 10% |
| Programme specific criteria- 1 | |
| Experience in logistic/organizational arrangements for face to face | |
| trainings, including travel and visa management for participants | |
| Specific evaluation questions | |
| Specific evaluation questions 1 - Does the applicant and its implementing partners (if applicable) have | |
| proven experience in organizing trainings with participants coming from | |
| different regions of the world and in different languages? | |
| Max 5 points | |
| | |
| 2 - Does the applicant and its implementing partners (if applicable) have | |
| experience in managing travel arrangements (including visa process), per | |
| diem management, and related arrangements? | |
| Max 5 points | |
| | |
| | 5% |
| Programme specific criteria- 2 | |
| Experience in organizing/managing on line trainings, exams and certifications | |
| | |
| Specific evaluation questions | |
| 1 - Does the applicant and its implementing partners (if applicable) have proven | |
| experience in providing on-line training, administering face-to-face and online | |
| exams and certifications? | |
| Max 5 points | |
| | |

To note that the financial aspects will be examined only for applicants who passed at least the Technical and Institutional screening.

Each evaluator will review the submitted Design Document against the set evaluation criteria, and provide ratings and comments to justify the ratings. For each criterion, a score will be assigned. The application receiving the highest total score will be selected.

No discussion will take place with the applicant on the substance of the proposals as long as the award has not been decided and internally approved.

Reviewers will also evaluate the selection process against the following key principles:

- **Impartiality**: recipients are rated with same criteria. Sufficient time provided (minimum 3 weeks for invitees)

- **Transparency**: relevant documents are disclosed equally to all recipients. Evaluation criteria specified in the solicitation document. Feedback is provided.

- **Rigour**: good balance of skills in the reviewer committee. ensure that appropriate records and data are maintained. Criteria ranking clearly articulated.

Applicants should note that, once selected, IFAD may require further refinements of the proposal throughout the internal review process, that the selected proposal will be subjected to prior review before submission for final approval.

In the event that only one applicant is considered eligible, a Direct Selection mechanism applies. In this case, the IFAD sponsor mobilizes the support of the Competitive Screening Evaluation Team to conduct a Review as per the evaluation criteria (specified above) to reach a conclusion on the value, merit and cost of the bid. The minutes of the meeting are prepared, submitted to the Division Director for agreement, and then made available to management for decision.