

Explanation NICHE TEC score sheet

Scores

Criterion		Score
I.	Capacity of the applicant/consortium	
I.1	Has the applicant and its sub-contractors shown that it has experience with comparable capacity building projects in the subject matter in the country in question or other developing countries?	25
I.2	Has the applicant and its sub-contractors shown that it has other knowledge or experience that is relevant for the implementation of the project?	10
Sub-total		35
(minimum score)		21
II.	Substantive quality of the proposed project	
II.1	Effectiveness (suitability of the chosen approach for achieving the desired effects)	8
II.2	Efficiency (degree to which the proposed application of resources can be expected to achieve the intended results)	7
II.3	Ownership (degree to which the proposal addresses ownership systematically)	7
II.4	Gender (degree to which the approach and activities can be expected to have a positive influence on the opportunities, living conditions and/or position of women)	7
II.5	Labour market (degree to which the project training and education activities are designed to relate to demands in the national labour market)	7
II.6	Degree to which possibilities for education and training which already exist in the region (and not belonging to the requesting organization) will be used	7
II.7	Sustainability (degree to which the proposal specifically addresses the academic, institutional, technical and financial sustainability of the project's results)	7
Sub-total		50
(minimum score)		30
III.	Technical quality of the project proposal	
III.1	Quality of the logical framework	8
III.2	Quality of the budget (transparent and realistic)	6
III.3	Quality of a system for internal project monitoring and evaluation	6
III.4	Quality of the project's organization and management	6
III.5	Quality of the presentation of the proposal	4
Sub-total		30
(minimum score)		18
IV.	Quality of the team members	
IV.1	Experience and expertise of the project director, bearing the policy responsibility for the project	7
IV.2	Experience and expertise of the principal adviser/coordinator delivering the major operational input in project implementation and/or management	10
IV.3	The other team members' knowledge and work experience in the region and/or in the subject matter in question	6
IV.4	Degree to which local or regional expertise (not belonging to the requesting organization) will be enlisted for the project	6
IV.5	Clear explanation of roles and responsibilities of team members in relation to the activities in the work plan	6
Sub-total		35
(minimum score)		21
Total score		150
(total minimum score I-IV)		90

V. Price

- V.1 Maximum 25% of the maximum score (to be calculated by Nuffic on the basis of a price comparison between the received bids)

50

Maximum Total Score 200

Footnotes to the criteria:

A. Assessment of the capacity of the applicant and the quality of the proposal

I. Capacity of the applicant/consortium

- I.1 Has the applicant and its sub-contractors shown that it has experience with comparable capacity building projects in the subject matter in the country in question or other developing countries?
- Has the applicant and its sub-contractors included a list of verifiable references of relevant and substantial projects which have been carried out by the applicant and its sub-contractors over the last 5 years? The list should include 3 projects. At least two of the projects should have a value over and above Euro 200,000 and have been implemented by the lead organization.
- I.2 Has the applicant and its sub-contractors shown that it has other knowledge or experience that is relevant for the implementation of the project?
- Are the testimonials credible, convincing and relevant in view of the experience needed for the implementation of the project?
 - Does the information make clear that the applicant (and its sub-contractors) has a specific added value in relation to the objectives and requirements of this project?

The projects and programmes which the applicant has conducted or been part of in recent years should provide evidence for the applicant's work experience in the specific field and region or country in question. Projects to strengthen capacity for post-secondary education and training are particularly relevant here. These activities should be described in terms of the type of organization(s) being given support, the countries where these are located, the purpose of the project or programme in question, the activities involved, the duration of the project or programme and its budget, and the role which the applicant and its employees played in the project or programme.

Criterion II. The substantive quality of the proposed project

The main subject of consideration here is the approach and strategy taken in order to achieve the project objectives and to solve relevant problems.

- II.1 Effectiveness (suitability of the chosen approach for achieving the desired effects)
- Is the approach tailor-made to the needs described in the project outline?
 - Is the chosen approach and strategy clear and realistic?
 - Are the planned results clear and realistic?
 - Are individual, organizational and institutional levels of capacity building related to each other?
 - Is the approach innovative in terms of proposed solutions, inputs and appropriate technologies?

- Is the approach taking into account the absorption capacity/carrying capacity of the requesting organization?
 - Does the proposed strategy (content, process and management) reflect experiences gained in previous and similar capacity building projects?
 - Is active exchange of knowledge or co-operation proposed with organizations or NICHE projects with congruent objectives, in the country or region?
- II.2 Efficiency (degree to which the proposed application of resources can be expected to achieve the intended results)
- Have the project resources (financial, physical, manpower, etc) been clearly described in both quantitative and qualitative terms?
 - Have adequate reasons been given for the choice and/or mix of resources?
 - Will the proposed resources be appropriate for the proposed activities?
 - Are the proposed resources proportional to the results the project is meant to achieve?
 - Has the involvement of proposed Dutch expertise (short, medium, long-term missions) been adequately described and justified?
- II.3 Ownership (degree to which the proposal addresses ownership systematically)
- Has it been made clear that the requesting organization(s) has a decisive say in steering or redirecting project processes?
 - Has it been made clear that also the requesting organization(s) is responsible for the planning, reporting, budgeting and finances of the project? Is this responsibility translated into the project management structure and division of labour?
 - Is a clear division in responsibilities provided, who is doing what and who takes the decisions between applicant and requesting organization?
- II.4 Gender (degree to which the approach and activities can be expected to have a positive influence on the opportunities, living conditions and/or position of women)
- Have gender equality issues relevant for the project been identified and elaborated (approach) in the proposal?
 - Is gender systematically integrated in the logical framework of the project (objectives, outcomes, outputs, activities and inputs)? Are gender indicators included?
 - Does the proposal make clear how attention for gender issues and objectives will be anchored in the management, implementation and monitoring of the project?
- II.5 Labour market (degree to which the project training and education activities are designed to relate to demands in the national labour market)
- Has it been made clear how the study, training or research programmes will match the requirements of the national labour market?
 - Is a mechanism proposed to ensure the involvement of representatives of the local Labour Market (public, private or parallel sector) in the planning and monitoring of the project?
 - Does the proposal provide indicators that can measure the effects of the project on (the strengthening of) the labour market?
- II.6 Degree to which possibilities for education and training which already exist in the region (and not belonging to the requesting organization) will be used

- Are education and training institutes in the region (the country the project will operate in, neighbouring countries or same continent) being proposed to offer their services for the project? *(Note that private enterprises also qualify)*
- If the involvement of regional education and training institutions is proposed, is this involvement incorporated in the proposed consortium?
- Is the involvement of regional education and training institutions proposed and is this involvement based on a written intention of collaboration between the bidder and a regional party?

II.7 Sustainability (degree to which the proposal specifically addresses the academic, institutional, technical and financial sustainability of the project's results)

- Has the applicant proposed measures and activities that will contribute to and create a conducive environment for the project to ensure a high level of sustainability at the different levels described below:
 - o Academic sustainability: does the proposal /strategy conduce towards enabling the requesting organization to maintain and upgrade the educational services produced during the lifetime of the project?
 - o Institutional sustainability: does the proposal /strategy conduce towards enabling the requesting organization to absorb and 'embed' project activities in her/their structure, system and strategic plans?
 - o Financial sustainability: is a proposal /strategy included to have financial resources available to keep the project results going beyond the timeframe of the project?
 - o Technical sustainability: is their sufficiently presence of skills and tools to properly use and maintain hardware, facilities and vehicles?
- Does the proposal include appropriate training for administrative, financial and technical support staff to ensure sustainability of project results?

Criterion III. Technical quality of the project proposal

Technical quality of the project proposal will be assessed in terms of various factors and the relationships between them.

III.1 Quality of the logical framework

- Does the proposal contain a clear and realistic relationship between objectives, planned results, activities, required resources, outcome and output indicators, sources of verification and budget indications?

III.2 Quality of the budget (transparent and realistic)

- Is the budget realistic and clearly linked to the project proposal (relationship between project strategy, objectives, activities, inputs and budget)?
- Are budget allocations proportional to project objectives and planned results?
- Is the division of the budget over cost categories clear?

III.3 Quality of a system for internal project monitoring and evaluation

- Is a system for internal project monitoring and evaluation included in the proposal?

- Is the system for internal project monitoring and evaluation effective in terms of the mandate, ownership, budget and time allocated?
- Is self-reflection part of the proposed M& E strategy? Is active exchange of knowledge and information within the project included in the project's activities and inputs?
- Is risk management explicitly integrated in the internal project monitoring and evaluation?

III.4 Quality of the project's organization and management

- Is the project's organization and management (organizational chart) included in the proposal?
- Is the management structure of the project sufficient in order to implement, to coordinate and monitor the project?
- Is there a sensible level of complementarities between the main applicant and its sub-contractors?
- Is the consortium (applicant and sub-contractors) flexible and limited in size to allow for good project management?

III.5 Quality of the presentation of the proposal

- Have the prescribed formats been used?
- Are the components of the proposal properly arranged?

Criterion IV. Quality of the team members

With the help of the curricula vitae submitted for each of the proposed members of the project team, and the staff list in section 5.3 a) which specifies the tasks and activities of all team members, the evaluation committee judges these individuals on the basis of their experience and seniority in the field of expertise in question; of their experience in developing countries, particularly in the region; and of their experience with projects aimed at strengthening capacity for post-secondary education and training. The expertise of the proposed project director and principal adviser/coordinator which has been acquired through the management and implementation of comparable projects is assessed separately.

The assessors will also look at the degree to which local or regional experts are enlisted for the project.

Submission of curricula vitae for all personnel involved in the project is mandatory. A close inspection of the personnel inputs in a proposal may reveal that – intentionally or unintentionally - planned personnel inputs do not (fully) match the submitted batch of curricula vitae. In such cases the TEC members will assess the proposal but give less or no points on the relevant sub-criterion.

IV.1 Experience and expertise of the project director, bearing the policy responsibility for the project

- Is the CV of the project director convincing and relevant in relation to the responsibilities of the position?

IV.2 Experience and expertise of the principal adviser/coordinator delivering the major operational input in project implementation and/or management

- Is the CV of the principal adviser/coordinator convincing and relevant in relation to the responsibilities of the position?

- IV.3 The other team members' knowledge and work experience in the region and/or in the subject matter in question
- Are the CVs of the other team members convincing and relevant in relation to the proposed activities and responsibilities?
- IV.4 Degree to which local or regional expertise (not belonging to the requesting organization) will be enlisted for the project
- Have local/regional experts been enlisted for input?
 - Have local/regional experts filled in statements of availability?
 - Has the input of local and regional expertise been described in terms of activities and responsibilities?
- IV.5 Clear explanation of roles and responsibilities of team members in relation to the activities in the work plan
- Are the job performances of the team members clearly described and linked to activities in the work plan?
 - Are the tasks and responsibilities among the project partners clearly described?
 - Has the responsibility for the focal issues (gender, labour market, organisational learning) been clearly assigned within the team?

Criterion V. Price

The reward for the factor price of the proposal is calculated on the basis of a formula for a price offer combined with a bonus for the **lowest** price offer.

The formula for the price offer is as follows:

$$\frac{(\text{maximum budget} - \text{price offer of the proposal})}{(\text{maximum budget}/100)} \times \frac{40}{25}$$

In this formula one point is equivalent to 0.6% of the maximum budget. There is a **maximum of 40 points** that can be obtained with a price offer.

The **lowest** price offer is awarded a bonus of 10 points.

The total maximum score on price is 40 + 10 = 50 points

B. The final score

The scores are added together to give one total score for each organization.

Anywhere a minimum score is indicated on the score sheet, this score must be attained. To be considered for the grant, an applicant must have attained at least all minimum scores.

C. The veto rights of the requesting organization

No matter how good the Tender Evaluation Committee finds the winning tender, the requesting organization which the project is meant to benefit has the right to reject the proposed partner. It can do this for its own reasons and on the basis of its own criteria, but if it does so, it must explain its reasons in writing to Nuffic. This explanation will be shared with the rejected applicant. If the Tender Evaluation Committee's choice is thus rejected, the project is cancelled.