

ATTACHMENT– EVALUATION CRITERIA

1. Introduction

- A. The tender process will be conducted to ensure that the tenders are evaluated fairly to identify the Most Economically Advantageous Tender (MEAT) from the point of view of the purchasing Authority.
- B. Account will be taken of any factor emerging from the tender process which impacts a Tenderer's suitability, relating to information provided by the Tenderer within the Qualification criteria, in particular any additional information which comes to light in respect of its financial standing.
- C. No importance should be attached to the order in which these criteria are listed. Any tender that is not compliant with the Conditions of Contract may be rejected.
- D. Bidders must be explicit and comprehensive in their responses to this ITT. Bidders are advised neither to make assumptions about their past or current supplier relationships with the Authority nor to assume that such prior business relationships will be taken into account in the evaluation procedure.
- E. All questions MUST BE answered in English.

2. General treatment of responses: (Award criteria and weightings)

1.8 Technical – Project Proposal (Questions 1.8.1 – 1.8.5)	
<p>1.8.1 Proposed Methodology</p> <p>Please provide:</p> <p>(i) Details of the methodology and approaches proposed to meet the requirements of this contract, and how you propose to plan, manage and deliver this project within the limited timescales. This should also include a gender and inclusion strategy and action plan.</p> <p style="text-align: right;"><i>Maximum pages = half page</i></p> <p>(ii) A project plan referring to Terms of Reference including schedule of activities and timescales, detailing milestones, deliverables.</p> <p style="text-align: right;"><i>Maximum pages = half page</i></p>	30
<p>1.8.2 Experience</p> <p>Please provide:</p> <p>(i) Evidence of similar work where you have conducted research, analysis and developed reports in the areas of work relevant to the outputs of this TOR. If available, suppliers should include evidence showing experience of delivering similar projects.</p> <p>(ii) Evidence of experience of conducting consultations with government agencies and the ability to work in a complex political, economic and social environment with minimal supervision.</p> <p>(iii) Ability to manage the totality of the research and technical meetings, including logistics, recruitment and management of other team members.</p>	20

<i>Maximum Page Limit: 1 pages</i>	
1.8.3 Risk Management and Delivery Please provide the following: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> I. A project plan referring to the Terms of Reference including schedule of activities and timescales, detailing milestones and deliverables. II. Identify any key risks (internal and external) to the project and explain how they will be mitigated. III. Please explain who is responsible for managing each risk and escalation points. IV. Indicate how the project will be monitored to ensure it is delivered in terms of quality, timeliness and cost. <i>Maximum Page Limit: 1 pages</i>	30
1.8.4 Project Team / Resource Plan <ul style="list-style-type: none"> I. Please provide a <u>2-page</u> CV for yourself and the team members who you propose to work on this project. II. Please include detail on the specific roles which you and your team members would take, and the proportion of your and their time which you propose to dedicate to the project. III. Given that the programme's priority target groups include women/girls, low-income youth and people with disabilities, the experts proposed would be expected to include at least one member with social development expertise. IV. The British Embassy in Mexico reserves the right to request interviews, request alternatives and provide final approval of suggested team members before commencement of the project. <i>1 pages per team member</i>	20
<i>*Equivalent to 70% of the total weighting</i>	100%
GRAND TOTAL– Quality/Technical (Partial weighting)	70%

1.9 Evaluation Criteria – Pricing & Commercial is 100%	Criteria Weighting %
1.9.1 Competitiveness of fee rates and overall project cost in relation to the market to demonstrate value for money (Tab 4 Pricing Sheet of the RFQ excel file), prices should be shown in Mexican Peso (MXN) including all applicable taxes & VAT) This MUST be included in the format of the table in Tab 4 Pricing Sheet of the RFQ excel file. Failure to provide a pricing submission in the format requested may invalidate your tender proposal. Your cost proposal will be taken as your Best and Final Offer .	100
<i>*Equivalent to 30% of the total weighting</i>	100%
GRAND TOTAL – Pricing & Commercial (Partial weighting)	30%

Notice: Technical- Project Proposal (70%) + Pricing & Commercial (30%) = 100% total weighting

Please send your proposal for each point on PDF with the extension required

3. Score Key Assessment

All tenders will be scored as above in accordance with the marking system set out below:

Score: Price / Commercial	Score Key Assess ment	Score: Quality / Technical	Interpretation
Most financially attractive to Authority	5	Excellent	Satisfies the requirement with additional benefits . Good demonstration by the Tenderer of the understanding and evidence to deliver a solution for the required supplies/services. Response identifies tailoring, proactive response, and factors that will offer potential added value .
Score awarded on inverse percentage difference from most financially attractive offer	4	Good	Satisfies the requirement . Demonstration by the Tenderer of the understanding and evidence in their ability/proposed methodology to deliver a solution for the required supplies/services.
	3	Minor Reservations	Satisfies most requirements with minor reservations. Some minor reservations of the Tenderer's understanding and methodology, and/or staffing and experience, with limited supporting evidence or information.
	2	Serious Reservations/ Non compliant	Major reservations of the Tenderer's understanding and proposed methodology, with lack of information and little or no evidence to support the response, with minimal tailoring.
	1	Unacceptable / Non-compliant	Does not meet the requirement. Does not comply and/or insufficient information provided to demonstrate that the Tenderer has the understanding or suitable methodology, with little or no evidence to support the response.

