Eastructions: Please, rate all proposals on early of the established sub-criteria in the rating matrix. Please provide a rating on a scale from 1 to 5: 1 = very weak, 2 = weak, 3 = neutral, 4 = strong, 5 = very strong (Please do not score 0). In the table below, extra space is provided for additional narrative explanation or comments on the rating, proposal, proposents, from the budget very devaluation: 1: no value for money 5 every good value for money 6 every 6 eve

he table contains formulas to aggregate the scores for each of the criterion. In this sheet you only need to type in the name of the bidders in the salmon-coloured cells. The scores for each sub-criteria and for each component will be automatically estimate

| | | | CRITERION 1: CONSULTANT PROFILE AND TEAM COMPOSITION | | | BIDDERS | |
|---|---|---|--|--|--|---|--------------------------------|
| | COMPONENT 1 | CRITERIA | SUB-CRITERIA | MAX. GRADING | Didden me | Pldder #2 | Didden #2 |
| 1 | | | | | Bidder #1 | Bidder #2 | Bidder #3 |
| | | | | | Name of the Bidder: | Name of the Bidder: | Name of the Bidder: |
| | Consultant profile and team composition | The extent to which the consultants present the required level of expertise and experience to fulfit the objectives of the ToR. | The extent to which the consultants provide evidence of their experience in designing and undertaking MTRs of development interventions, as well as ToC analyses, showing a good understanding of result frameworks. | 5 | | | |
| | | | Relevant expertise and sector experience of the consultants: Private Sector Development, Farmer Cooperative Development, Agriculture and Gender and youth inclusion, with demonstrated knowledge of the Dutch PSD development policy. | 5 | | | |
| 1 | | | Relevant regional, local, and field-level experience. The extent to which the consultant provides evidence of the social, economic & environmental context of the FFT countries of operation | 5 | | | |
| | | | Demonstrated experience in facilitating focus group discussions and key informant interviews and facilitating sensemaking workshops and presentations of evaluation or research findings. | 5 | | | |
| | | | Capacity to operate in the required languages: English (Fluent), French (fluent where necessary such as in Francophone countries) | 5 | | | |
| | ! | | | COMMENTS | | | |
| | | | Combined Score for consultant profile and team composition | | | | |
| | | | | | | II. | |
| | | | CRITERION 2: OVERALL TECHNICAL PROPOSAL | | | BIDDERS | |
| | COMPONENT 2 | CRITERIA | SUB-CRITERIA | MAX. GRADING | Bidder #1 | Bidder #2 | Bidder #3 |
| | | | | | Name of the Bidder: | Name of the Bidder: | Name of the Bidder: |
| | | | Challs of the methodological passes in dual and in the technical ar | - | | | |
| | Overall technical approach | The extent to which the consultant demonstrates a clear understanding of these ToRs, and the soundness of the methodology proposed to achieve the objectives listed out in these ToRs | Clarity of the methodological approach developed in the technical proposal Quality of the proposed methodology, including the extent to which the methodology elaborates on prescriptions set out in Chapter 5 of | 5 | | | |
| _ | | | the TOR | 5 | | | |
| 2 | | | Sampling design, method and size | 5 | | | |
| | | | Quality of the overall proposal writing, argumentation, structure of the text and visuals | 5 | | | |
| | | | Adequateness of the workplan | 5 | | | |
| | | | | COMMENTS | | | |
| | | | Combined Score for Overall technical approach | | | | |
| | | | | | | | |
| | | | | | | | |
| | COMPONENT 1 | COLLEGIA | CRITERION 3: PRICE | MAY CRADING | | BIDDERS | |
| | COMPONENT 1 | CRITERIA | CRITERION 3: PRICE SUB-CRITERIA | MAX. GRADING | Bidder #1 | BIDDERS Bidder #2 | Bidder #3 |
| | COMPONENT 1 | CRITERIA | | MAX. GRADING | Bidder #1 Name of the Bidder: | | Bidder #3 Name of the Bidder: |
| | COMPONENT 1 | CRITERIA | | MAX. GRADING | | Bidder #2 | |
| | COMPONENT 1 | CRITERIA | SUB-CRITERIA | | | Bidder #2 | |
| | COMPONENT 1 | | SUB-CRITERIA Daily fee per consultant. The will be evaluated based on the level of seniority. | 5 | | Bidder #2 | |
| 3 | COMPONENT 1 | CRITERIA Best price for the proposed level of quality and depth of the proposed deliverables | SUB-CRITERIA Daily fee per consultant. The will be evaluated based on the level of seniority. Travel and transport expenses | 5 | | Bidder #2 | |
| 3 | | Best price for the proposed level of quality and depth of | SUB-CRITERIA Daily fee per consultant. The will be evaluated based on the level of seniority. Travel and transport expenses Data collection unit cost Cost per deliverable | 5 5 5 | | Bidder #2 | |
| 3 | | Best price for the proposed level of quality and depth of | SUB-CRITERIA Daily fee per consultant. The will be evaluated based on the level of seniority. Travel and transport expenses Data collection unit cost Cost per deliverable Contingency budget | 5 5 5 5 | | Bidder #2 | |
| 3 | | Best price for the proposed level of quality and depth of | SUB-CRITERIA Daily fee per consultant. The will be evaluated based on the level of seniority. Travel and transport expenses Data collection unit cost Cost per deliverable | 5 5 5 5 | | Bidder #2 | |
| 3 | | Best price for the proposed level of quality and depth of | SUB-CRITERIA Daily fee per consultant. The will be evaluated based on the level of seniority. Travel and transport expenses Data collection unit cost Cost per deliverable Contingency budget | 5 5 5 5 | | Bidder #2 | |
| 3 | | Best price for the proposed level of quality and depth of | SUB-CRITERIA Daily fee per consultant. The will be evaluated based on the level of seniority. Travel and transport expenses Data collection unit cost Cost per deliverable Contingency budget | 5 5 5 5 5 | | Bidder #2 | |
| 3 | | Best price for the proposed level of quality and depth of | Daily fee per consultant. The will be evaluated based on the level of seniority. Travel and transport expenses Data collection unit cost Cost per deliverable Contingency budget Overall budget | 5 5 5 5 5 | | Bidder #2 | |
| 3 | | Best price for the proposed level of quality and depth of | Daily fee per consultant. The will be evaluated based on the level of seniority. Travel and transport expenses Data collection unit cost Cost per deliverable Contingency budget Overall budget Combined Score for Price | 5 5 5 5 COMMENTS | Name of the Bidder: | Bidder #2 | |
| 3 | | Best price for the proposed level of quality and depth of | Daily fee per consultant. The will be evaluated based on the level of seniority. Travel and transport expenses Data collection unit cost Cost per deliverable Contingency budget Overall budget | 5 5 5 5 COMMENTS | Name of the Bidder: | Bidder #2 | |
| 3 | | Best price for the proposed level of quality and depth of | Daily fee per consultant. The will be evaluated based on the level of seniority. Travel and transport expenses Data collection unit cost Cost per deliverable Contingency budget Overall budget Combined Score for Price | 5 5 5 5 COMMENTS | Name of the Bidder: | Bidder #2 | Name of the Bidder: |
| 3 | | Best price for the proposed level of quality and depth of | Daily fee per consultant. The will be evaluated based on the level of seniority. Travel and transport expenses Data collection unit cost Cost per deliverable Contingency budget Overall budget Combined Score for Price | 5 5 5 5 COMMENTS | Name of the Bidder: I approach - 30% price ta. Bidder #1 | Bidder #2 Name of the Bidder: Bidder #2 | Name of the Bidder: |
| 3 | | Best price for the proposed level of quality and depth of | Daily fee per consultant. The will be evaluated based on the level of seniority. Travel and transport expenses Data collection unit cost Cost per deliverable Contingency budget Overall budget Combined Score for Price WEIGHT 20% Consultant Profile and teams This table con | 5 5 5 5 COMMENTS | Name of the Bidder: | Bidder #2 Name of the Bidder: | Name of the Bidder: |
| 3 | | Best price for the proposed level of quality and depth of | Daily fee per consultant. The will be evaluated based on the level of seniority. Travel and transport expenses Data collection unit cost Cost per deliverable Contingency budget Overall budget Combined Score for Price WEIGHT 20% Consultant Profile and teams This table con | 5 5 5 5 COMMENTS | Name of the Bidder: I approach - 30% price ta. Bidder #1 | Bidder #2 Name of the Bidder: Bidder #2 | Name of the Bidder: |
| 3 | | Best price for the proposed level of quality and depth of | Daily fee per consultant. The will be evaluated based on the level of seniority. Travel and transport expenses Data collection unit cost Cost per deliverable Contingency budget Overall budget Combined Score for Price WEECHT 20% Consultant Profile and learn in This stable continues. | 5 5 5 5 COMMENTS | Name of the Bidder: I approach - 30% price ta. Bidder #1 | Bidder #2 Name of the Bidder: Bidder #2 | Name of the Bidder: |
| 3 | | Best price for the proposed level of quality and depth of | Daily fee per consultant. The will be evaluated based on the level of seniority. Travel and transport expenses Data collection unit cost Cost per deliverable Contingency budget Overall budget Combined Score for Price WEEKIT TOTAL SCORE Criterion 1 - Consultant profile and team composition | 5 5 5 5 COMMENTS | Name of the Bidder: I approach - 30% price ta. Bidder #1 | Bidder #2 Name of the Bidder: Bidder #2 | Name of the Bidder: |
| 3 | | Best price for the proposed level of quality and depth of | Daily fee per consultant. The will be evaluated based on the level of seniority. Travel and transport expenses Data collection unit cost Cost per deliverable Contingency budget Overall budget Combined Score for Price Combined Score for Price TOTAL SCORE Criterion 1 - Consultant profile and team composition Criterion 2 - Overall technical approach | 5 5 5 5 COMMENTS COMMENTS FING FACTOR OF THE CRITERIA composition—Sofis Overall technical sains formulas. On not enter any dis | Name of the Bidder: I approach - 30% price ta. Bidder #1 | Bidder #2 Name of the Bidder: Bidder #2 | Name of the Bidder: |