



CONSULTANT EVALUATION SCORING SHEET

A. TECHNICAL EVALUATION- 70 POINTS

S.N.	EVALUATION CRITERIA	FULL SCORE	DETAILED DESCRIPTION	SCORING GUIDANCE	SCORE OBTAINED
T1	RELEVANT EXPERIENCE IN SIMILAR ASSIGNMENT	20	Assess the consultant's demonstrated experience in assignments similar in nature and scope to this TOR, specifically focusing on BOQ validation, technical review of drawings, and review of bidding documents for building construction projects. Emphasis shall be placed on relevance and applicability, not volume of unrelated work. Experience with NGO, INGO, or institutional projects shall be considered an advantage.	<p>Extensive experience in BOQ validation and technical review of drawings & bid documents for similar projects (including NGO/INGO or institutional projects)- 20</p> <p>Strong and relevant experience in similar assignments, with minor gaps- 16</p> <p>Good experience; completed multiple relevant assignments- 12</p> <p>Adequate experience in related work, but limited in scope or scale- 8</p> <p>Very limited relevant experience- 4</p>	<p>...../20</p> <p>.....</p> <p>Evaluator's Comments</p>
T2	TECHNICAL QUALIFICATION & PROFESSIONAL EXPERTISE	15	Evaluate the consultant's academic qualifications, professional background, and technical expertise relevant to BOQ preparation and review, building construction, specifications, and technical	<p>Master's/Bachelor's in Civil Engineering with strong specialization and extensive BOQ & technical review experience- 15</p> <p>Bachelor's in Civil Engineering with solid, relevant professional experience- 11.25</p>	<p>...../15</p> <p>.....</p> <p>Evaluator's Comments</p>



			documentation. For firms, evaluation shall focus on the qualifications of the proposed key expert(s) for this assignment.	Meets minimum qualification with adequate technical exposure- 7.5 Meets minimum qualification but lacks depth in relevant expertise- 3.75 Does not meet minimum qualifications- 0	
T3	UNDERSTANDING OF TOR & APPROACH	25	Assess how clearly the consultant understands the TOR objectives, scope, and exclusions. Evaluate the proposed methodology for BOQ validation and technical review, clarity of approach, risk awareness, and the realism of the work plan in relation to the 7 + 4 working day duration. This criterion carries the highest weight due to the short duration and review-based nature of the assignment.	Clear, precise understanding of TOR; well-structured, practical methodology; realistic work plan fully aligned with timeline- 25 Strong understanding with minor gaps; clearly feasible approach- 18.75 Adequate understanding and methodology, but lacking detail or clarity in parts- 12.5 Partial understanding; generic or weak methodology- 6.25 Weak understanding, unclear method- 0/25 Evaluator's Comments
T4	PAST PERFORMANCE & REFERENCES	10	Evaluate the consultant's past performance based on reference checks, previous client feedback,	Outstanding references, consistently high-quality and timely performance- 10/10 Evaluator's Comments



			evidence of timely delivery, professionalism, responsiveness, and quality of outputs in similar assignments.	Strong references, reliable and professional delivery- 7.5 Generally positive references with minor concerns- 5 Limited references; mixed performance record- 2.5 No references or negative feedback- 0	
	TOTAL TECHNICAL SCORE (TS)	70		/ 70

B. FINANCIAL EVALUATION- 30 POINTS

S.N.	EVALUATION CRITERIA	FULL SCORE	DETAILED DESCRIPTION	SCORING GUIDANCE	SCORE OBTAINED
F1	FINANCIAL EVALUATION	30	Financial proposals shall be evaluated on the basis of the lowest evaluated price using a transparent and formula-based method. Prices must be realistic and aligned with the TOR scope.	Financial Score= (Lowest Submitted Price/ Consultant's Submitted Price)* 30/ 30
	TOTAL FINANCIAL SCORE (FS)	30		/ 30

TOTAL COMBINED SCORE (TCS)= TOTAL TECHNICAL SCORE+ TOTAL FINANCIAL SCORE