

**TECHNICAL EVALUATION MATRIX (TEM)**

Evaluator		KM	
<b>Stage I: Mandatory Requirements (Pre-qualification Criteria)</b>			
3 years' experience in engaging with different social groups, including children and youth, preferably in social affairs.		Yes/No	
Experience in conducting qualitative research, organizing and delivery of workshops, focus group discussions, and similar activities.		Yes/No	
Familiarity with on how to obtain research ethics approval.		Yes/No	
Ability to mobilize highly-qualified professionals for the project implementation, with relevant expertise and		Yes/No	
Partnership building and networking experience.		Yes/No	
Fluency in conducting workshops and focus groups meetings in Georgian and developing reports in Georgian and English		Yes/No	
<b>Stage II: Technical Evaluation Criteria</b>			<b>Scores</b>
<b>1</b>	<b>Organizational experience and knoweldge</b>	<b>#REF!</b>	<b>Out of #REF!</b>
1.1	3 years' experience in engaging with different social groups, including children and youth, preferably in social affairs.	no experience	0
		less than 3 years	2
		3-5 years	3
		More than 5 years	5
1.2	relevant Experience conducting qualitative research, organizing and delivery of workshops, focus group discussions, and similar activities.	no experience	0
		less than 5 years	2
		5-10 years	3
		More than 10 years	5
1.3	Familiarity with on how to obtain research ethics approval.	No	0
		Yes	1
1.4	Ability to mobilize highly-qualified professionals for the project implementation, with relevant expertise and experience in the areas of social affairs	No Ability	0
		moderate ability	3
		strong ability	5
1.5	Fluency in conducting workshops and focus groups meetings in Georgian and developing reports in Georgian and English	No	0
		Yes	5
1.6	Partnership building and networking experience.	no partnership with Municipalities	0
		One time project-based involvement with municipalities in social field	2
		Regular involvement with some municipalities (preferably in the area of chil/social protection)	3
		strong long-term partnership with municipalities	4
<b>2</b>	<b>Quality of the project proposal</b>	<b>0</b>	<b>25</b>
2.1	Project proposal detailing all actions mentioned in the given TOR and the working methodology in place; objectives, actions and resources are well understood and clearly proposed	Not realistic, poorly developed, major elements are not accounted	0
		Some elements are missing, and some are under/overestimated, or not realistic	2
		Minor elements are missing, some elements are under/overestimated	3
		All elements of the proposal are present, but several are under/overestimated for the planned resource inputs	4
		proposal is well developed,well structured and realistic;	5
2.2	Description of the proposed work plan and timeline is realistic and well developed	No plan in place	0
		Plan moderately in place	2
		Plan fully adequate and in place	5

2.3	Detailed proposed budget with indication of all activities and the proposed fees in place	No budget and fees in place		0
		budget and fees moderatly in place		2
		budget and fees fully adequate and in place		5
2.4	List of completed similar projectst	List not present		0
		List presented		5
2.5	CVs of suggested experts	Experts are not qualified		0
		Experts are moderatly qualified		5
		Experts are qualified		10
		Qualifications and expertise of proposed experts fully correspnds the TOR requirements		25
<b>Total score for quality of the project proposal</b>				<b>45</b>
	<b>Total score:</b>		<b>#REF!</b>	<b>#REF!</b>