

Criteria 1 Relevant experience reflected in organizations CV provides a demonstrated ability to deliver similar capacity building programmes. (maximum score – 15 points)			Criteria 2 Team proposed have appropriate expertise and clearly defined roles that align with the requirements of the Terms of Reference. (maximum score – 20 points)			Criteria 3 The methodology and the action plan outlines a clear, effective, is well-structured, applicable, and tailored to effectively meet the requirements of the Terms of Reference. (maximum score – 15 points)			Criteria 4 Positive references from previous beneficiaries and a solid track record in delivering similar services. (maximum score – 10 points)			Criteria 5 The study visit concept aligns with the needs of applying the program topics. (maximum score – 10 points)			Criteria 6 Financial offer, respecting the quality/price ratio (maximum score – 30 points)
15 points	7 points	0 points	20 points	10 points	0 points	15 points	7 points	0 points	10 points	5 points	0 points	10 points	5 points	0 points	will be determined by the formula
Relevant and demonstrated experience	Experience is relevant but does not match the topic of the Program outlined in the ToR	Experience not relevant	Reflects the Team structure and expertise requirements of the expert(s) described in the ToR	One or more members of the Team structure provides experience less than the requirements listed in the ToR	Does not reflect the Team structure and expertise requirements of the expert(s) described in the ToR	The methodology and the action plan is clear, effective, and practical, is well-structured, applicable, and tailored to all the requirements of the ToR.	The methodology and the action plan provides a somewhat clear and practical approach but lacks in certain areas of effectiveness or detail, only partially addressing the requirements of the ToR.	The methodology and the action plan does not effectively address the requirements of the ToR.	The application provides strong positive references from previous beneficiaries and demonstrates a solid and relevant track record in delivering similar services.	The application includes some positive references from previous beneficiaries but the evidence is incomplete or only somewhat relevant.	The application lacks references and there is no evidence of a solid track record in delivering similar services.	The concept of the study visit is clearly structured, the proposed country and institutions/ organizations are relevant and aligned with the training program topics	The concept of the study visit is somehow clearly structured, the proposed country is relevant yet the institutions and organizations proposed for visit are not aligned with the training program topics	The concept of the study visit does not have a clear structure, the proposed country and/or institutions are not relevant and are not aligned with the training program topics	$P = P_{min}/P_{of} \times 30$ points where: P - points awarded to the examined offer; P _{min} - lowest price offered; P _{of} - price presented in the evaluated offer.