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**ANNEXURE C - DESKTOP EVALUATION SCORECARD**

**ER-RFQ/2023-2024/013/Review of Annual Report**

**Proposer Name:**

**Evaluation was completed by:**

**Evaluator Signature:**

**Date:**

**aNNEXURE C: DESKTOP EVALUATION SCORECARD**

The proposals submitted will be evaluated according to the technical evaluation criteria in the scorecard below

**RATING SCALE TO BE APPLIED**

|  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- |
| **SCORE** | **DESCRIPTION** | **Rating** |
| **0** | Nil or inadequate response  The evaluator is of the view that the response demonstrates that the respondent does not understand the requirements and/or will not be able to meet the requirements | Unacceptable |
| **1** | Response is partially relevant but general **very** poor.  The response addresses some elements of the requirement but contains insufficient/limited detail or explanation to demonstrate how the requirement will be fulfilled.  The evaluator is **not confident** that the respondent understands the requirements and/or will be able to meet the requirements | Very Poor |
| **2** | Response is partially relevant but generally poor.  The response addresses some elements of the requirement but contains insufficient/limited detail or explanation to demonstrate how the requirement will be fulfilled.  The evaluator has **some reservations** as to whether the respondent understands the requirements and/or will be able to satisfactorily meet the requirements | Poor |
| **3** | Response is relevant and acceptable.  The response addresses a broad understanding of the requirement but may lack details on how the requirement will be fulfilled in certain areas.  The evaluator is **reasonably confident** that the respondent understands the requirements and/or will be able to satisfactorily meet the requirements | Acceptable |
| **4** | Response is relevant and good.  The response is sufficiently detailed to demonstrate a good understanding and provides details on how the requirements will be fulfilled.  The evaluator is **confident** that the respondent understands the requirements and/or will be able to satisfactorily meet the requirements | Good |
| **5** | Response is completely relevant and excellent overall.  The response is comprehensive, unambiguous and demonstrates a thorough understanding of the requirement and provides details of how the requirement will be met in full.  The evaluator is **completely confident** that the respondent understands the requirements and/or will be able to satisfactorily meet the requirements | Excellent |

**TECHNICAL SCORECARD**

Service providers must indicate the relevant section in their proposal that addresses each criterion in the column headed **Reference in Proposal** and additional comments can be included in the column headed **Comments.**

|  | **Technical Evaluation Criterion** | **Weight** | **Reference in Proposal** | **Score** | **Comments** |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| **DESKTOP EVALUATION** | | **100%** |  |  |  |
| 1 | Ability to provide complete Annual Report reviewing and editorial services with a proven reputation and Track Record | 20% |  |  |  |
| 2 | Creative excellence. Based on submission of three (3) to five (5) printed annual reports.  Demonstrate understanding of storytelling techniques and the ability to enhance narrative elements | 40% |  |  |  |
| 3 | Technical ability in editorial and reviewing skills.  Attention to detail in the accurate representation of reviewed content  Ability to meet deadlines and deliver high-quality work within the specified timeframe | 35% |  |  |  |
| 4 | Ability to edit and review regulatory document content.  Familiarity with relevant regulatory requirements and best practices for reporting | 5% |  |  |  |