

## Az. 19\_M\_RECHT\_CO03

**Matrices for reviewing the suitability and assessment of service- *Human Rights in German Development Policy: Concept, Implementation, Effectiveness* – One consultant in evaluation for a country case study in Nigeria**

Reviewing suitability				
In order to assess the professional qualifications the following requirements have to be met by the consultant and are to be proven by CV and copy of diploma.				
Criterion	Type	Description	A-Criterion fulfilled	Remarks
K1.	A	Minimum of five years of work experience in the last 10 years in conducting evaluations.		
K2.	A	Minimum of five years of work experience in the last 10 years in the context of international development cooperation.		
K3.	A	Profound knowledge and of qualitative data collection and analysis, with a focus on participatory methods or human rights-based evaluation experience (demonstrated by a minimum of four relevant data collections in the last 10 years).		
K4.	A	Excellent command of English (written and oral).		
K5.	A	Excellent command of one local language.		
K6.	A	Current residence in Nigeria.		
K7.	A	Nigerian citizenship or permanent residency in Nigeria for at least the last 10 years.		

## Assessment of service

						Expectations			
Criterion	Type	Description	Weightage (G)	Performance points assigned (Lp)	Lp x G	0 – 3 Points	4 – 7 Points	8 – 10 Points	Remarks
K8.	B	Please describe how you would implement a human rights-based approach in an evaluation/during data collection and name possible challenges that might occur. Please highlight how a do no harm approach can be incorporated.	60			Reference of the approach to human rights-based research and practice, methodological innovativeness, adequate reflection of the procedure (coherence and comprehensibility and classification in the evaluative context), and possible challenges are hardly or not given.	Reference of the approach to human rights-based research and practice, methodological innovativeness, adequate reflection of the procedure (coherence and comprehensibility and classification in the evaluative context), and possible challenges are given satisfactorily.	Reference of the approach to human rights-based research and practice, methodological innovativeness, adequate reflection of the procedure (coherence and comprehensibility and classification in the evaluative context), and possible challenges are given in almost all or all aspects.	Max. 2 pages, front size 11
K9.	B	Verbal presentation of K8 in an skype interview.	40			Quality of content of the presentation as well as the quality of content and methodology of the contributions to the discussion is low or very low.	Quality of content of the presentation as well as the quality of content and methodology of the contributions to the discussion is satisfactory.	Quality of content of the presentation as well as the quality of content and methodology of the contributions to the discussion is good or very good.	Estimated date: between <b>March 15 &amp; March 19, 2021</b> . Invitation dispatch expected between March 8 and March 12, 2021. Duration: max. 30 minutes Language: English or German
Total performance points (L):									

For K8 at least 50% (meaning at least 300 of 600 points) must be achieved to be invited to the verbal presentation (K9). Tenders that attain less than 300 performance points will be excluded from the further procedure.

## Assessment method:

The assessment is carried out according to the extended guideline method. The extended reference value method according to UfAB V v2.0 is used, by forming a quotient of performance (addition of performance points) and price for each tender. The key figure for the price-performance ratio (economic efficiency) is calculated as follows:

$$Z = L/P$$

Z = Key figure (of economic efficiency)

L = Total number of performance points (key performance indicator)

P = Total price (Euro) of the tender (price key figure)

Subsequently, all tenders within a 10 percent fluctuation range based on the leading tender (highest Z value) are selected. Finally, these pre-selected tenders are compared against the performance points L and the tender with the highest performance points is awarded. If there are tenders with the same number of points within the fluctuation range, the tender with the lower price will be accepted.