ANNEX A

Comprehensive Evaluation Criteria for the Selection of Digital Strategy Development Consulting Firms (Panel Arrangement) for Government Capabilities.

Forms an integral part of the Terms of Reference for the Recruitment of Digital Strategy Development Consulting Firms (Panel Arrangement) for Government Capabilities.

1. Purpose and Selection Method 3
2. Evaluation Architecture – Overview 3
3. Stage 1 – Expression of Interest / Technical Proposal (25 points) 4
4. Shortlisting Rule Before the Written Examination 5
5. Stage 2 – Written Examination (35 points) 5
Part A – Desk Review and Findings (2 hours) 5
Part B – Validation Next Steps (45 minutes) 5
Part C – Methodology, Approach and Engagement Model (1 hour 15 minutes) 5
Marking Rubric (35 points total) 5
6. Stage 3 – Panel Interview (30 points) 6
7. Stage 4 – ICT Business Analyst Assessment (5 points) 7
8. Stage 5 – Reference and Due-Diligence Checks (5 points) 7
9. Minimum Qualifying Score and Sequencing 8
10. Financial Proposal Evaluation 8
11. Examination Integrity and Conflict-of-Interest Controls 9

1. Purpose and Selection Method

This Annex sets out the complete scoring architecture used to select Panel firms/individuals and their Key Professional Staff. The assignment is complex and judgement-intensive, the quality of the individuals who will perform the analysis matters more than marginal differences in price. The selection therefore uses Quality Based Selection (QBS).

2. Evaluation Architecture – Overview

Stage	What is Assessed	Who	Weight (of Technical Score)	Pass/Fail or Scored
–	Consultant firm/individual eligibility (registration, blacklist, COI, minimum qualification thresholds in ToR §5.1/5.2)	Firm/Individual & Staff	–	Pass/Fail gate before Stage 1 scoring
1	EOI: Lead researcher experience, methodology, work plan, CVs (Lead researcher + BA)	Firm	25%	Stage 1 total less than 20 % fails at this stage)
2	4-hour Written Examination	Lead Researcher	35%	Stage 1 + Stage 2 total less than 40 % fails at this stage)
3	1-hour Panel Interview	Lead Researcher	30%	Stage 1 + Stage 2 + Stage 3 total less than 70% fails at this stage
4	CV and qualification review	ICT Business Analyst	5%	Scored
5	Reference & due-diligence checks	Firm & both Key Staff	5%	Stage 1 + Stage 2 + Stage 3 + Stage 4 + Stage 5 less than 80 % fails at this stage
6	Financial Proposal	Firm		Scored, opened only if Technical ≥ 80

Evaluation is conducted for the given capability with this ToR (only one capability, same *capability is given to all the participating firms. A firm may submit multiple bids, but each bid requires its own dedicated Lead Researcher and ICT Business Analyst nomination, and each is scored entirely independently.*

The weighting places 65% of the Technical Score on Stages 2 and 3 combined, direct, live-tested evidence of the Lead Researcher's own analytical and communication competence rather than on paper credentials (Stage 1, 25%) or documentary checks (Stages 4 and 5, 5% each). This is the intended design: the Lead Researcher is the person accountable for the quality of the strategy, and the process is built to verify that they, personally, can do the work.

3. Stage 1 – Expression of Interest / Technical Proposal (25 points)

Scored per firm/individual, per capability bid. Used both to score and to shortlist firms/individuals into Stage 2 (see Section 4).

Sub-criterion	What Evaluators Look For	Points
Key personnel expert's relevant experience & track record	Similar digital strategy, enterprise architecture, or large-scale public-sector consulting assignments; evidence of delivery quality (not just number of contracts). Years of firm experience are scored here, not gated – see Section 11.	5
Proposed methodology and approach	Soundness and logical coherence of the proposed approach to capability mapping, current-state analysis, digital opportunity assessment, and stakeholder validation; realistic treatment of desk-review limitations.	13
Team composition and CVs	Complementarity of Lead Researcher and ICT Business Analyst skill sets; relevance (not just seniority) of past roles; strength of any additional non-key experts proposed under ToR §5.3.	5
Work plan and timeline realism	Whether the proposed 4-month work plan reflects a realistic understanding of stakeholder engagement lead times and the deliverable schedule in ToR Section 6.	2

4. Shortlisting Rule Before the Written Examination

Administering a 4-hour supervised examination for every bid is resource-intensive. To keep the process rigorous but manageable, GovTech will shortlist only those firms scoring 80% of 25 marks and above.

5. Stage 2 – Written Examination (35 points)

Each shortlisted Lead Researcher sits a supervised, individual, 4-hour written examination. Each candidate is given a data pack for one assigned government capability (organisational mandate documents, publicly available strategic/annual plans, and an organisation chart) not previously disclosed to bidders. The examination has three parts:

Part A – Desk Review and Findings (2 hours)

Candidates conduct a desk review of the assigned capability using the data pack (and permitted public sources, as per the exam rules in Section 12) and document their review approach, the sources consulted and how they were triangulated, and their findings on the capability's structure, services, and apparent digital maturity (if applicable).

Part B – Validation Next Steps (45 minutes)

Candidates set out, in writing, the specific next steps they would take to validate the desk-review findings with the Agency, who they would engage, in what sequence, through what method, and what they would do if findings and stakeholder input conflict.

Part C – Methodology, Approach and Engagement Model (1 hour 15 minutes)

Candidates describe, end-to-end, the high-level methodology and engagement model they would apply from validation of the desk review through to finalisation of the digital strategy within the assignment's 4-month duration, including how they would sequence current-state analysis, opportunity assessment, future-state design, and roadmap development, with at least 2 example services provided during the written examination and how they would manage Agency and GovTech engagement at each stage.

Marking Rubric (35 points total)

Criterion	Indicators of Strong Performance	Points
Desk review approach & rigor (Part A)	Structured, source-triangulated, transparent about assumptions vs. evidence; avoids treating single sources as fact.	7
Quality and depth of findings (Part A)	Findings are specific to the assigned capability (not generic), evidence-based, and surface genuine	9

	issues or gaps rather than restating the mandate documents.	
Validation next steps (Part B)	Realistic, appropriately sequenced stakeholder plan; sound handling of conflicting evidence; awareness of political/organisational sensitivities.	7
Methodology & engagement model (Part C)	Logical end-to-end sequencing fitted to a realistic 4-month timeline; explicit treatment of governance/sign-off points; evidence of having done this kind of work before, not a generic consulting template.	9
Clarity, structure and professional writing	Well-organised, precise, appropriately concise; a document an Agency executive could read without translation.	3

Marking is undertaken independently by at least three qualified evaluators (e.g., a Chief, DST and two independent subject-matter reviewers); scores are reconciled and averaged, with a documented discussion for any sub-criterion where scores diverge by more than 30%. A candidate scoring below 40/60 (Stage1 + Stage 2) does not advance to Stage 3 technical evaluation (see Section 6).

6. Stage 3 – Panel Interview (30 points)

Conducted with candidates whose Stage 1 and 2 script meets the minimum bar (≥ 40/60), to validate through live probing that the written performance reflects genuine competence rather than prepared or assisted material. Weighting of the six competencies assessed:

Competency	Points
Analytical and critical thinking	6
Communication and stakeholder engagement approach	6
Technical/domain knowledge of digital government, GEA and interoperability concepts	5
Problem-solving under a live scenario question	6
Integrity, independence and professional judgement	3
Consistency between Stage 2 script and live responses	4

At 30% of the Technical Score, the interview is now GovTech's single largest verification tool for the Lead Researcher's genuine, unassisted competence. Panels should hold candidates to the full rigor, a comfortable, unchallenging interview undermines the purpose of this weighting.

7. Stage 4 – ICT Business Analyst Assessment (5 points)

Per ToR Section 9, this stage is a CV and qualification review only – no written exercise or interview is required.

Component	Description	Points
Verification against minimum qualification threshold	Confirms the nominated ICT Business Analyst meets the ToR §5.2 threshold (Bachelor's degree in Computer Science, Information Systems, Software/IT Engineering or related field, with a minimum of 3 years of relevant experience).	2
Relevance and depth of past project experience	Quality and relevance of prior systems analysis, business-requirements, or IT strategy work to the scope in ToR Section 3, based on the CV and any supporting project references submitted with the EOI.	3

8. Stage 5 – Reference and Due-Diligence Checks (5 points)

At least two independent referees are contacted for the firm and for each of the two Key Professional Staff, covering assignments claimed in the CV/EOI. Checks verify: role actually performed, quality and timeliness of delivery, stakeholder-management conduct, and any integrity concerns.

Finding	Scoring Treatment
Referee feedback strongly corroborates claimed role and performance	Full 5 points
Referee feedback partially corroborates, or claimed seniority/role is overstated	Pro-rated 2–4 points, with written justification recorded

Referee unreachable after 3 documented attempts, or claim cannot be verified	0 points for that reference; does not by itself disqualify the bid
Referee or public record raises a material integrity concern (fraud, contract termination for cause, misrepresentation)	Pass/Fail flag – referred to the Digital Strategy Review Committee; may result in disqualification regardless of score elsewhere

9. Minimum Qualifying Score and Sequencing

- Combined Technical Score (Stages 1–5) is calculated out of 100, using the weights confirmed in ToR Section 12 and Section 2 above.
- A minimum Technical Score of 80/100 is required for a bid to proceed to financial evaluation (ToR §12).
- A candidate Lead Researcher who scores below 40/60 on total of Stage 1 and Stage 2 is not advanced to Stage 3 technical evaluation (Section 5), and that bid is scored as non-qualifying.
- Bids not meeting the 80/100 threshold for a given capability are not awarded Panel membership, irrespective of financial proposal.

10. Financial Proposal Evaluation

Financial Evaluation and Swiss Challenge Negotiation Mechanism

Where multiple firms meet the minimum qualifying Technical Score of 80/100 for a given capability for example, if "n number" of shortlisted firms all reach the financial stage, GovTech's intent is to admit every technically qualified firm to Panel membership, consistent with the Panel arrangement in Section 4, rather than awarding to a single firm alone. To reconcile this objective with value-for-money and budget discipline, financial proposals are evaluated and, where necessary, negotiated as follows:

1. **Benchmark comparison.** Each technically qualified firm's financial proposal is compared against GovTech's internal cost estimate of **Nu. 2,62,9000 (two million six hundred twenty-nine thousand)**. This estimate represents the tentative average cost for a Digital Strategy covering **twelve (12)** Level-3 (L3) Sub-Capabililities/Services under each RGoB Level-1 (L1) Capability.
2. **Acceptable deviation band.** Bids falling within ±20% of the GovTech Estimate are treated as within the acceptable range. Bids deviating by more than 20%, whether above or below the Estimate, fall outside the acceptable range; they are excluded from serving as the reference price (point 3) but remain eligible for negotiation (point 4).

3. **Determination of the Final Bid Price.** Among the bids that fall within the acceptable ±20% range, the lowest bid is adopted as the "Determined Final Bid Price". This price serves as both the basis for contract award and the reference point for negotiation with higher and out-of-range bidders.
4. **Negotiation with higher and out-of-range bidders (Swiss Challenge).** Firms whose bids are higher than "Determined Final Bid Price" or deviate by more than 20% from the GovTech Estimate are invited to a Swiss Challenge–style negotiation: GovTech offers these firms Panel membership on condition that they accept the "Determined Final Bid Price" in (point 3). Acceptance is entirely at the firm's discretion; a firm that agrees to deliver the assignment at the "Determined Final Bid price" is admitted to the Panel; firms that decline are not selected.
5. **No negotiation for (less than 20%) range bidders.** Firms whose original bids are below the negative 20 deviation are not asked to negotiate. The proposal will be treated as **an abnormally low proposal**, it raises material concerns as to the capability of the proposer to perform the contract for the offered proposal price.
6. **Quality safeguard.** This approach carries no added delivery risk. Performance and deliverable quality are independently and continuously safeguarded through the quality gate in ToR Section 8, under which any Panel firm failing to meet the required standard within the first months of engagement or failing to meet two bi-weekly progress may be terminated from that assignment. Further payment is tagged with the deliverable which has been designed to eliminate front loaded projects.

11. Examination Integrity and Conflict-of-Interest Controls

Control	Detail
Non-Disclosure & Integrity Undertaking	Signed by each Stage 2 candidate before receiving the exam data pack (ToR §11).
Permitted materials	Open-book with respect to publicly available sources on the internet and the supplied data pack. GovTech's proprietary DSDF materials are not disclosed to bidders in any event. AI writing assistance is not restricted because Panel Interview (1 hour) with each Lead Researcher whose Stage 2 script is shortlisted, to probe and validate the analytical reasoning, competence, and communication demonstration is there.
Invigilation	In-person, supervised sitting at a GovTech-designated venue, devices and communications monitored for the duration.

Evaluator conflict-of-interest declaration	All Stage 1–5 evaluators and interview panel members sign a conflict-of-interest declaration before scoring begins any declared conflict results in recusal from that specific bid.