

Evaluation Criteria

All responses to the RFP will be evaluated technically and financially and the winning proposal will be selected on the basis of “best value” in terms of technical superiority as well as cost effectiveness. Technical and financial proposals shall be reviewed by the Purchase Committee at the Ministry and evaluated in accordance with the following procedure:

The overall proposal will be evaluated according to the following criteria:

1. Overall Technical Proposal 70%
2. Overall Financial Proposal 30%
3. The overall bidders mark will be calculated as follows:

$$= 30 * (\text{least value of financial proposals} / \text{bidder financial proposal value}) + (\%70 * \text{bidder technical mark})$$

If the bidder does not achieve a minimum technical score of **70%**, the **financial proposal will not be considered and shall be disqualified.**

Technical Proposal Evaluation Criteria:

Category	Detailed Criteria	Weight (%)
Understanding of Requirements & Methodology	<p>-Clarity of understanding project objectives and scope 5% :</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Understanding of project objectives (1%) <p>What to Evaluate The bidder clearly explains the main goals of the project and what the client wants to achieve.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Understanding of business needs and expected outcomes (1%) <p>What to Evaluate The proposal shows awareness of the business problem, target users, expected benefits, and desired results.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Understanding of project scope (1%) <p>What to Evaluate The bidder clearly identifies what is included in the project scope, such as services, modules, activities, and deliverables.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Identification of out-of-scope items, assumptions, and dependencies (1%) <p>What to Evaluate The proposal clarifies assumptions, dependencies, exclusions, limitations, or items requiring client input.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Alignment with tender/RFP requirements (1%) 	20%

What to Evaluate

- The understanding is consistent with the requirements stated in the tender documents and does not misinterpret the scope.

Completeness and relevance of proposed solution 5%

- **Coverage of technical requirements (2%)**

What to Evaluate

The solution addresses technical aspects such as architecture, integration, hosting, security, performance, and scalability.

- **Relevance to project objectives and scope (1%)**

What to Evaluate

The proposed solution is directly related to the project needs and avoids generic or unrelated components.

- **Implementation approach and methodology (1%)**

What to Evaluate

The bidder provides a clear implementation plan, phases, activities, responsibilities, timeline, and methodology.

- **Sustainability, support, and knowledge transfer (1%)**

What to Evaluate

The solution includes documentation, training, maintenance, support, handover, and long-term operability considerations.

Appropriateness of development methodology (Agile/Scrum, etc.) 3%

Alignment with functional & non-functional requirements 7% :

Section1. Non-Functional Requirements (Total: 3.5 %)

1.1 Compliance Requirements (1.0 %)

- **0.4 %:** Full legal alignment with the *Jordanian Personal Data Protection Law No. (24) of 2023*.
- **0.3 %:** Features for explicit user consent logging and management.
- **0.3 %:** Functional tools for data subject rights (access, correction, erasure) and automated privacy impact audit paths.

1.2 Business Continuity & Testing (1.0 %)

- **0.4 %:** Disproving architectural viability for **RTO ≤ 4 hours** and **RPO ≤ 1 hour**.
- **0.3 %:** Automated daily off-site backup workflows and active hardware failover redundancy.
- **0.3 %:** 24/7 environment monitoring/alerting alongside a robust deployment testing suite (Unit, Integration, E2E).

1.3 Security & Availability (1.0 %)

- **0.4 %:** Application of strong encryption (AES-256 at rest, TLS 1.3 in transit).
- **0.3 %:** Strict Role-Based Access Control (RBAC) to enforce the principle of least privilege.
- **0.3 %:** Proven high-uptime application hosting architecture aligned with national/international security baselines.

	<p>1.4 Performance (0.5 %)</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • 0.5 %: System concurrency testing proofs (handling simultaneous application traffic spikes smoothly) paired with fast page/action response times. <p>Section2. Functional Requirements (Total: 3.5 %)</p> <p>2.1 Registration & Verification (1.0 %)</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • 0.5 %: Native SANAD single sign-on login portal integration and unified household-based profile creation. • 0.5 %: Real-time API integrations via the Government Service Bus (GSB) to pull live data from the National Unified Registry (NUR) and Jordan Civil Status/Social Security (JSR) to validate multi-tier assets/income. <p>2.2 Field Visits & Case Management (1.0 %)</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • 0.5 %: Automated/manual field-visit assignment logic for social workers, metadata capture (GPS stamps, direct photo/document attachments), and data updates without forcing physical re-visits. • 0.5 %: Multi-level (two-way) approval hierarchy routings and transparent case reassignment tracks. <p>2.3 Eligibility & Payment Processing (1.0 %)</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • 0.5 %: Accuracy of the automated classification rules engine determining eligibility thresholds. • 0.5 %: Calculation accuracy of subsidy amounts, automated payment batch generation, and secure financial handshakes with e-wallets, standard bank accounts, and Jordan Post. <p>2.4 Complaints & Reporting (0.5 %)</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • 0.25 %: Citizen grievance/appeal submittal portal and dynamic lifecycle tracking states. • 0.25 %: Operational reporting engines and executive BI dashboard visualizations for NAF management. 	
<p>System Architecture & Technical Approach</p>	<p>Proposed System Architecture and Design Quality 5%</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Architecture clarity and completeness (1%) <p>What to Evaluate The proposal clearly explains the overall system architecture, main components, layers, and how they interact.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Suitability of architecture to project needs (1%) <p>What to Evaluate The architecture fits the project objectives, expected users, services, transaction volume, and operational environment.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Design quality and modularity (1%) <p>What to Evaluate The design is modular, well-structured, and clearly separates responsibilities between frontend, backend, database, integration, and security layers.</p>	<p>20%</p>

- **Reliability, availability, and performance design (1%)**

What to Evaluate

The architecture addresses uptime, fault tolerance, performance, backup, recovery, monitoring, and load handling.

- **Documentation and diagram quality (1%)**

What to Evaluate

The proposal includes clear architecture diagrams, deployment diagrams, data flow diagrams, or design descriptions that are easy to understand.

Use of Modern Technologies — 5%

- **Use of appropriate development frameworks (1%)**

What to Evaluate

The proposed frontend and backend frameworks are modern, stable, supported, and suitable for enterprise or government systems.

- **Database technology and data management approach (1%)**

What to Evaluate

The proposal addresses database design, DBMS selection, indexing, backup, data integrity, and data migration approach.

- **API and integration technology (1%)**

What to Evaluate

The solution uses standard APIs, web services, REST/SOAP where applicable, API documentation, and secure integration patterns.

- **Security standards and controls (1%)**

What to Evaluate

The proposal includes authentication, authorization, encryption, audit logs, secure coding practices, vulnerability management, and compliance with relevant security standards.

- **Technology sustainability and vendor support (1%)**

What to Evaluate

The selected technologies are maintainable, widely supported, not obsolete, and suitable for long-term operation.

Scalability, Interoperability, and Maintainability (5%)

- **Scalability of the solution (1%)**

What to Evaluate

The system can handle growth in users, transactions, services, data volume, and future expansion.

- **Performance optimization approach (1%)**

What to Evaluate

The proposal includes caching, indexing, load balancing, efficient queries, background processing, or other performance improvement measures.

	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Interoperability with other platforms (1%) <p>What to Evaluate The solution can exchange data with other systems using standard protocols, APIs, data formats, and integration methods.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Maintainability and code quality (1%) <p>What to Evaluate The solution supports clean code, modular design, configuration management, version control, testing, and easy future enhancement.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Monitoring, logging, and operational support (1%) <p>What to Evaluate The proposal includes system monitoring, error logging, audit trails, alerts, troubleshooting tools, and operational procedures.</p> <p>Integration with Existing Systems and Government Databases (5%)</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Understanding of existing systems and databases (1%) <p>What to Evaluate The bidder demonstrates clear understanding of the current systems, legacy databases, data sources, and operational dependencies.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Integration approach and methodology (1%) <p>What to Evaluate The proposal explains how integration will be implemented, including APIs, web services, data exchange mechanisms, middleware, or ETL where needed.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Data mapping, validation, and synchronization (1%) <p>What to Evaluate The solution addresses data mapping, validation rules, data quality, duplicate handling, synchronization frequency, and error handling.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Security and access control for integrations (1%) <p>What to Evaluate The proposal covers secure connectivity, authentication, authorization, encryption, audit logging, and protection of sensitive government data.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Testing, fallback, and continuity of integrations (1%) <p>What to Evaluate The proposal includes integration testing, UAT, exception handling, rollback or fallback procedures, and continuity plans if an external system is unavailable.</p>		
System Delivery	Describe the implementation methodology for all the points that are mentioned in the scope of work and eservice system delivery component overall implementation strategy covering all Phases of implementation	3%	10%
	Describe Requirements Gathering Method for collecting functional and non-functional requirements, Techniques for validating requirements with stakeholders and business owners.	2%	



	Provide a high-level design and logical architecture of the solution, describing system architecture, functions, and interactions of all the components.	2%	
	Describe the implementation approach methodology for the migration process, demonstrate capability to successfully migrate two legacy systems currently used, ensuring data integrity, service continuity, and minimal downtime during the transition to a modern platform, as well as Test and validation process.	3%	
Security & Data Protection	<p>Section 1: Compliance with Information Security Standards (Total: 5 Points) This section evaluates the vendor's alignment with globally recognized frameworks and industry best practices.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • ISO 27001 Certification & Audits (1.5%) What to Evaluate: Valid certification from an accredited body and recent external audit reports (e.g., SOC 2 Type II or ISO surveillance audits). • Application Security Frameworks / OWASP Top 10 (1.5 %) What to Evaluate: Evidence that the software is developed following secure coding practices, with regular vulnerability scanning and penetration testing mimicking OWASP guidelines. • Regulatory Compliance (1%) What to Evaluate: Adherence to region- or industry-specific mandates relevant to your operations (e.g., GDPR, HIPAA, or local data protection acts). • Security Incident Response & Governance (1%) What to Evaluate: A documented incident response plan, business continuity strategy, and clear SLAs for reporting and patching critical vulnerabilities. <p>Section 2: Data Privacy & Protection Approach (Total: 5 Points) This section evaluates the technical mechanisms used to shield data from unauthorized access, both at rest and in transit.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Robust Encryption Mechanisms (1.5%) What to Evaluate: Use of strong encryption protocols (e.g., AES-256 for data at rest and TLS 1.3 for data in transit) along with secure key management practices. • Advanced Authentication (MFA / SSO) (1.5%) What to Evaluate: Support for Multi-Factor Authentication (MFA) and seamless integration with corporate Single Sign-On (SSO) providers using SAML 2.0 or OIDC. • Role-Based Access Control - RBAC (1%) What to Evaluate: Granular permission settings that enforce the "principle of least privilege," ensuring users only see data necessary for their role. • Data Minimization & Privacy by Design (1%) What to Evaluate: Features like data masking, anonymization, clear data retention/deletion policies, and explicit user consent logging. 	10%	
Support, Maintenance &	Post-Deployment Support Plan and SLA Commitments 5% <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Support model and coverage (1%) 	10%	



<p>Knowledge Transfer</p>	<p>What to Evaluate The proposal clearly defines the post-deployment support model, support channels, working hours, escalation levels, and responsible support team.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • SLA response times (1%) <p>What to Evaluate The bidder provides clear response time commitments based on incident severity, such as critical, high, medium, and low priority issues.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • SLA resolution times (1%) <p>What to Evaluate The proposal includes realistic resolution time commitments for different types of incidents, technical issues, bugs, and service interruptions.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Incident management and escalation process (1%) <p>What to Evaluate The support plan explains how incidents will be reported, tracked, prioritized, escalated, resolved, and communicated to the client.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Maintenance, updates, and reporting (1%) <p>What to Evaluate The proposal includes preventive maintenance, patches, updates, bug fixes, periodic health checks, support reports, and service performance reporting.</p> <p>Training and Capacity Building Plan for Client Team 5%</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Training scope and target groups (1%) <p>What to Evaluate The proposal clearly identifies the training topics, target users, administrators, technical staff, and business users who will receive training.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Training materials and documentation (1%) <p>What to Evaluate The bidder provides user manuals, technical guides, administrator guides, training presentations, FAQs, and other relevant learning materials.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Practical hands-on training approach (1%) <p>What to Evaluate The training plan includes practical sessions, real system scenarios, exercises, demonstrations, and knowledge transfer activities.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Capacity building for technical team (1%) <p>What to Evaluate The proposal includes technical knowledge transfer covering system administration, configuration, troubleshooting, integrations, database, security, and maintenance.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Training schedule, evaluation, and follow-up (1%) 	
----------------------------------	---	--

	<p>What to Evaluate</p> <p>The proposal includes a clear training schedule, attendance plan, evaluation method, feedback collection, and post-training support or refresher sessions.</p>		
Project Management Plan	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Detailed implementation plan and milestones 2% - Risk management approach 1% - Quality assurance/testing strategy 1% - Change management and communication plan 1% 	5%	
Required Infrastructure	Proposed options for hosting on GPC	2%	5%
	Logical infrastructure architecture showing all solution components and its description	1%	
	Proposed GPC services that will fulfill project's needs and requirements	1%	
	Required computing resources to host the solution	1%	
Team Qualifications & Experience	- Experience of the project manager and key technical staff 10%		20%
	1 Project manager, with at least bachelor degree. At least five years as a project manager for development and implementation of IT software systems. With PMP certificate or equivalent Preferable to have more certifications in project management (ACP, PMI-RMP ,SP...etc)	1%	
	1 Business Analyst, with at least bachelor degree. At least five years as an analyst of business requirements for projects for the development and implementation of IT software systems. Preferable to have more certification in business analysis (PMI-PBA,,, etc)	1%	
	1 Technical leader /system architect, with at least bachelor degree in the field of ICT. At least five years in design (including DB design and System architecture), development and implementation of IT software systems with service-oriented software architecture	2%	
	2 Software backend/full stack developer, with at least bachelor degree in the ICT field. At least five years of experience	1%	
	2 Software frontend developer/client side of IT software systems, with at least bachelor degree in the field of ICT. At least five years of experience	1%	
	1 Quality Control Engineer, with at least bachelor degree. At least five years as quality tester for projects of the development and implementation of IT software systems. With ISTQB certificate or equivalent	1%	
	1 System Engineer, with at least bachelor degree in the field of ICT. At least five years of experience	1%	
	1 information security Specialist with at least three years' experience and industry-recognized certifications may be preferred	1%	
	1 UI\UX expert with at least 3 years' experience in Customer journey and UI\UX.	1%	

- Relevant past performance in similar government or IT projects(in scale)

10%

مطلوب مشروع واحد على الأقل مشابه لنطاق العمل (وفق المعايير التفصيلية أدناه) على ان تكون بداية ونهاية المشروع خلال اخر 7 سنوات
علما بأن علامة المشروع سيتم وضعها اعتمادا على تقييم أفضل مشروع تم تقديمه يغطي كافة مكونات نطاق العمل ولا يتم تجزئة المكونات على أكثر من مشروع .

ومعايير تقييم المشروع التفصيلية:

نطاق العمل المشروع وحجمه 3%

يتضمن ربط مع جهات خارجية او داخلية او كلاهما 2%

(work flow) يتضمن سير عمل 2%

(frontend) يتضمن واجهات امامية 1%

(Backend) يتضمن واجهات خلفية 2%