PUBLICATION REF: IPA SA/RES-NCPA/SRV/03  
  
Contract title: **SERVICE CONTRACT NOTICE**

“EXTERNAL EXPERTISE AND SERVICES IN THE PACKAGE MANAGEMENT, SELECTION OF AN EXTERNAL EXPERT FOR THE GENERAL MANAGEMENT OF THE PROJECT RESILIENT SA (as assistant manager), IN THE FRAMEWORK OF INTERREG IPA SOUTH ADRIATIC 2021-2027

Maximum budget: 38.340,00 euro

**Contents:** Timetable  
Observers  
Evaluation  
- Technical evaluation  
- Financial evaluation  
Conclusion  
Signatures

**Annexes:**

[Electronic submission (direct management): Appointment of Opening and Evaluation Committees from PPMT/Ares with the declarations of impartiality and confidentiality]

[Electronic submission (direct management): Record of opening of submissions generated from eSubmission]

[Paper submission (indirect management): Tender opening record and its annexes]  
Administrative compliance grid  
[Correspondence concerning clarification sought from tenderers]  
[Correspondence regarding Declaration on Honour and supporting documents on exclusion and selection criteria from tenderers]  
Evaluation grids completed by the individual evaluators  
Summary of average scores, technical and financial score and conclusion  
[Interview records]

**1. Timetable**

|  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- |
|  | **DATE** | **TIME** | **VENUE** |
| **< Meeting 1 >** |  |  |  |
| **< Meeting 2 >** |  |  |  |
| **< Interview session 1 >** |  |  |  |
| **Etc.** |  |  |  |

**2. Observers**

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
| **Name** | **Representing** |
|  |  |
|  |  |

**3. Evaluation**

**Administrative compliance**

The evaluation committee used the administrative compliance grid in the tender dossier to assess the compliance of each tender with the administrative requirements of the tender dossier.

[If any tenderers were asked to provide clarification:

With the agreement of the other evaluation committee members, the contracting authority wrote to the following tenderers whose tenders required clarification, asking them to respond by fax or email within a reasonable deadline set by the evaluation committee (all correspondence is attached in the annex indicated):

|  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- |
| **Tender number** | **Tenderer name** | **Summary of exchange of correspondence** |
|  |  |  |
|  |  |  |
|  |  |  |

]

The completed administrative compliance grid is attached. On the basis of this, the evaluation committee decided that the following tenders had not met the administrative requirements and should be rejected:

| **Tender number** | **Tenderer name** | **Reason** |
| --- | --- | --- |
|  |  | [The tenderer is in an exclusion situation.] |
|  |  | [The tenderer has misrepresented or failed to supply the information required.] |
|  |  | [The tenderer was previously involved in the preparation of procurement documents, this entailing a distortion of competition which cannot be remedied otherwise.] |
|  |  | [For procedures other than the restricted procedure: The tenderer does not meet the selection criteria.] |
|  |  | [<Other reason>] |

**Technical evaluation**

All voting members of the evaluation committee used the evaluation grid in the tender dossier to assess the technical offers of the tenders that met the administrative requirements. The completed evaluation grids are attached to this report, together with a summary of the evaluators’ comments on the strengths and weaknesses of the technical offers.

[If clarification were requested for the submissions from any tenderer:

With the agreement of the other evaluation committee members, the contracting authority wrote to the following tenderers whose tenders required clarification, asking them to respond by fax or email within a reasonable deadline set by the evaluation committee (all correspondence is attached in the annex indicated):

|  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- |
| **Tender number** | **Tenderer name** | **Summary of exchange of correspondence** |
|  |  |  |
|  |  |  |
|  |  |  |

]

[If interviews were provided for in the tender dossier:

Based on the provisional average technical score given by the evaluation committee to the technical offers, the key experts of the following tenderers (which achieved a provisional average score around 75 points or more) were called for interview:

| **Tender number** | **Tenderer name** | **Provisional average technical score** |
| --- | --- | --- |
|  |  |  |
|  |  |  |
|  |  |  |

The interviews followed the standard format agreed by the evaluation committee. The records of the interviews are attached to this report.

On completion of the interviews, the members of the evaluation committee considered whether or not it was necessary to adjust the provisional scores given to the experts. Any changes are clearly indicated by the members on their evaluation grids with a note explaining why the change was made.]

[When references are verified:

Based on the provisional average scores given by the evaluation committee to the technical offers, the references of the key experts proposed by the following tenderers (which achieved an average technical score around 75 points or more) were verified:

| **Tender number** | **Tenderer name** | **Provisional average technical score** |
| --- | --- | --- |
|  |  |  |
|  |  |  |
|  |  |  |

The references which were verified are diplomas and documents proving the experts' professional experience, as mentioned in their CV, and/or other references provided by the tenderer.

On completion of the verification, the members of the evaluation committee considered whether or not it was necessary to adjust the provisional scores given to the experts. Any change is clearly indicated by the members on their evaluation grids, with a note explaining why the change was made.]

The evaluators discussed their comments and their scores on the technical offers.

The main strengths and weaknesses commonly agreed by the evaluators for each tender were as follows:

| **Tender number** | **Tenderer name** | **Strengths** | **Weaknesses** |
| --- | --- | --- | --- |
|  |  |  |  |
|  |  |  |  |
|  |  |  |  |

The final average technical scores of the administratively compliant tenders and the weighted technical scores of the tenders that were subject to the technical evaluation were as follows:

| **Tender number** | **Tenderer name** | **Final average technical score** | **Weighted technical score (score/rejection)** | **Reason for rejection** |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
|  |  |  |  | [The tender does not comply with the minimum requirements specified in the procurement documents.] |
|  |  |  |  | [For tenders awarded less than 75 points: The tender does not meet the minimum quality levels.] |

Only tenders with a final average technical score of at least 75 points qualify for the financial evaluation.

**Financial evaluation**

[Paper submission (indirect management): The envelopes containing the financial offers of the technically accepted tenders were opened and all copies were initialled by the chairperson and secretary.]

The evaluation committee checked that the financial offers met the formal requirements of the tender dossier.

For fee-based contracts:

The evaluation committee checked the financial offers for arithmetic errors and that the provision for actual expenditure included in the tender dossier was correctly inserted in the budget breakdown. Any such errors were corrected.

For each financial offer, the contract value was compared to the maximum budget available for the contract.]

[If any financial offers were not meeting the formal requirements, including exceeding the maximum budget available:

The following financial offers did not meet the formal requirements indicated (and were rejected on these grounds as shown below):

| **Tender number** | **Tenderer name** | **Formal requirement(s) not satisfied** | **Rejected? (YES / NO)** |
| --- | --- | --- | --- |
|  |  |  |  |
|  |  |  |  |
|  |  |  |  |

]

[For fee-based contracts:

The evaluation committee compared the total fees [and lump sums] in the remaining financial offers to calculate their financial scores:

| **Tender number** | **Tenderer name** | **Total fees [and lump sums] [EUR] [<ISO code of national currency> only for indirect management]** | **Financial score** |
| --- | --- | --- | --- |
|  |  |  |  |
|  |  |  |  |
|  |  |  |  |

]

**4. Conclusion**

The composite evaluation of the technically compliant tenders was as follows:

| **Tender number** | **Tenderer name** | **Overall score** (Weighted technical score x 0.80 + Financial score x 0.20) | **Final ranking** |
| --- | --- | --- | --- |
|  |  |  |  |
|  |  |  |  |

[MFF 2014-2020- EDF only: If preference rules are used:

In respect of service contracts other than the European Commission's framework contracts, when technical offers are evaluated, preference shall be given to tenders submitted by legal or natural persons of ACP States, either individually or in a consortium among them.

If two tenders are equivalent (overall scores are equal), preference is given:

1. To the tenderer of an ACP State; or
2. If there is no such tender, to the tenderer who:

* allows for the best possible use of physical and human resources of the ACP States;
* offers the greatest subcontracting possibilities to ACP companies, firms or natural persons; or
* is a consortium of natural persons, companies and firms from ACP States and the EU.

Application of these rules produced the following results:

| **Tender number** | **Tenderer name** | **Overall score** | **Final ranking** |
| --- | --- | --- | --- |
|  |  |  |  |
|  |  |  |  |

]

**Correspondence regarding** **the Declaration(s) on honour and documentary evidence for exclusion and selection criteria**

[“Point 3 - Documentary evidence for selection criteria” of the email below is not to be used for the simplified procedure **if**  the Contracting Authority decided in the Instructions to Tenderers not to request the documentary evidence on selection criteria]

An email requesting [for paper submission only: the original signed Declaration on honour on exclusion and selection criteria and] documentary evidence for exclusion and, if applicable, selection criteria, for the tender with the highest overall scores was sent on <specify the date>.

[The text of the email to the tender with the highest overall score must at least contain the following information:

“Please send to <address of the Contracting Authority> or/and <email address of the Contracting Authority>.

1. The Declaration(s) on honour on exclusion criteria and selection criteria.

Paper submission :

Please submit the original signed Declaration(s) on honour of which a copy has been submitted by you with the request to participate form/the tender submission form. The original signed Declaration(s) on honour must be submitted for every member of the consortium and any capacity providing entity or subcontractor (if applicable). Please use a reliable courier service or registered mail to avoid any delays or loss of the documents. The envelope, clearly mentioning the reference of the call for tenders and, if applicable, the eSubmission ID of the tender submitted, must be marked as "CALL FOR TENDERS – NOT TO BE OPENED BY THE INTERNAL MAIL DEPARTMENT".

If you use the Qualified Electronic Signature (QES) for the signing of documents, please sign the Declaration(s) on honour on exclusion and selection criteria with QES and send by email. ]

[**Documentary evidence on** **exclusion criteria** is requiredfor all tender procedures with a value above EUR 300 000. For tender procedures below EUR 300 000, the contracting authority may, if it has doubts about whether the tenderer to whom the contract is to be awarded is in one of the situations leading to exclusion, require the tenderer to provide the evidence on exclusion criteria.

2. Documentary evidence for the exclusion criteria. Please send by email or by courier service or registered mail[[1]](#footnote-1) the documentary evidence demonstrating that you do not fall into any of the exclusion situations listed in Section 2.6.10.1.1. of the Practical Guide. Examples of the admissible supporting documents are provided in Section 2.6.10.1.3. of the Practical Guide. The admissible proof or statement should be under the law of the country in which you (including all consortium members, as well as subcontractors and capacity providing entities, if applicable) are established in accordance with the undertaking in the declaration(s) which was included in your tender. The date on the evidence or documents provided must be no earlier than 1 year before the date of submission of the tender. [You] [Your firm] [each consortium member] must, in addition, provide a statement that the situation has not been altered in the period that has elapsed since the evidence in question was drawn up.

If the nature of your entity is such that it cannot fall into the exclusion situations and/or cannot provide the documents indicated above (for instance, national public administrations and international organisations), please provide a declaration explaining this situation.

The contracting authority may waive the obligation to submit the documentary evidence referred to above if such evidence has already been submitted for the purposes of another procurement procedure, provided that the issue date of the documents does not exceed one year and that they are still valid. In this case, please declare that the documentary evidence has already been provided in a previous procurement procedure, indicating its title and reference number, and confirm that the situation has not changed.]

[**Documentary evidence** **on** **selection criteria** is requested for all tender procedures with a value above EUR 300 000. For tender procedures below EUR 300 000: The contracting authority may, depending on its assessment of the risks, decide not to require proof for selection criteria, but then no pre-financing must be made, see Section 2.6.11. of the practical guide.

3. Documentary evidence for selection criteria.  Please send by email or by courier service or registered mail1 the documentary evidence of the financial and economic capacity and the technical and professional capacity according to the selection criteria specified in the additional information about the contract notice (A5f).

Specifically for technical and professional capacity the documentary evidence has to be provided for the following references <specify for which references in the request to participate form – point 6 Experience – evidence has to be submitted and introduce the information from column ‘Short-listed on experience ref. N°’ as mentioned on the longlist.> ]

Where the documentary evidence submitted is in an official language of the European Union other than the one of the procedure, it is strongly recommended to provide a translation into the language of the procedure, in order to facilitate the evaluation of the documents. Although copies of the documentary evidence are accepted at this stage, the originals must be available to be send to the contracting authority upon request.

We would be grateful to receive the requested documents at the latest by <date>.

[Only for procedures where tenders were submitted via electronic submission (restricted, open, negotiated): In the course of the procedure the EU Validation Services of REA may contact you and all consortium members via the Participant Register and ask for supporting documents with respect to the legal existence, status and financial data of your organisation (Participant Identification Code (PIC) validation). Please note that a request for supporting documents in no way implies that the tenderer has been successful. All communications with the EU Validation Services will take place through the F&T portal.]

]

The original (if applicable) signed declaration(s) on honour on exclusion and selection criteria for the tender with the highest overall scores, including the declarations of every member of the consortium and any capacity providing entity or subcontractor (if applicable), and documentary evidence on compliance with exclusion and selection criteria were submitted on <specify the date>.

[If further clarifications on documentary evidence were requested from the tenderer:

With the agreement of the other evaluation committee members, the chairperson wrote to the tenderer offering them the possibility to respond by fax or email within a reasonable time limit fixed by the evaluation committee (all correspondence is attached in the annex indicated):

|  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- |
| **Tender number** | **Tenderer name** | **Summary of exchange of correspondence** |
|  |  |  |

]

The evaluation committee verified the documentary evidence for exclusion and selection criteria for the tender with the highest overall scores and the documents were found [admissible] [not admissible].

If the documentary evidence is not found to be admissible, the evaluation committee will proceed as stated above with the second best technically and financially acceptable tender, using the email text template provided above to request the original (if applicable) Declaration on honour and the documentary evidence for exclusion and selection criteria. Upon receipt and verification of all requested documents, the evaluation committee may recommend awarding the contract to the second best tenderer.]

The evaluation committee has ensured that there is no detection of a recommended tenderer or members of their consortium in the early detection and exclusion system. [In indirect management, if the contracting authority does not have access to the early detection and exclusion system this must be verified by a representative of the European Commission]

The evaluation committee has ensured that there is no detection of a recommended tenderer or members of their consortium in the lists of EU restrictive measures[[2]](#footnote-2).

[Electronic submission The evaluation committee requested the PIC validation[[3]](#footnote-3) of the tenderer with the highest overall scores (lead of the consortium and all consortium members).]

Consequently, the evaluation committee recommends that < tenderer name > is awarded the contract with a contract value of [EUR] [<ISO code of the country of the contracting authority> only for indirect management] <amount>.

**5. Signatures**

|  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- |
|  | **Name** | **Signature** |
| **Chairperson** |  |  |
| **Secretary** |  |  |
| **Evaluators** |  |  |
|  |  |  |
|  |  |  |

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
| **[Approved by the European Commission** only in the event of ex-ante control by the European Commission | |
| Name: |  |
| Title: |  |
| Signature: |  |
| Date: **]** |  |

1. Please use a reliable courier service or registered mail to avoid any delays or loss of the documents. The envelope, clearly mentioning the reference of the call for tenders and, if applicable, the eSubmission ID of the tender submitted, must be marked as "CALL FOR TENDERS – NOT TO BE OPENED BY THE INTERNAL MAIL DEPARTMENT" [↑](#footnote-ref-1)
2. The updated lists of sanctions are available at [www.sanctionsmap.eu](http://www.sanctionsmap.eu).

   Please note that the sanctions map is an IT tool for identifying the sanctions regimes. The source of the sanctions stems from legal acts published in the Official Journal (OJ). In case of discrepancy between the published legal acts and the updates on the website, it is the OJ version that prevails. [↑](#footnote-ref-2)
3. For further guidance on the procedure to request the PIC validation, please consult RELEX internal Wiki [↑](#footnote-ref-3)