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**1. Timetable**

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

**2. Observers**

|  |
| --- |
| **Note: tenderer representatives are not observers and must leave after tender opening session (if public opening of received tenders is foreseen).** |

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
| **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 Chairperson 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 envelope 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 envelope 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.] |
|  |  | [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, as listed in the Tender opening report. 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 Chairperson 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 envelope number** | **Tenderer name** | **Summary of exchange of correspondence** |
|  |  |  |
|  |  |  |
|  |  |  |

]

|  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- |
|  |  |  |
|  |  |  |
|  |  |  |
|  |  |  |

[If 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 a provisional average score around 75 points or more) were verified:

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

The references which were verified are diplomas and documents proving experts' professional experience of EU projects, 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 changes are 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 scores were as follows:

|  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- |
| **Tender envelope number** | **Tenderer name** | **Score** | **Justification** |
|  |  |  |  |
|  |  |  |  |
|  |  |  |  |

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

|  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| **Tender envelope number** | **Tenderer name** | **Final average score** | **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 final average scores of at least 75 points qualify for the financial evaluation.

**Financial evaluation**

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.

The Evaluation Committee checked the financial offers for arithmetic errors. 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 found not to meet 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):

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

]

The Evaluation Committee compared prices in the remaining financial offers to calculate their financial scores:

|  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- |
| **Tender envelope number** | **Tenderer name** | **[EUR] [<national currency>** | **Financial score** |
|  |  |  |  |
|  |  |  |  |
|  |  |  |  |

|  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- |
|  |  |  |  |
|  |  |  |  |
|  |  |  |  |
|  |  |  |  |

[If a tender appears to have an abnormally low price in relation to the services in question*:*

The tender submitted by <Tenderer name> appeared to have an abnormally low price in relation to the market for the services in question. Consequently, the Chairperson of the Evaluation Committee wrote to <Tenderer name> to obtain a detailed explanation for the low price proposed.

On the basis of the response of the tenderer, the Evaluation Committee decided to

[accept the tender because [the tenderer used an economic production method] [of the nature of the technical solution used] [the financial offer reflected exceptionally favourable conditions available to the tenderer.]]

OR [reject the tender as the abnormally low price could not be justified on objective grounds.]

**4. Conclusion**

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

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

|  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- |
|  |  |  |  |
|  |  |  |  |
|  |  |  |  |

**Verification of documentary evidence for exclusion and selection criteria**

The Evaluation Committee checked that the documentary evidence for exclusion and selection criteria for the tender with the highest overall scores were submitted.

[If clarifications of 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 envelope 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 admissible the evaluation committee shall proceed to the second best technically and financially acceptable tender and verify their documentary evidence. If the documents are found admissible the conclusion may be to propose to award the contract to them.

Consequently, the Evaluation Committee recommends that < tenderer name > is awarded the contract with a contract value of [EUR] [<National currency> <amount>.

**5. Signatures**

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

**Approved by the Contracting Authority:**

**Name & Signature: Date:**

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
|  | |
|  |  |
|  |  |
|  |  |
|  |  |

Not to be used for simplified procedures where only one tender was received

**< Letterhead of the Contracting Authority >**

**AWARD DECISION**

**PUBLICATION REF: <Ref>  
  
<Contract title>**

**[Lot number and lot title: <number and title> ]**

**Maximum budget: <amount and currency>**

The Contracting Authority, having examined the evaluation report prepared by the Evaluation Committee on the <date>, acknowledges that the Evaluation Committee recommends that <tenderer name> is awarded the contract with a contract value of [EUR] [<national currency> <amount>.

The Contracting Authority

The Contracting Authority approves the evaluation report. Following the Evaluation Committee's recommendation, the Contracting Authority takes the decision to award the contract to <tenderer name>, the latter being the tenderer who provides the most economically advantageous tender while meeting the selection criteria.

**Name and signature:**

**Date:**

|  |
| --- |
|  |
|  |
|  |
|  |
|  |