Request for specific contract < electronic exchange system reference> <specific contract title>

[FWC SEA 2023 - Lot <number and title> ]

Maximum budget: <amount and currency>

**1. Timetable**

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

**2. Observers**

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

**3. Evaluation**

**Admissibility**

The evaluation committee met on <date> and checked the following criteria of admissibility of each offer:

- the deadline for the submission of offers has been respected

- the offer complies with the eligibility rules of the Instrument/Programme which finances the Specific Contract

<All <number> offers were admissible > /or

<The offer n.< > from Framework Contractor <name> did not meet the requirements <reason> and has been rejected:>. <Number> offers were admissible >

**Technical evaluation**

All voting members of the evaluation committee used the evaluation grid sent with the request for specific contract to assess the technical offers that were admissible, as per the electronic exchange system opening report.

[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 e-mail within a reasonable deadline set by the evaluation committee (all correspondence is attached in the annex indicated):

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

]

[If interviews were provided for in the request for service/evaluation grid:

Based on the provisional average scores 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:

| **Tenderer name** | **Provisional average 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. 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:

| **Tenderer name** | **Strengths** | **Weaknesses** |
| --- | --- | --- |
|  |  |  |
|  |  |  |
|  |  |  |

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:

Evaluator’s Grids Overview

|  | **Technical Evaluation Criteria**\* | **Offer 1** | **Offer 2** | **Offer 3** | **Offer 4** |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| Evaluator 1 | Criteria 1  Criteria 2  ...  Expert/expertise  ...  Total (/100) |  |  |  |  |
| Evaluator 2 | Criteria 1  Criteria 2  ...  Expert/expertise  ...  Total (/100) |  |  |  |  |
| Evaluator 3 | Criteria 1  Criteria 2  ...  Expert/expertise  ...  Total (/100) |  |  |  |  |
| Final average score |  |  |  |  |  |
| Technical score[[1]](#footnote-1) (score/rejection) |  |  |  |  |  |
| Reason for rejection | [For tenders awarded less than 75 points: The tender does not meet the minimum quality levels.] |  |  |  |  |

\*The Technical Evaluation Criteria are those included in the Specific Contract Evaluation Grid

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

The final technical scores will be encoded in the electronic exchange system.

**Financial evaluation**

The financial offers of the technically accepted tenders were evaluated.

-The fee rates (expert fees + management fees) (including those in the Budget Breakdown of a global price specific contract) do not exceed the contractual maxima.

-The maximum budget is not exceeded.

[Fee based:

Both the provision for incidental expenditure and the provision for expenditure verification were not taken into account in the comparison of the financial offers.]

[Global price:

The total price was taken into account in the comparison of the financial offers.]

[For fee-based contracts:

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

| **Tenderer name** | **Total fees [and lump sums] [EUR]** | **Financial score[[2]](#footnote-2)** |
| --- | --- | --- |
|  |  |  |
|  |  |  |
|  |  |  |

]

[For global price contracts:

The evaluation committee compared the global prices quoted in the financial offers to calculate their financial scores:

| **Tenderer name** | **Global price [EUR** | **Financial score** |
| --- | --- | --- |
|  |  |  |
|  |  |  |
|  |  |  |

]

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

The tender submitted by <Framework Contractor 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 <Framework Contractor 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 [indicate reason ]]

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:

| **Tenderer name** | **Technical score**  **(x 0,60)** | **Financial score**  **(x 0.40)** | **Overall score**  **(Technical score x 0.60 + Financial score x 0.40)** | **Final**  **ranking** |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
|  |  |  |  |  |
|  |  |  |  |  |
|  |  |  |  |  |
|  |  |  |  |  |

The evaluation committee has ensured that there is no detection of a recommended tenderer or members in their consortium in the early detection and exclusion system.

The evaluation committee has ensured that there is no detection of a recommended tenderer or members in their consortium in the lists of EU restrictive measures[[3]](#footnote-3).

Consequently, the evaluation committee recommends that < Framework Contractor name > is awarded the specific contract with a contract value of [EUR ] <amount>.

**5. Signatures**

|  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- |
|  | **Name** | **Signature** |
| **[Chairperson]\*** |  | (e-signed in ARES) |
| **[Secretary]\*** |  | (e-signed in ARES) |
| **Evaluators** |  | (e-signed in ARES) |
|  |  | (e-signed in ARES) |
|  |  | (e-signed in ARES) |

Annexes:

[Correspondence concerning clarification sought from tenderers]

[Interview records]

\* For RfS with a value between EUR 1 000 000 and EUR 1 999 999

1. Out of the offers reaching the 75-point threshold, the best technical offer is awarded 100 points. The other offers receive points calculated using the following formula: Technical score = (final score of the technical offer in question/final score of the best technical offer) x 100 [↑](#footnote-ref-1)
2. The offer with the lowest amount receives 100 points. The other offers receive points calculated using the following formula: Financial score = (lowest amount/ amount of the financial offer in question) x 100. [↑](#footnote-ref-2)
3. 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-3)