PUBLICATION REF: HR-RS253-7/cleaning services and maintenance  
  
Services of cleaning and maintenance of mosquito killer billboards for the project MOS-Cross2

Maximum budget: <amount > RSD
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**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**

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.

[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)** |
| --- | --- | --- | --- |
|  |  |  |  |
|  |  |  |  |
|  |  |  |  |

]

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

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

The original 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 (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 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[[1]](#footnote-1).

Consequently, the evaluation committee recommends that < tenderer name > is awarded the contract with a contract value of **RSD** <amount>.

**5. Signatures**

|  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- |
|  | **Name** | **Signature** |
| **Evaluators** |  |  |
|  |  |  |
|  |  |  |

1. 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-1)