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**1. Timetable**

|  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- |
|  | **DATE** | **TIME** | **VENUE** |
| **Preparatory session** |  |  |  |
| **Deadline for the submission of tenders** |  |  |  |
| **Tender opening session** |  |  |  |
| **< Meeting 1 >** |  |  |  |
| **< Meeting 2 >** |  |  |  |
| **Etc.** |  |  |  |

**2. Observers**

|  |
| --- |
| **Note: tenderer representatives are not observers and must leave after tender opening session.** |

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

**3. Evaluation**

**Preparatory session**

The Chairperson informed the Evaluation Committee of the scope of the proposed contract, identified the organisations responsible for preparing the tender dossier, and summarised the essential features of the tender procedure to date, including the evaluation grid published as part of the tender dossier.

**Tender opening session**

The Tender opening report is attached to this report. The Evaluation Committee only considered those tenders, which were found to be suitable for further evaluation following the tender opening session.

**3.1 Administrative compliance**

The Evaluation Committee used the administrative compliance grid included in the tender dossier to assess the compliance of each of the tenders with the administrative requirements of the tender dossier.

[If clarifications were requested for the submissions from any tenderers*:*

Evaluation Committee wrote to the following tenderers whose tenders required clarification, offering them the possibility to respond by <within a reasonable time limit (not less than 2 working days) fixed by the evaluation committee> (all correspondence is attached in the Annex indicated):

|  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- |
| **Tender envelope No** | **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 were administratively non-compliant and should not be considered further:

| **Tender envelope No** | **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>] |

**3.2 Technical compliance**

Each evaluator on the Evaluation Committee used the Technical evaluation grid included in the tender dossier to assess the compliance of each of the tenders with the technical requirements of the tender dossier. The completed Technical evaluation grids are attached.

[If clarifications were requested from any tenderers *:*

Evaluation Committee wrote to the following tenderers whose tenders required clarification, offering them the possibility to respond by <within a reasonable time limit (not less than 2 working days) fixed by the evaluation committee> (all correspondence is attached in the Annex indicated):

|  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- |
| **Tender envelope No** | **Tenderer name** | **Summary of exchange of correspondence** |
|  |  |  |
|  |  |  |

]

After discussing the individual conclusions of the Evaluators, the Evaluation Committee concluded that the following tenders were technically non-compliant and should not be considered further:

| **Tender envelope No** | **Tenderer name** | **Reason** |
| --- | --- | --- |
|  |  | [The tender does not comply with the minimum requirements specified in the procurement documents.] |
|  |  | [The tender does not meet the minimum quality levels.] |
|  |  |  |

**3.3 Financial evaluation**

The Evaluation Committee checked the technically compliant tenders for arithmetic errors.

[If any arithmetic errors were found:

As stated in the instructions to tenderers, arithmetic errors were corrected on the following basis:

* Where there was a discrepancy between amounts in figures and in words, the amount in words prevailed
* Where there was a discrepancy between a unit price and the total amount derived from the multiplication of the unit price and the quantity, the unit price as quoted prevailed, except where the Evaluation Committee agreed that there was an obvious error in the unit price, in which case the total amount as quoted prevailed
* Where unconditional discounts applied to financial offers for individual lots, the discount was applied to the financial offer

The following arithmetic corrections were made:

| **Tender envelope No** | **Tenderer name** | **Stated financial offer RSD** | **Arithmetically corrected financial offer RSD** |
| --- | --- | --- | --- |
|  |  |  |  |
|  |  |  |  |

The arithmetically corrected financial offers were compared [for each lot] to identify the technically compliant tender with the lowest price [for that lot].]

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

The tender submitted by <Tenderer name> appeared to have an abnormally low price in relation to the market for the supplies 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

EITHER [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.]

[For each lot] The ranking of the tenders which were not excluded during the evaluation was as follows, in order of the arithmetically corrected financial offers:

| **Tender envelope No** | **Tenderer name** | **Financial offer** [after arithmetical correction] **RSD** | **Ranking** |
| --- | --- | --- | --- |
|  |  |  |  |
|  |  |  |  |

]

[If discounts are offered: Application of discounts:

| **Tender envelope No** | **Tenderer name** | **Financial offer** [after arithmetical correction] **RSD** | **Discount applicable**  **RSD** |
| --- | --- | --- | --- |
|  |  |  |  |
|  |  |  |  |

**\*** Delete column if there are no lots.]

**3.4 Most economically advantageous tender**

Either: The most economically advantageous tender is the technically compliant tender with the lowest price.

**4. Conclusion**

**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:

Evaluation Committee wrote to the tenderer offering them the possibility to respond by fax or email within a reasonable time limit (not less than 2 working days) 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 the contract[s] [is] [are] awarded as follows:

| **Tender envelope No** | **Tenderer name** | **Financial offer** (after arithmetical correction and discounts) **RSD** | **[Spare parts and/or consumables]**  **RSD** | **Contract value**  **RSD** |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
|  |  |  |  |  |
|  |  |  |  |  |

**5. Signatures**

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

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

**< Letterhead of the Contracting Authority >**

**AWARD DECISION**

PUBLICATION REF: HRRS00094-3/green rooms  
  
Supply of green rooms for the project INTERCLIM

Maximum budget: <amount RSD

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 **RSD** <amount>.

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:**