

Template for Evaluation Report – needs to be tailored in accordance to the tender in question. Remove any sections / sentences that are not applicable.

Tender Reference Number

LETTERHEAD OF THE CONTRACTING AUTHORITY

(Address of Contracting Authority – if not included in Letterhead)

EVALUATION REPORT dated XX/XX/XXXX

PUBLICATION REF.: [Ref Number] and Title

Contents: Timetable
Evaluation
- Preparatory session
- Administrative compliance
- Technical compliance
- Financial evaluation
Conclusion
Signatures

Annexes: Annex I: Schedule of Offers received (screenshot from ePPS)
Annex II: Exchange of clarifications' correspondence during evaluation (if applicable)
Annex III: Individually signed Technical Evaluation Grid (Individual Scoring sheet -- these have to be in detail)
Annex IV: Justifications for decisions taken by the Evaluation Committee including documentary evidence (if applicable)
Annex V: Summary of justifications of BPQR award criteria scores at annex V that shall be communicated to the relevant bidders (if applicable).
Annex VI: Declarations of Impartiality and Confidentiality of each of the Evaluation Committee members including any Technical or Financial Experts and / or Observers
Annex VII: Log sheet of Samples received (if applicable).

1. Timetable

	DATE	TIME
Preparatory session		
Deadline for the submission of tenders		09:30hrs
Tender opening session		10:00hrs
Meeting 1		
Meeting 2		
(... etc)		

2. Evaluation

2.1 Preparatory session

The Chairperson informed the Evaluation Committee of the scope of the proposed contract, identified the Contracting Authority responsible for preparing the tender document, and summarised the essential features of the tender procedure to date.

2.2 Schedule of offers received

The Schedule of Offers received is attached to this report at **Annex I**.
[Indicate here the details and the number of tenders / offers received and unlocked].

Tender ID	Name of Tenderer	Sub-contractor/s name and relative percentage of works / supplies or services to be provided (if applicable)	Financial Bid Excl. VAT €

[The members checked all documentation and confirm that the account used by the bidder belongs to the bidder who has submitted the bid.]

It is being confirmed that the Evaluation Committee members have also checked and verified the correctness of the original tender guarantee (bid bond), dated and time stamped by the Department of Contracts. It is being confirmed that all were compliant and received within the pre-stipulated time frame accordingly. If not, the Evaluation Board is to indicate which submissions were incomplete or not submitted within the due date and time.]

2.2 Administrative compliance

The voting members of the Evaluation Committee carried out an exercise through the ePPS to determine the administrative compliance of the [offer/s received].

The following rectifications / clarifications were deemed necessary:

- Include here details of rectification / clarification, and its outcome (acceptable or not?)

A copy of the rectifications / clarifications requests and replies are attached to this report at Annex II.

On the basis of this, the Evaluation Committee decided that [indicate offer/s] submitted was / were administratively compliant and should be considered further.

The following offer/s was / were considered to be administratively non-compliant for the following reasons:

- Name / TID of non-compliant tenderer, and reasons leading to non-compliance

Tender ID	Name of Tenderer	Financial Bid Excl. VAT €	Reasons

2.3 Technical Evaluation

Each evaluator on the Evaluation Committee through the EPPS assessed the compliance of the administratively compliant tenders with the technical requirements for each of the items in the tender document.

The following clarifications were deemed necessary:

- Include here details of clarification, and its outcome (acceptable or not?)

A copy of the clarifications requests and replies are attached to this report at Annex II.

[In the case of Price (cheapest) as award criteria]

All offers were considered to be technically compliant / The following offer(s) was / were considered to be technically non-compliant for the following reasons:

- Name of non-compliant tenderer, and reasons leading to non-compliance

[In the case of BPQR as award criteria]

Each Evaluator used the evaluation grid included in the tender document under Article 9 of Section 1, to assess the technical offers of the tenders which had been established as being administratively compliant. The completed evaluation grids are attached to this report in Annex IV, together with a summary of the evaluators' comments on the strengths and weaknesses of the technical offers.

It is very important to also include in Annex IV, the score each evaluator awards for each criteria / sub-criteria, as well as the respective strengths and weaknesses.

The following clarifications were deemed necessary:

- Include here details of clarification, and its outcome (acceptable or not?)

A copy of the clarifications requests and replies are attached to this report at Annex II.

The final average technical scores of the administratively and technically compliant tenders [(i.e. those with final average technical scores of at least <80*> points)] were as follows:

[*80 is given as an example score]

Tender ID	Tenderer name	Average Technical Score <i>(derived by summing up the final technical scores of the three Evaluators and finding their average score)</i>	Technical Weight

All offers were considered to be technically compliant / The following offer(s) was / were considered to be technically non-compliant for the following reasons:

- Name of non-compliant tenderer, and reasons leading to non-compliance.

Tender ID	Tenderer name	Average Technical Score <i>(derived by summing up the final technical scores of the three Evaluators and finding their average score)</i>	Reasons

2.4 Financial evaluation

The administrative and technically compliant offers were reviewed for arithmetic corrections.

The following arithmetic corrections / clarifications were deemed necessary.

Tender ID	Tenderer name	Price in Euro as per financial offer	Price in Euro including any arithmetical corrections (if any)*

The financial offer of the offers submitted which were found to be both administratively and technically compliant was compared to the budget available for the contract which is stated at [reference in file] as €..... excluding VAT. In this regard, the financial offer of the recommended tenderer is within the estimated budget / exceeded the estimated budget by ...%.

In the evaluation report, the Evaluation Board shall provide a justification for any offers (whether below or above the local threshold) that are substantially lower than the estimated budget accordingly. Moreover, for any tenders specifically above the departmental threshold that may be deemed as abnormally low, such a justification is mandatory by the regulations. In the latter circumstance, the Evaluation Boards are prompted to consult Guidance Note 11 (www.etenders.gov.mt/Resources) in order to decide the way forward.

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

Tender ID	Tenderer name	Financial offer after arithmetical correction (if applicable) (Euro)	Final Ranking

[In the case of BPQR as award criteria]

The Evaluation Committee compared the arithmetically corrected financial offers to calculate their financial scores:

*In case there were arithmetical corrections, one should include an annex describing what these arithmetical corrections were.

Tender ID	Tenderer name	Price in Euro as per financial offer	Price in Euro including any arithmetical corrections (if any)*	Financial Weight

Final Ranking of Administratively and Technically Compliant Tenders as follows:

Tender ID	Name of Tenderer	Price in Euro including any arithmetical corrections (if any)	Overall score [(Technical score x 0.80*) + (Financial score x 0.20*) – as per Tender Document]	Ranking

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

Tender ID	Tenderer name	Financial offer [after arithmetical correction] (Euro)	Final ranking

3. Conclusion

Pursuant to the above, the Evaluation Committee recommends that this tender is awarded to [name of bidder] for the amount of [€.....] exclusive of VAT, this being the cheapest compliant offer (Price Award) / the most economically advantageous offer with the BPQR.

(In the case where the financial offer of the recommended tenderer exceeds the estimated budget)

It is confirmed that the offer is fair and reasonable, and funds are available. Justifications as well as an updated EU Commitment Form/B2, B3 Forms and Budget Office (as applicable) approval is / are being included in Annex V.

If a recommended tenderer exceeds the estimated budget available, reasons are to be given as to why there is such a considerable discrepancy between the original estimate and the recommended tender for award.

(In the case where the financial offer of the recommended tenderer is within the estimated budget)

In the case where a financial offer is lower than the estimated budget available, the EC must also confirm if the recommended offer is fair and reasonable.

It is confirmed that this report is a true reflection of the XL report generated by the ePPS. In case where there was the need to amend the system-generated report, it is confirmed that the revised XL report was uploaded in the ePPS.

4. Signatures

	Name	Signature
Chairperson		
Secretary		
Evaluator 1		
Evaluator 2		
Evaluator 3		

DECLARATION OF IMPARTIALITY AND CONFIDENTIALITY

PUBLICATION REF: [REF NO]

I, the undersigned, hereby declare that I agree to participate in the evaluation of the above-mentioned tender procedure*. By making this declaration, I confirm that I have familiarised myself with the information available to date concerning this tender procedure*. I further declare that I shall execute my responsibilities honestly and fairly.

I am independent* of all parties which stand to gain from the outcome of the evaluation process†. To the best of my knowledge and belief, there are no facts or circumstances, past or present, or that could arise in the foreseeable future, which might call into question my independence in the eyes of any party; and, should it become apparent during the course of the evaluation process that such a relationship exists or has been established, I will immediately cease to participate in the evaluation process.

I agree to hold in trust and confidence any information or documents ("confidential information") disclosed to me or discovered by me or prepared by me in the course of or as a result of the evaluation and agree that it shall be used only for the purposes of this evaluation and shall not be disclosed to any third party. I also agree not to retain copies of any written information or prototypes supplied.

Confidential information shall not be disclosed to any employee or expert unless they agree to execute and be bound by the terms of this Declaration.

Name	
Signed	
Date	

* Delete as applicable

* Taking into consideration whether there exists any past or present relationship, direct or indirect, whether financial, professional or of another kind

† i.e., all [tenderers / applicants]* who are participating in the [tender / call for proposals]*, whether individuals or members of a consortium, or any of the partners or subcontractors proposed by them

The maximum scores must correspond to the evaluation grid (BPQR table) included in the tender document under Article 9 of Section 1.

EVALUATION GRID

	Maximum	Evaluator 1	Evaluator 2	Evaluator 3	Average Technical Score
Evaluation Criteria					
Total score	100				

EVALUATION GRID

To be completed for each tender offer separately by each evaluator

CT / Departmental Reference:	Tender Title:			
Tender ID	Tenderer's name	Evaluation Criteria	Points Awarded	Justifications

Evaluator's Name	
Evaluator's Signature	
Date	

Furthermore, the Summary of the Evaluation Grid (on the average scores achieved by all evaluators) for each bidder should ideally include the following: evaluation criteria, maximum points, average points achieved + technical score and justifications for each criteria.

This table is then copied and sent to bidders with the Letter to unsuccessful / successful, to inform them about the outcome of the evaluation.

Tender ID Tenderer's Name			
	Maximum	Average Technical Score	Justification
Evaluation Criteria			