EVALUATION REPORT

PUBLICATION REF.: NS01

Contents:

Annexes:

Tender opening report and its annexes
Administrative compliance grid
Technical evaluation grids completed by the individual evaluators, [incl Annex III Technical Offer]
Attendance records
[Clarification correspondence with tenderers]

1. Timetable

	DATE	TIME	VENUE
Preparatory session	17.10.2021	10:00	Nisporeni District Council, Ioan Vodă no. 2 street, MD – 6401, Nisporeni city, Nisporeni district, Republic of Moldova
Deadline for the submission of tenders	19.10.2021	17:00	
Tender opening session	25.10.2021	14:00	Nisporeni District Council, Ioan Vodă no. 2 street, MD – 6401, Nisporeni city, Nisporeni district, Republic of Moldova.
< Meeting 1 >			
< Meeting 2 >			

2. Observers

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:

With the agreement of the other Evaluation Committee members, the Chairperson wrote to the following tenderers whose tenders required clarification, offering them the possibility to respond by <within a reasonable time limit 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.]

Tender envelope No	Tenderer name	Reason
		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 evaluation

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 :

With the agreement of the other Evaluation Committee members, the Chairperson wrote to the following tenderers whose tenders required clarification, offering them the possibility to respond by <within a reasonable time limit 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

3.3 Financial evaluation

Determination of the amount of the financial offers

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;
- Except for lump-sum contracts, 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 [EUR]	Arithmetically corrected financial offer [EUR]

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.]]

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] [EUR]	Ranking

Tender envelope No	Tenderer name	Financial offer [after arithmetical correction] [EUR]	Ranking

3.4 Most economically advantageous tender

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 most economically advantageous tender.

[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 most economically advantageous tender 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.

The evaluation committee has ensured that the recommended tenderer or the members in the consortium are not in a situation of exclusion 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 has to be verified with the representative of the European Commission.]

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] **[EUR]**	**[Spare parts and/or consumables]** **[EUR]**	**Contract value** **[EUR]**

[If the proportion of the contracts the tenderer intends to subcontract is known:

The proposed contractor intends to subcontract to third parties <insert proportion> of the contract.]

5. Signatures

	Name	**Signature**
Chairperson		
Secretary		
Evaluators		

REPUBLICA MOLDOVA
CONSILIUL RAIONAL NISPORENI

MD – 6401, or. Nisporeni, str. Ioan Vodă, 2, tel/fax (264) 2-20-57, e_mail: craional@mail.ru,
pagina web: www.nisporeni.md

AWARD DECISION

PUBLICATION REF: NS01

Construction of road L401(from R10 to Varzaresti Monastery)

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 <amount>.

The Contracting Authority

[approves the evaluation report.
Choose an option:
[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.]

Or: [However, the Contracting Authority cannot follow the Evaluation Committee's recommendation for the following reason(s): <explain>. Therefore, the Contracting Authority takes the decision to award the contract to <tenderer name> which, while meeting the selection criteria <insert the reasons>.]

[For contracts awarded following a competitive dialogue: The recourse to the competitive dialogue was justified by the following circumstances <insert>.]
]

[has decided not to award the contract for the following reason(s): <explain>.]

Name and signature:

Date:

WORKS CONTRACT AWARD NOTICE

Construction of road L401(from R10 to Varzaresti Monastery)

Nisporeni District, Republic of Moldova, MD

1. **Type of procedure**

   Local open tender

2. **Publication reference and date of the contract notice**

   12.08.2021, NS01

3. **Lot number and lot title**

   No lots

4. **Contract number and value**

   < Contract number > < Amount> EUR

5. **Date of award of the contract**

   24.12.2021

6. **Number of tenders received**

   < Number >

7. **Name, address and nationality of successful tenderer**

   < Name and address, with the leader shown in bold type in the case of a grouping (consortium) of tenderers >

   < ISO code of country>

   MD

8. **Duration of contract**

   12 months

9. **Contracting Authority**

Republic of Moldova

Nisporeni District Council, Ioan Vodă no. 2 street, MD – 6401, Nisporeni city, Nisporeni district.

10. Legal basis

Regulation (EU) N°236/2014 of the European Parliament and of the Council of 11 March 2014 laying down common rules and procedures for the implementation of the Union's instruments for financing external action and Joint Operational Programme Romania – Republic of Moldova, ENI 2014-2020.