

**PRETORIA**

Call-off Inquiry Renewed Competitive Tendering

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
| Contracting authority: | Embassy name  Dep/Unit  Address |
|  |  |
| Reference number: | State the reference number |
|  |  |
| Contact person: | Name of the responsible program officer/buyer |
|  |  |
| Call-off within the framework agreement: | Specify which framework agreement area the call-off inquiry will be in |
|  |  |
| Last date to submit a call-off response: | State the last date to submit a call-off response (time frames are often specified in each framework agreement) |
|  |  |
| Send the call-off response:  The tender shall be valid until: | State e-mail or address  90 days from the last date to tender |
|  |  |
| Evaluation method | The economically most advantageous tender |

## General information

Write a general description of the buyer, reasons for the call-off and the goal of the call-off/delivery terms (or enclose ToR)

 Type here

## Specification of the assigment/Service

Description of the assignment/service (or enclose ToR)

  Type here

## Time-plan

Specify when the assignment/service shall commence and when it ends (or enclose ToR).

  Type here

Evaluation of call-off responses

State below how the evaluation of the call-off responses will be carried out and which criteria will be used.

  Type here

The call-off response shall include following:

1. Suggested personnel for the assignment, and short explanation of suggested persons suitability for the assignment
2. Short description of how the assignment will be designed and implemented (Method);
3. Time-plan and costs for the assignment.

Sida will use the following criteria for choosing the best proposal.

Evaluation criteria for this call-off are:

**The points and criteria below are examples, these should be adjusted for each specific call-off. Also, look in the specific framework agreement and/or the call of instruction for the framework agreement that may have predefined criteria. If applicable, add the criterion Measures to limit travel (environmental considerations).**

|  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- |
| **Criteria** | | **Max point/criteria** |
| 1. | Team-leaders suitability | 25 |
| 2. | Other personnel’s suitability | 15 |
| 3. | Appropriate method | 15 |
| 4. | Organisation of the assignment | 10 |
| 5. | Appropriate Time-plan | 5 |
|  | **Total max point technical criteria** | **70** |

The scale of grades that will be used when assessing the criteria (except price evaluation) are:

|  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- |
| The number of points that can be awarded under each of the technical evaluation criteria. For example, if a maximum of 20 points can be awarded for a given criterion, ”Good” will mean  0.8 x 20 = 16 points.  (In the evaluation, the levels (in %) will have fixed values, which means that there will be no intermediate values). | Poor[[1]](#footnote-1)  Not entirely satisfactory[[2]](#footnote-2)  Satisfactory[[3]](#footnote-3)  Good[[4]](#footnote-4)  Very Good[[5]](#footnote-5) | 0 %  40 %  60 %  80 %  100 % |
| Minimum score to proceed to price-evaluation | The call-off response must achieve a minimum of <45> points as a condition for further price evaluation | |

# Price-Evaluation

Price will be assessed according to the following model:

The call-off response that submitted the lowest call-off price achieves maximal price points. The other call-off responses achieve points according to percentage difference between the individual call-off price and call-off with the lowest price.

Price point = (Lowest call-off price / Individual call-off price) \* Max point price criterion

|  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- |
| **Criterion** | | **Max point/criterion** |
| 6. | Cost of the assignment | 30 |
|  | **Total max point price criterion** | **30** |

# DECISION regarding contract award

All consultants that have submitted a call-off response will be informed of the decision regarding the contract awarded by email.

A call-off contract can at the earliest be signed when then 10 calendar days have passed, counting from the day after the decision of contract award was sent out to all consultants.

Enclosure 1: Terms of reference (enclosed if appropriate)

1. Not addressed or not sufficient [↑](#footnote-ref-1)
2. Sufficient in some aspects but not as a whole [↑](#footnote-ref-2)
3. Sufficient but lacks substantial advantages or has uneven quality [↑](#footnote-ref-3)
4. Adequate and well suited to the purpose [↑](#footnote-ref-4)
5. Gives added value and shows high quality on the whole [↑](#footnote-ref-5)