



Tel: +  
Fax: +  
E-mail:

Reference number:

Your ref:

## Call-off Inquiry Renewed Competitive Tendering

Contracting authority:	Embassy of Sweden in Lusaka Section Address
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 (consultancy companies should be afforded reasonable time to develop a proposal, normally about 10 working days)
Send the call-off response:	State e-mail or address

### **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 ASSIGNMENT/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 but should be based on criteria settled in the specific framework agreement.**

Criteria		Max point/criteria
1.	Team-leaders suitability	To be determined for each call off
2.	Other personnel's suitability	To be determined for each call off
3.	Appropriate method	To be determined for each call off
4.	Organisation of the assignment	To be determined for each call off
5.	Appropriate Time-plan	To be determined for each call off
<b>Total max point technical criteria</b>		<b>Sum of the above</b>

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 $0.8 \times 20 = 16$ points. (In the evaluation, the levels (in %) will have fixed values, which means that there will be no intermediate values).	Poor <sup>1</sup>	0 %
	Not entirely satisfactory <sup>2</sup>	40 %
	Satisfactory <sup>3</sup>	60 %
	Good <sup>4</sup>	80 %
	Very Good <sup>5</sup>	100 %
Minimum score to proceed to price-evaluation	The call-off response must achieve a minimum of <70> 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	To be determined for each call off
	<b>Total max point price criterion</b>	<b>Sum of the above</b>

### **TOTAL EVALUATION OF CALL OFF**

The sum of Max point for Technical and Price will amount to 100. The relation between Quality and Price can differ amongst assignments as well as the weighting of evaluation criteria in the technical evaluation depending on assignment.

### **EXAMPLE EVALUATION CALL OFF**

To state an example of how evaluation could be done

Assume total max point for technical evaluation is 60 and for price 40.

<sup>1</sup> Not addressed or not sufficient

<sup>2</sup> Sufficient in some aspects but not as a whole

<sup>3</sup> Sufficient but lacks substantial advantages or has uneven quality

<sup>4</sup> Adequate and well suited to the purpose

<sup>5</sup> Gives added value and shows high quality on the whole

Tender A has the lowest price and gets 85% of technical score  
Tender B has a 15% higher price than Tender A and gets 90% of technical score, then

Tender A total points:  $85\% \times 60 + 100\% \times 40 = 51 + 40 = 91$

Tender B total points:  $90\% \times 60 + (100\% - 15\%) \times 40 = 54 + 34 = 88$

**Hence Tender A wins the bid with 91 points.**