**TENDER REPORT**

**ORGANIZATION LOGO**

**Contract title**

**Publication reference**

[1. Context 1](#_Toc76659687)

[2. Tender Evaluation Committee 1](#_Toc76659688)

[3. Tender planning 1](#_Toc76659689)

[4. Evaluation 2](#_Toc76659690)

[5. Conclusion 3](#_Toc76659691)

[6. Signatures 4](#_Toc76659692)

### Context

Quickly present the Program / Donor / Estimated amount / threshold / why a tender has been launched

### Tender Evaluation Committee

The Evaluation committee is made of:

* [name] – position
* [name] – position
* [name] – position
* [name] – position

These members commit to respect the Declaration of Objectivity and Confidentiality that they signed.

### Tender planning

|  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- |
|  | **DATE** | **Participants** | **Objectives / Output** |
| **Preparatory session #1** |  |  | Example: definition of planning and lots |
| **Preparatory session #2** |  |  | Example: review and wrap up of technical specifications |
| **Deadline for the submission of tenders** |  |  |  |
| **Tender opening session** |  |  |  |
| **Internal meeting #1:** |  |  | **Example: Sample Evaluation** |
| **Internal meeting #2:** |  |  | **Example: Price analysis** |
| **Calls to Customers references** |  |  |  |
| **Shortlist definition and communication (OPTIONNAL)** |  |  |  |
| **External meeting #1:** |  |  | **Eg. Clarifications, supplier site visit, negociation, etc.** |
| **Final evaluation session** |  |  |  |

### Evaluation

#### Tender opening session

The Applicants and Opening Report is attached to this document. XX offers have been received and XX offers have been considered as complete enough to be analysed:

The Evaluation Committee only considered those tenders, which were found to be suitable for further evaluation following the tender opening session, i.e. offers accepted in the Overall decision column.

#### Clarifications (OPTIONAL)

**If clarifications were requested for the submissions from any tenderer :**

With the agreement of the other Evaluation Committee members, the Chairman wrote to the following tenderers whose tenders required clarification, offering them the possibility to respond within a maximum of 48 hours (all correspondence is attached in the Annex indicated):

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

#### Administrative compliance

The Evaluation Committee used the Suppliers Questionnaire Analysis (in the Tender Assessment Table) attached in the Appendixes to assess the compliance of each of the tenders with the essential requirements of the tender dossier.

Based on 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** |
| --- | --- | --- |
|  |  |  |
|  |  |  |
|  |  |  |

#### Technical compliance

Each evaluator on the Evaluation Committee used the Technical evaluation grid (in the Tender Assessment Table) attached in the Appendixes to assess the compliance of each of the tenders with the technical requirements of the tender dossier.

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** |
| --- | --- | --- |
|  |  |  |
|  |  |  |
|  |  |  |

### Conclusion

**OPTION:** It was decided to weight differently the 3 analytical grades as follows :

Administrative grade = Coefficient XX of the final grade

Technical grade = Coefficient XX of the final grade

Financial grade = Coefficient XX of the final grade.

as per the Summary tab (in the Tender Evaluation Tables), the final ranking of the compliant offers, once the weights have been applied is as follows:

|  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- |
| **Envelope N°** | **Company Name** | **Final Weighted Grade** |
|  |  |  |
|  |  |  |
|  |  |  |
|  |  |  |
|  |  |  |

Consequently, the Evaluation Committee recommends that the contract(s) is (are) awarded as follows:

| **Lot number** | **Tender envelope No** | **Tenderer name** | **Financial offer** [after arithmetical correction] **(currency)** | **Contract value (currency)** |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
|  |  |  |  |  |
|  |  |  |  |  |

### Signatures

|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| Person Responsible for Purchasing | | |  | Person Responsible for Payments | | | |  | Person who Manages Program | | |  | Person Validating Process | | |
|  |  |  | | |  |  |  |  | |  |  |  | |  |  |
|  | | |  |  | | | |  |  | | |  |  | | |
| Purchaser Name | | |  | Payer Name | | | |  | Program Manager Name | | |  | Approver Name | | |
|  |  |  | | |  |  |  |  | |  |  |  | |  |  |
|  |  |  | | |  |  | |  | |  | |  | |  | |
| Purchaser Title | | |  | Payer Title | | | |  | Program Manager Title | | |  | Approver Title | | |
|  |  |  | | |  |  |  |  | |  |  |  | |  |  |
|  |  |  | | |  |  | |  | |  | |  | |  | |
| Date | | |  | Date | | | |  | Date | | |  | Date | | |
|  |  |  | | |  |  |  |  | |  |  |  | |  |  |
|  |  |  | | |  |  | |  | |  | |  | |  | |
| Purchaser Signature | | |  | Payer Signature | | | |  | Program Manager Signature | | |  | Approver Signature | | |