

## METHODOLOGY FOR EVALUATION OF OFFERS

To a Simplified procedure for

### «Providing Training Services under the TA SRPC Capacity Building Programme»

for the European Union funded project 'Technical Assistance to the Sector Reform Performance Contract 'EU for Youth' EuropeAid/140701/DH/SER/MK.

The evaluation will be carried out according to the **criterion "the most economically advantageous tender"**, according to which the ranking of the tenders admitted to bid is made based on a "**Complex Assessment**" (CA) of each received offer as a sum of the individual estimates according to the predefined indicators.

For the purposes of this procedure, the following indicators and their respective relative weights in the assessment are defined as follows:

Indicator - I (title)	Maximum number of points	Relative weight	CA max points	Symbolic designation (points on the Indicator)
1	2	3	4	5
1. Proposed Price – I <sub>1</sub>	50	20 % (0,20)	10	Pp
2. Degree of Compliance – I <sub>2</sub>	50	80 % (0,80)	40	Pc
Total	100	100%	50	

Column 1 indicates the specified indicators with their designations; column 2 shows the maximum number of points (same for all metrics); column 3 shows the relative weights of each indicator as a percentage of the complex estimate (up to 100%); column 4 shows the maximum number of points as result of the complex assessment (CA); column 5 gives a symbolic indication of the points that a given bid will receive in a specific metric.

### **Guidelines for determining the rating for each indicator:**

**Indicator I<sub>1</sub> – "Proposed Price"**, with a maximum score of 50 points and a relative weight of 0.20.

The maximum number of points gets the offer at the lowest bid - 50 points. The points of the other participants are determined in relation to the lowest price offered by the following formula:

$$P_p = 50 \times \frac{C_{\min}}{C_n}, \text{ where:}$$

- "50" is the maximum points on the metric;
- "C<sub>min.</sub>" is the lowest proposed price;
- "C<sub>n</sub>" is the price of the n-participant.

The CA points for the first indicator of the n-participant are obtained by the following formula:

$$I_1(n) = P_p(n) \times 0.20, \text{ where:}$$

- "0.20" is the relative weight of the indicator.

**Indicator I<sub>2</sub> – "Degree of Compliance"** with a maximum score of 50 points and a relative weight in the complex assessment of 0.80.

Only proposals that were assessed 'YES' for the criteria 'Legal status of the applicant' will be evaluated. The maximum number of points is awarded to a bid that has been awarded a "YES" for the Legal status compliance, and has received the highest number of Points under Criterion I "Administrative compliance" listed in Table 1 below.

Table № 1 for Indicator I<sub>2</sub>

Degree of Compliance	Parameters	Evaluation	
1	2	3	
I. Administrative Compliance			
1. Legal status of the applicant - proof for the Legal status of candidates and a copy of company registration	All the required documents according to the letter of Invitation to tender are presented	YES	NO
2. Compliance with the Assignor's Technical Terms Partial offers are allowed	100% compliance of the Technical offer to the requirements of selected items specified in Annex 2.1 Technical specification of the Assignor. Partial proposals are accepted.	14	
3. Compliance with the Quality criteria <sup>1</sup>	100% compliance of the Technical Offer with the quality requirements	36	
Maximum points per Indicator I <sub>2</sub> "Degree of Compliance" – P <sub>c</sub>		50 points	

The CA points for the second indicator of the n-participant are obtained by the following formula:

$$I_2(n) = P_c(n) \times 0.80 \text{ where:}$$

➤ "0.80" is the relative weight of the indicator.

The complex assessment of each participant (CA (n)) is obtained as the sum of the bid estimates for the two metrics, calculated using the formula:

$$CA(n) = I_1(n) + I_2(n)$$

As an integral part of this Methodology two evaluation tables are developed - a table for **individual assessment** (CA, Appendix 5.1 to the Methodology) for each candidate and a **summary** table for the results of the overall evaluation (CA, Appendix 5.2 to the Methodology) of each candidate on the basis of which the final ranking of the candidates is made.

**The top-ranked bid is ranked first.**

<sup>1</sup> The Quality criteria will be assessed based on assessment the capacities and qualities of candidates described in the technical offer and presented proofs.