

INTERREG V A ITALY CROATIA CBC PROGRAMME 2014-2020 EVALUATION SERVICE REGULATION (EU) No 1303/2013 ART. 54, 56 AND 114

TERMS OF REFERENCE

ANNEX B2 - BIDS EVALUATION METHODOLOGY AND GRID

AUGUST 2020

METHODOLOGY FOR ASSESSING BIDS

Choice of selected tenderer

The best value for money is established by weighing technical quality against price on an 80/20 basis.

In line with the Italy Croatia CBC Programme Evaluation Plan, awarding criteria set in the ToR (Chapter 10 “Budget and awarding criteria”) foresee that the quality of the proposed evaluation methods and team will be given the highest weight compared to the offered price. **The best value for money is established by weighing technical quality against price on an 80/20 basis**, namely:

- Technical offer, including evaluation team (80%)
- Price (20%)

Therefore, the relating formula foreseen in the ToR is:

- Technical score = (final score of the technical offer in question/final score of the best technical offer) x 100.
- Financial score = (lowest total fees / total fees of the tender being considered) x 100.

Given the above mentioned approach and calculation method, this document also presents the **of evaluation grid**, showing criteria and sub-criteria that shall be adopted for the appraisal of bids, divided per the following 4 main subjects: 1. evaluation purpose and rationale, 2. evaluation implementation, 3. evaluation team and 4. price.

With the exception of the offered price, each of the above-mentioned subject is assessed by observing one or more criteria (detailed by sub-criteria) which are given **scores based on the relevance of each subject as identified and explained in the ToR**. The offered price stands alone and represents 20% of the overall score based on the previously mentioned formula (lowest total fees / total fees of the tender being considered x 100).

Thus, the technical offer is divided into three main parts:

1. Evaluation purpose and rationale: valued a maximum of 10 points;
2. Evaluation implementation, that includes the evaluation approach, methods and techniques as well as time-schedule, deliverables, modalities of coordination with Programme bodies and evaluation internal quality management: this is given the highest weight with an overall score of 55 points;
3. Evaluation team: valued a maximum of 35 points.

Only bids that pass the technical evaluation with a score equal to or greater than 60 points will be eligible for the financial offer evaluation.

The following tables show practical examples on how technical and financial offers will be appraised by the selection committee.

Methodology

Part 1: Technical assessment

Once the administrative compliance is confirmed, the Committee opens the technical offers and, before proceeding to the assessment checks, verifies that the technical admissibility requirements are respected. Detailed view of these requirements can be found in table 4.

The Committee then examines the technical offers, the financial offers remaining sealed. When evaluating technical offers, each member awards each offer a score out of a maximum 100 points in accordance with the technical evaluation grid (setting out the technical criteria, sub-criteria and weightings). Under no circumstances may the Committee or its members change the technical evaluation grid.

In practice, it is recommended that tenders are scored for a given criterion one after another, rather than scoring each tender for all criteria before moving on to the next. Where the content of a tender is incomplete or deviates substantially from one or more of the technical award criteria laid down in the tender dossier (e.g. evaluation team not reaching the minimum composition), the tender should be automatically rejected, without being given a score, but this should be justified in the evaluation report.

The Committee discusses each technical offer and each member awards it a final score. The Committee members may modify their individual evaluation grids as a result of the general discussion on the merits of each offer.

Once discussed, each Evaluation Committee member finalises his/her evaluation grid on each of the technical offers and signs it.

The Secretary of the Committee assessing technical tenders calculates the aggregate final score, which is the arithmetical average of the individual final scores.

Out of the tenders reaching the 60-point threshold, the best technical offer is awarded 100 points. The others receive points calculated using the following formula:

Technical score = (final score of the technical offer in question/final score of the best technical offer) x 100.

Example:

Table 1 Assessment of the Technical Offer

	Maximum possible	Tenderer1	Tenderer2	Tenderer3
Evaluator A	100	55	88	84
Evaluator B	100	60	84	82
Evaluator C	100	59	82	90
Total	300	147	254	256
Average Score (Mathematical Average)		$147/3=58.00$	$254/3 = 84.67$	$256/3 = 85.33$
Technical offer score (actual final score/highest final score)		Eliminated*	$84.67/85.33 \times 100 = 99.22$	100.00

* Only tenders with average score of at least 60 points qualify for the financial evaluation

Part 2: Assessment of financial offers

Upon completion of the technical evaluation, the envelopes containing the financial offers for tenders who were not eliminated during the technical evaluation (i.e., those which have achieved an average score of 60 points or more) are opened.

The Evaluation Committee has to ensure that the financial offer satisfies all formal requirements.

A financial offer not meeting these requirements may be rejected.

The Evaluation Committee checks that the financial offers contain no arithmetical errors. Any arithmetical errors are corrected without penalty to the tenderer.

The envelopes containing the financial offers of rejected tenders following the technical evaluation must remain unopened and retained.

Tenders exceeding the maximum budget allocated for the contract are eliminated.

The Evaluation Committee then proceeds with the financial comparison of the fees between the different financial offers. The provision for incidental expenditure, as well as the provision

for expenditure verification is excluded from the comparison of the financial offers as it was specified in the tender dossier.

The tender with the lowest total fees, after assessment of any anomalous offers, receives 100 points. The others are awarded points by means of the following formula:

Financial score = (lowest total fees / total fees of the tender being considered) x 100.

When evaluating financial offers, the Evaluation Committee compares only the total fees.

Example:

Table 2 Financial Assessment

	Maximum possible score	Tenderer1	Tenderer2	Tenderer3
Total fees		Eliminated	€ 951 322	€ 1 060 452
Financial offer score (lowest total fees/actual total fees x 100)		following technical evaluation	100	$951\,322 / 1\,060\,452 \times 100 = 89.71$

Part 3: Conclusions of the Evaluation Committee

The best value for money is established by weighing technical quality against price on an 80/20 basis.

This is done by multiplying:

- the scores awarded to the technical offers by 0,80
- the scores awarded to the financial offers by 0,20.

Example:

Table 3 Final Score

	Maximum possible	Tenderer1	Tenderer2	Tenderer3
Technical score x 0.80		Eliminated following technical assessment	$99,22 \times 0.80 =$ 79.38	$100.00 \times 0.80 =$ 80.00
Financial score x 0.20			$100.00 \times 0.20 =$ 20.00	$89.71 \times 0.20 =$ 17.94
Overall score			$79.38 + 20.00 =$ 99.38	$80.00 + 17.94 =$ 97.94
Final ranking			1	2

EVALUATION GRID

The following table gives details on the criteria and sub-criteria to be adopted for the assessment of technical offers, including guiding principles for scoring each sub-criterion.

It should be noted that the evaluation grid does not take into account the price offer which is evaluated separately.

Table 4 Technical admissibility requirements grid

Subject	Check	Result
Admissibility	<i>Technical Offer written in English</i>	Yes/No
	<i>Compliance of the Evaluation Team with the requirements established by the TOR (i.e. at least 4 members)</i>	Yes/No
	<i>Use of the provided templates</i>	Yes/No
	<i>Statement of the absence of any conflict of interest during the implementation of the evaluation exercise.</i>	Yes/No

Table 5 Technical offer evaluation grid

Subject	Criteria	Sub-criteria and principles for scoring	Max score
Evaluation purpose and rationale	<p>Understanding of the evaluation context, of its general and specific objectives and tasks</p> <p>(Maximum score 10)</p>	<p>1. The proposal includes a description of the IT-HR CBC Programme and relating context (i.e., cooperation area, CBC Programme objectives, previous cooperation experiences, synergies with other ETC/mainstream programmes, etc.). The use of updated information on the cooperation area and/or Programme state of play (for instance, information published on the Programme website) will be a plus:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> a. The technical offer shows only basic information on the Programme (2) b. The technical offer contains a description of both the Programme and its context clearly showing the knowledge of the cooperation area, the Programme general and specific objectives and Priority Axis, Programme bodies, typologies of projects financed (standard, standard+ and strategic) (3) c. The technical offer includes a comprehensive description of the Programme (as above) and its context making references, for instance, to the previous EU initiatives on which the Programme builds on (under ERDF and IPA), to 	4

		the synergies and complementarities with macro-regional strategies and mainstream programmes, to the Programme state of play making use of updated information taken from the IT-HR web-site and using any other additional information the bidder may deem useful to highlight his understanding of the CBC Programme (4)	6
		<p>2. Description of the evaluation service rationale: references to evaluation general/specific objectives and tasks (types of evaluation and themes):</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> a. The technical offer shows minimum content taken from the ToR (Chapter 2 “Evaluation purpose and target audience”, Chapter 3.1. “Specific objectives and tasks” and 4.1. “The main objective of the additional evaluation”) only describing the evaluation mandate (2) b. The technical offer includes a clear description of the evaluation service rationale making cross-references between evaluation general and specific objectives, types of evaluations envisaged and tasks stated in chapters 3 and 4 of the ToR, including references to evaluation final users (MA/JS, MC, EWG, post 2020 TF) (4) c. The technical offer contains an exhaustive description of the evaluation service rationale highlighting logical linkages (evaluation service 	

		logical framework) between evaluation overall and specific objectives, typology of evaluations and tasks (also, for example, through graphs), stating evaluation final users and outputs (evaluation reports to feed AIRs), also giving examples on previous/similar evaluation experiences in dealing with the same tasks (6)	
Evaluation implementation	<p>Quality of the proposed evaluation approach and methodology for collecting and processing data</p> <p>(Maximum score 40)</p>	<p>3. Knowledge of the theory-based evaluation approach:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> a. The technical offer does not make any reference to the theory-based evaluation approach (0) b. The bidder states he will adopt a theory-based approach in line with Chapter 3.3. "Evaluation approach, methods and available data" of the ToR and describes its objectives (if Programme assumptions are still valid and detecting possible bottlenecks and unintended impacts) and characteristics (if Programme theory of changed is based on cooperation area needs) (3) c. The bidder clearly describes the objectives and characteristics of the theory-based evaluation approach (as above) also making references to the Programme logic of intervention (through text and/or graphs) and gives details on its application's expected results (ex., assessing the effectiveness and robustness of the 	5

		Programme logic intervention based on cooperation area needs, repeatable elements and/or fine tunings in view of the next programming period) (5)	
		<p>4. Completeness in the description of the proposed combination of quantitative and qualitative methods, also stating possible data needs. Examples of previous use in similar evaluation contexts will be considered as a plus:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> a. The technical offer only describes the proposed methodology through a list of qualitative and qualitative methods/tools to be used for evaluation activities (5) b. The technical offer includes a description of the combination of quantitative and qualitative methods to be used for each evaluation task also stating data needs and motivating the choice (10) c. The technical offer contains a detailed description of the combination of quantitative and qualitative methods to be used for each evaluation task also stating data needs and giving examples of their use in similar 	15

		evaluation contexts (15)	
		<p>5. Use of participatory methods involving Programme bodies, stakeholders and beneficiaries from both Countries to collect primary information:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> a. The technical offer does not foresee any use of participatory methods (0) b. The technical offer includes the description of the participatory methods proposed to involve Programme bodies, stakeholders and beneficiaries from both Countries to collect primary information (3) c. The technical offer includes a precise description of the participatory methods proposed to involve Programme bodies, stakeholders and beneficiaries from both Countries to collect primary information also giving examples of their use in similar evaluation contexts (5) 	5
		<p>6. Clear justification for choosing the proposed methods and techniques to collect both primary and secondary data:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> a. The technical offer does not justify the choice of the proposed methods and techniques for collecting data (0) b. The bidder justifies the choice of the proposed methods and techniques for collecting primary and secondary information (10) 	15

		<p>c. The bidder clearly justifies the choice of the proposed methods and techniques stressing the logic behind choice and the reasons behind choice and the techniques are considered efficient also giving examples of previous evaluation exercises (15)</p>	
	<p>Reliability of the proposed time-schedule for delivering evaluation reports (Integrated Evaluation Design, draft and final reports of operational, impact and additional evaluations)</p> <p>(Maximum score 5)</p>	<p>7. Adequacy of the proposed timing for delivering the evaluation reports foreseen in the ToR, taking into account the possible timing for starting the evaluation service:</p> <p>a. The technical offer does not include a time-schedule for the evaluation activities (0)</p> <p>b. The technical offer includes the time-scheduling foreseen in the ToR (3)</p> <p>c. The technical offer contains a clear and full description (text and/or tables) of the proposed time-scheduling with hypothesis on the timing for delivering each report (integrated evaluation design, draft and final reports) also making references to possible fine tunings based on the contracting phase and the kick-off meeting (5)</p>	5
	<p>Accuracy in describing the modalities of coordination with Programme bodies and internal</p>	<p>8. Completeness of proposed modalities of coordination between the evaluation team and Programme bodies, also for further support activities stated in the ToR:</p>	5

	quality management (Maximum score 10)	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> a. The technical offer does not contain a description of the modalities intended to be adopted for the coordination with Programme bodies (0) b. The technical offer describes the modalities of coordination between the evaluation team and Programme bodies (meetings etc.) in relation to all support activities foreseen in Chapter 6 “Further support activities” of the ToR (3) c. In addition to the above mentioned modalities of coordination, the technical offer foresees additional information such as, for example, the identification, within the evaluation team, of one or more contact persons for each support activity, the use of online instruments to guarantee regular exchanges and/or proposals alike (5) 	
		<p>9. Description of quality management of evaluation activities and deliverables:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> a. The technical offer does not contain a description of the quality management of evaluation activities and deliverables (0) b. The technical offer presents a basic description of the modalities the bidder intends to adopt to guarantee the quality of evaluation activities and outputs (3) 	5

		<p>c. The bidder describes the quality management of evaluation activities and deliverables giving details on the criteria, methods and tools that will be adopted to ensure the quality of evaluation outcomes (ex. Quality plans, internal group dedicated to quality control, regular exchanges with MA and Programme bodies, internal monitoring of evaluation activities, etc.) (5)</p>	
Evaluation team	Quality of the proposed evaluation team (Maximum score 35)	<p>10. Description of the overall evaluation team, role distribution and responsibilities, working method:</p> <p>a. The technical offer does not show any description of the overall evaluation team (0)</p> <p>b. The technical offer includes a full description of the overall evaluation team (both minimum team made of team leader, 2 senior experts and 1 junior expert as well as thematic experts) with a summary of involved professionals' experience, the description of their role in the team and of the overall working method (2)</p>	2
		<p>11. Team leader with university degree and at least 7 years of proven experience in the evaluation of EU funded Programmes and in socio-economic and territorial development analysis, of which 5 years related to ESI/IPA funds Programmes (every two years of experience beyond</p>	5

		the minimum requirements 1 point up to a maximum of 5)	
		12. Senior expert with university degree and at least 5 years of proven experience in the evaluation of ESI/IPA funds programmes (every two years of experience beyond the minimum requirements 1 point up to a maximum of 5)	5
		13. Senior expert with university degree and at least 5 years of proven experience in socio-economic and territorial development analysis, of which 3 years in European cross border multi-disciplinary analysis and specialised technical expertise and knowledge related to data collection, special data analysis and mapping territorial trends (every two years of experience beyond the minimum requirements 1 point up to a maximum of 5)	5
		14. Junior expert with university degree and no less than 3 years of experience in evaluation of ESI/IPA Funds and/or socio-economic and territorial development analysis and/or data management and/or quantification of indicators and/or drafting survey (every two years of experience beyond the minimum requirements 1 point up to a maximum of 3)	3
		15. Deep knowledge of the ETC EU legislative framework and rules thanks to previous experience in the evaluation of Interreg Programmes referred to the whole evaluation team considered in its core composition (at least 2 Programmes) (Half point every evaluation of Interreg programme beyond the minimum requirement up to 2)	2
		16. Background in the analysis and evaluation of EU	2

		development policies, particularly on the themes handled by the IT-HR CBC Programme referred to the whole evaluation team: blue innovation, safety and adaptation to climate change, preservation and promotion of environment and cultural heritage, sustainable transport (at least 5 years) (every two years of experience beyond the minimum requirements 1 point up to a maximum of 2)	
		17. Additional senior expert with university degree and at least 5 years of proven experience in a field deemed useful within the Evaluation Team, to be described and duly motivated (1 point for each expert, up to 2 points)	2
		18. Proven experience in the relevant macro-regional strategies referred to the whole evaluation team (for example, previous experience in studies or reports relating, in particular, to the EUSAIR)	2
		19. presence of a thematic expert in blue innovation (considered as a plus): 0,5 point if skill proper of a member of the core team; 1 point if additional expert	1
		20. presence of a thematic expert in the safety and adaptation to climate change (considered as a plus): 0,5 point if skill proper of a member of the core team; 1 point if additional expert	1
		21. presence of an expert in the evaluation of communication activities (considered as a plus): 0,5 point if skill proper of a member of the core team; 1 point if additional expert	1
		22. presence of a thematic expert in sustainable transport (considered as a plus): 0,5 point if skill proper of a	1

		member of the core team; 1 point if additional expert	
		23. excellent written and oral command of English language referred to the whole team (C1: Effective operational proficiency or advanced for the whole team, proven by appropriate certification)	1
		24. sound knowledge of one or both languages of the Programme area: at least one of the members of the team, mother tongue or C1, proved by appropriate certification (1 point for each language, up to 2 points)	2
Maximum theoretical SCORE (equivalent to 80% of the overall score)			100