



EVALUATION REPORT
Call for tenders EUOSHA/2021/OP/F/SE/0142
Communication and event services
Open procedure

**Lot 2/ Communication, and media and
stakeholder relationships at EU level**

Contents

1	Information on the procedure	3
1.1	Procedure references	3
1.2	Subject matter of the procedure and of the lot	4
1.3	Publications in the Official Journal and other publicity	4
1.4	Launch of the procedure and respect of the applicable time limits	4
1.5	Contacts before opening	4
1.6	Opening of tenders.....	4
2	Working method for the evaluation.....	4
2.1	Evaluation committee	5
3	Evaluation of the tenders.....	5
3.1	Introduction.....	5
3.2	Access to procurement	6
3.3	Verification of administrative compliance	6
3.4	Verification of non-exclusion of tenderers.....	6
3.4.1	Initial verification of non-exclusion.....	6
3.4.2	Verification of the documentary evidence	6
3.5	Selection of tenderers on the basis of selection criteria	6
3.5.1	Initial assessment of selection criteria.....	6
3.5.2	Verification of the documentary evidence	7
3.5.3	Lack of conflicting professional interests.....	8
3.6	Compliance with the minimum requirements specified in the procurement documents	8
3.6.1	Initial check of compliance with the minimum requirements	8
3.6.2	Check of compliance with minimum requirements on the base of technical and financial offer	8
3.7	Evaluation of tenders under the award criteria	8
3.7.1	Technical Evaluation.....	8
3.7.2	Financial Evaluation.....	9
4	Summary of contacts after opening of tenders	9
5	Rejected tenderer(s) or tender(s).....	9

6	Ranking of the tenders	9
7	Proposed successful tenderer	9
7.1	Identification of proposed successful tenderer	10
7.2	Award justification.....	10
8	Maximum value of the framework contract	10
8.1	Total cost in euro	10
	List of annexes:	10

1 Information on the procedure

1.1 Procedure references

Reference of the procedure:	EUOSHA/2021/OP/F/SE/0142
Title of the procedure:	Provision of Communication and Event Services
Reference of the lot:	Lot 2/ Communication, and media and stakeholder relationships at EU level
Contract type:	Framework contract with single operator
Duration of the contract(s):	48 months
Purchase/procurement type:	services
Estimated value:	EUR 1,600,000
Type of procedure:	Open procedure with publication of a contract notice in accordance with Article 164(1)(a) FR 2018/1046
Contracting authority:	EU-OSHA referred to as the <i>Contracting authority</i> for the purposes of this call for tenders
Responsible unit:	Communication and Promotion Unit
Address of the contracting authority:	address from the contract notice section I.1

1.2 Subject matter of the procedure and of the lot

Procedure: EU-OSHA wishes to be able to draw on the services of companies specialising in communications, public relations and event organisation to design and implement networking, information and communication activities.

Lot 2 aims to select a company to provide high-quality professional services in the following areas of activity:

- communication and promotion (online newsroom and social media);
- implementation of media actions;
- support for stakeholder relations management, such as official campaign partners, media partners and other potential partners at the EU level.

1.3 Publications in the Official Journal and other publicity

- Contract Notice – Reference: [2021/S 087-223871](#) published on 05/05/2021
- Publication on the website with reference to e-tendering
- News item published on 05/05/2021 on EU-OSHA website and social media

1.4 Launch of the procedure and respect of the applicable time limits

The procurement documents were available from the date of publication with unrestricted and full direct access, free of charge, at the following link: <https://etendering.ted.europa.eu/cft/cft-display.html?cftId=8274>

The time limit for receipt of tenders was 14/06/2021, 51 days from the date of dispatch of the Contract Notice. The applicable minimum time limit was observed.

1.5 Contacts before opening

All contacts that took place before the opening (the replies to all questions considered of general interest to potential tenderers) can be consulted in the eTendering Document Library or Q&A section (see eTendering link above).

1.6 Opening of tenders

The results of the opening were duly documented in the record of opening of submissions (Ares(2021)4034350).

The following tenders were declared in order (in compliance with the requirements for submission) at the opening of tenders:

No	Name of tenderer (including group members)	Short name used throughout the Evaluation report
1	[REDACTED]	[REDACTED]
1	[REDACTED]	[REDACTED]
3	[REDACTED]	[REDACTED]
1	[REDACTED]	[REDACTED]
1	[REDACTED]	[REDACTED]
1	[REDACTED]	[REDACTED]

2 Working method for the evaluation

2.1 Evaluation committee

The evaluation was performed by an evaluation committee appointed by the responsible authorising officer, see Ares(2021)3992360. The following members of the evaluation committee performed the evaluation:

Name	Unit
[REDACTED]	[REDACTED]
[REDACTED]	[REDACTED]
[REDACTED]	[REDACTED]
[REDACTED]	[REDACTED]
[REDACTED]	[REDACTED]

The evaluators were given access to the tenders via MS Teams on 22/06/2021, on a private evaluation channel with restricted access.

The members of the evaluation committee have held meetings according to the following schedule:

Date	Place	Topic discussed
06/07/2021	MS Teams	Kick of meeting and award criteria/ Project management and quality assurance (PM/QA) first part
07/07/2021	MS Teams	Award criteria/ PM/QA second part
08/07/2021	MS Teams	Award criteria/ Scenario first part
09/07/2021	MS Teams	Award criteria/ Scenario second part and pricing

15/07/2021	MS Teams	Award criteria/ wrap-up meeting
24/08/2021	MS Teams	Selection criteria

3 Evaluation of the tenders

3.1 Introduction

The evaluation was based on the information and evidence contained in the tenders submitted electronically and on additional information and evidence provided by the tenderers at the request of the contracting authority.

Pursuant to the tender specifications, the contracting authority evaluated the tenders that complied with the submission conditions in order to award the contract to the most economically advantageous tender.

The tenders were assessed with regard to the following:

- Check if the tenderer has access to procurement;
- Verification of administrative compliance;
- Verification of non-exclusion of tenderers on the basis of the exclusion criteria;
- Selection of tenderers on the basis of selection criteria;
- Verification of compliance with the minimum requirements specified in the procurement documents;
- Evaluation of tenders on the basis of the award criteria.

The tenders were assessed in the following order:

1. access to procurement;
2. evaluation of award criteria;
3. verification of administrative compliance (first ranked tenderer only);
4. verification of non-exclusion and selection criteria (first ranked tenderer only).

After the conclusion of the evaluation process on all of the above elements, the final ranking of the tenderers was carried out.

The summary table in Annex I of the present evaluation report outlines the assessment of tenders.

3.2 Access to procurement

Access to procurement, pursuant to Articles 176 and 177 of the Financial Regulation, has been verified for all tenderers (including group members in the case of joint tenders).

Agreement on Government Procurement¹ (GPA) is not applicable to the present procedure.

The results of the verification are summarised in the following table:

No	Short name of tenderer	Group members in case of joint tender	Place of establishment or domicile	Access to procurement
1	[REDACTED]	[REDACTED]	[REDACTED]	Yes
2	[REDACTED]	[REDACTED]	[REDACTED]	Yes
3	[REDACTED]	[REDACTED]	[REDACTED]	Yes
4	[REDACTED]	[REDACTED]	[REDACTED]	Yes
5	[REDACTED]	[REDACTED]	[REDACTED]	Yes
6	[REDACTED]	[REDACTED]	[REDACTED]	Yes

¹ https://www.wto.org/english/tratop_E/gproc_e/gp_gpa_e.htm

3.3 Verification of administrative compliance

Administrative compliance (if the tender is drawn up in one of the official EU languages and the required documents signed by duly authorised representatives of the tenderer) has been verified.

All tenders evaluated under this step were found to be administratively compliant.

3.4 Verification of non-exclusion of tenderer (ranked first)

3.4.1 Initial verification of non-exclusion

The initial assessment of tenderers' compliance with exclusion criteria was based on the *Declaration on Honour on Exclusion and Selection criteria* provided with the tenders and consultation of the *European Union's Early Detection and Exclusion System (EDES)*.

The declaration on honour, dated and signed, stating that the tenderer (including group members in case of joint tenders, identified subcontractors and other involved entities as provided in the tender specifications) is not in one of the exclusion or rejection situations referred to in Articles 136(1) and 141(1) of the Financial Regulation, has been verified for the tenderer ranked first.

The Early Detection and Exclusion System has been checked with respect to the tenderer ranked first, which was not found to be in an exclusion situation or any other situation set out in Article 141 of the Financial Regulation.

3.4.2 Verification of the documentary evidence

The supporting documentary evidence was requested during the evaluation stage (as detailed in section 4 of this report) to the first ranked tenderer on 29/07/2021.

Based on the supporting documentary evidence provided, the tenderer was not found to be in an exclusion situation or any other situation set out in Article 141 of the Financial Regulation.

3.5 Selection of tenderer (ranked first) on the basis of selection criteria

According to Article 167(1)(c) of the Financial Regulation, the tenderer was assessed against the selection criteria specified in the procurement documents.

3.5.1 Initial assessment of selection criteria

The initial assessment of the selection criteria was based on the *Declaration on Honour on Exclusion and Selection criteria* provided with the tenders and additional information and evidence provided by the tenderers at the request of the contracting authority, where necessary.

The declaration on honour provided by the tenderer and the involved entities for which the tender specifications require the declaration, has been verified for the tenderer ranked first (which has access to procurement and is not registered in EDES with an exclusion case).

The tenderer was found to fulfil the selection criteria, based on the *Declaration on Honour on Exclusion and Selection criteria*.

3.5.2 Verification of the documentary evidence

The supporting documentary evidence to the declaration on honour was requested to be submitted with the tenders in eSubmission and checked only for the first ranked tenderer.

The following table provides an overview of the assessment of the supporting documentary evidence for the selection criteria:

Tenderer: [REDACTED]

Selection Criterion	Basis for assessment	In case of reliance on other entities, was a commitment letter provided?	Result of verification
Legal and regulatory capacity			
Country of establishment	- Registry document	N/A	criterion met
Economic and financial capacity			
Specific turnover of past 2 years	- Statement of overall and specific turnover (past 2 years) - From leader and partner	Yes	criterion met
Technical and professional capacity			
Appropriate organisational and staffing structure	- Concise company profile - Organisational structure with average annual workforce and managerial staff	N/A	criterion met
Experience of projects similar to the services described	- List of main services	Yes	criterion met
Experience of projects similar to the services described	- 4 to 6 PARFs - 1 PARF at least related to stakeholder relations - 1 PARF at least related to promotion and communication outputs - 1 PARF related to a promotion plan including a press conference - 1 PARF related to a social media campaign - 1 PARF at least of 100,000 € min. related to national events	Yes	criterion met
Competence of the team proposed	- CVs of senior profiles for contract and finance management, project management and teams and workflow coordination (min. 5 years and C1) - CVs of senior profiles for stakeholder/ media relations management; community/social media management; editorial management; digital/multi-media design (min. 5 years and C2) - CVs of junior profiles for stakeholder/ media relations management; community/social media management; editorial management; digital/multi-media design (min. 3 years and C2)	Yes	criterion met

Based on the review of the documents submitted with the tenders, the evaluation committee concluded that the first ranked tenderer possessed the necessary capacity level to perform the contract.

3.5.3 Lack of conflicting professional interests

The first ranked tenderer confirmed in the declaration on honour and where applicable, in the commitment letters, that they are not in situation of conflicting interests which may negatively affect the contract performance.

3.6 Compliance with the minimum requirements specified in the procurement documents

3.6.1 Initial check of compliance with the minimum requirements

N/A

3.6.2 Check of compliance with minimum requirements on the base of technical and financial offer

The compliance of the submitted tenders with the minimum requirements of the procurement documents has been checked on the basis of the technical and financial offer for all tenders. The first ranked tender was found to be compliant with the minimum requirements specified in the procurement documents.

3.7 Evaluation of tenders under the award criteria

3.7.1 Technical Evaluation

▪ Results of technical evaluation

The following table summarises the results of the technical evaluation for the tenders per criterion:

Short name of the tenderer	Criteria	Max	Min	Score	Reaches the minim scores
██████████	Project management	1000	600	350	NO
	Scenario	700	420	N/A	N/A
	Total score for quality criteria	1700	1020	N/A	N/A
██████	Project management	1000	600	100	NO
	Scenario	700	420	N/A	N/A
	Total score for quality criteria	1700	1020	N/A	N/A
██████████	Project management	1000	600	770	YES
	Scenario	700	420	582.5	YES
	Total score for quality criteria	1700	1020	1352.5	YES
████	Project management	1000	600	640	YES
	Scenario	700	420	422.5	YES
	Total score for quality criteria	1700	1020	1062.5	YES
██████████	Project management	1000	600	890	YES
	Scenario	700	420	362.5	NO
	Total score for quality criteria	1700	1020	N/A	N/A
██████████	Project management	1000	600	500	NO
	Scenario	700	420	N/A	N/A
	Total score for quality criteria	1700	1020	N/A	N/A

▪ Details of the technical evaluation of the tenders

The detailed scores (points per sub-criterion) resulting from the technical evaluation of the tenders as well as a summary evaluation for each of the answers to the provided sub-criterion, grouped by criterion, are provided in Annex 1.

3.7.2 Financial Evaluation

- **Detection of abnormally low tender(s)**

The reviewed offers did not raise any doubts concerning the possibility of being abnormally low. There is no evidence based on the market research that the offer could appear as abnormally low and therefore no further checks were made in this regard.

- **Results of the Financial Evaluation**

The result of the financial evaluation, performed for the tenders that were not rejected at previous steps, is a price figure corresponding to the total price of the tender, covering all the requirements set out in the tender specifications:

Short name of tenderer	Price/cost of the tender
██████	██████
██	██████

4 Summary of contacts after opening of tenders

After the time limit of receipt of tenders, the following requests for clarification were sent out to the first ranked tenderer and replies to all of them were received within the provided deadlines:

Short name of tenderer	Phase of the Evaluation	Reference(s) of the letters sent	Reference(s) of the letters received
██████	Exclusion criteria	Ares(2021)4859997	Ares(2021)5526848
██████	Selection criteria	Ares(2021)5363457	Ares(2021)5526889
██████	Selection criteria	Ares(2021)5479966	Ares(2021)5526942

5 Rejected tenderer(s) or tender(s)

Short name of tenderer	Rejection reasons
██████████	Not meeting the minimum quality levels as laid down in Annex I point 21.3 FR (Project management approach)
██████	Not meeting the minimum quality levels as laid down in Annex I point 21.3 FR (Project management approach)
██████	Not meeting the minimum quality levels as laid down in Annex I point 21.3 FR (Scenario/ news article, social media posts and social media animation)
██████████	Not meeting the minimum quality levels as laid down in Annex I point 21.3 FR (Project management approach)






6 Ranking of the tenders

The tenders that were not rejected during the evaluation were ranked following the formula indicated in the tender specifications:

$$\text{Final score} = (0.6 \times \text{Quality score}) + (0.4 \times \text{Financial score})$$

No	Short name of tenderer	Total score for quality criteria	Quality points x 0.6	Price/cost of the tender	Price points x 0.4	Final score	Ranking
1	██████████	1352.5	811.5	██████████	509.66	1321.16	1
2	██████████	1062.5	637.5	██████████	680	1317.50	2

Name, date and signature of the evaluation committee members:

Name	Unit	Date and signature
[REDACTED]	[REDACTED]	 [REDACTED]
[REDACTED]	[REDACTED]	 [REDACTED]
[REDACTED]	[REDACTED]	 [REDACTED]
[REDACTED]	[REDACTED]	 [REDACTED]
[REDACTED]	[REDACTED]	 [REDACTED]