|  |  |
| --- | --- |
| LOGO | *[Name of Employer / Purchaser]* ER1: Report on the evaluation of submissions received following a call for an expression of interest |
| Tender / Project No: |
| **Title:**  (version 1: June 2016) |

|  |
| --- |
| The National Treasury Standard for Infrastructure Procurement and Delivery Management requires that:   * + - 1. The evaluation report shall be prepared by one or more persons who are conversant with the nature and subject matter of the procurement documents or the framework contract, and who are registered as:  1. a professional architect or professional senior architectural technologist in terms of the Architectural Profession Act; 2. a professional engineer or professional engineering technologist in terms of the Engineering Profession Act; 3. a professional landscape architect or a professional landscape technologist in terms of the Landscape Architectural Profession; 4. a professional project manager or a professional construction manager in terms of the Project and Construction Management Professions Act; or 5. a professional quantity surveyor in terms of the Quantity Surveying Profession Act.    * + 1. Submissions shall be evaluated strictly in accordance with the provisions of the procurement documents (see Annex C of SANS 10845-3 and Annex C of SANS 10845-4, as relevant). Where quality is evaluated, at least three persons who satisfy the requirements of 4.2.3.2 shall undertake such evaluation. Quality shall be scored in terms of the prompts for judgement, with fixed scores assigned to each prompt, either individually and averaged or collectively, as appropriate.        2. Evaluation reports shall be prepared in accordance with the content headings and relevant guidelines contained in Tables 5 or 6, with modifications as necessary where a two-envelope, two-stage process or competitive negotiation procedure is followed. Such reports shall contain extracts from the procurement documents which are linked to the evaluation of submissions, such as eligibility criteria, criteria associated with evaluation methods, preferencing, quality criteria (including prompts for judgement), the method by which tenders are reduced to a common base and lists of returnable documents. Such references shall enable those who are tasked with making decisions based on these documents to do so without having to refer back to submissions in order to understand the content of the report.   **Table 5: Content of an evaluation report relating to an expression of interest** |

| **Section heading** | | **Subsection heading** | | **Guidelines for the preparation of content** |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| **1** | **Summary** | - | - | Provide an overview of the parameters associated with the expression of interest, preferably in tabular form, including the following as relevant:   * Contract / project no and contract / project description * Purpose of the expression of interest * Media in which advertisement was placed * Advertisement date(s) * Estimated value of contract or orders which are likely to be awarded during the term of the contract, if applicable * Date from which documents were available * Number and title of addenda issued * Closing date * Details of clarification meeting, including date and place, if any * Number of submissions made * Number of responsive submissions received * Recommended outcomes of the process |
| **2** | **An overview of the evaluation process** | - | - | Provide an overview of the procurement process, indicating the eligibility criteria that were applied. State points relating to evaluation criteria, prompts for judgement and weightings relating thereto. Reproduce the list of returnable documents.  Provide, if applicable, an overview as to how the quality aspects of the submissions were scored.  Record that those involved in the evaluation of tenders have no conflicts of interest or have declared any conflict of interest that they may have, and the nature of such conflict. |
| **3** | **Evaluation process** | **3.1** | **Submissions received** | List the submissions that were received.  Describe any noteworthy events regarding the opening of submissions, e.g. the returning of late submissions. |
| **3.2** | **Completeness of submissions received** | Compare submissions received against the list of returnable documents. State if any submissions were incomplete and outline how clarifications were obtained.  Confirm if respondents took into account addenda, if any, in their submission. |
| **3.3** | **Responsiveness of respondents** | Identify which of the submissions received were non-responsive and provide clear reasons for declaring respondents to be non-responsive. |
| **3.4** | **Evaluation of submissions** | Record the manner in which submissions were evaluated.  Record, where relevant, and preferably in a tabular form, the scores for each of the evaluation criteria and the total score (excluding those who failed to score above a threshold, if any). |
| **3.5** | **Reasons for disqualification on the grounds of corrupt or fraudulent practice** | State reasons if applicable. |
| **3.6** | **Compliance with legal requirements** | Confirm as relevant that respondents are not barred from participation, tax matters are in order, are registered, etc. |
| 4 | **Recommendation** | - | - | Make a recommendation for the outcome of the process, e.g. admit to a database or prequalify / shortlist respondent to be invited to submit tender offers.  Record the names and qualifications of those who performed the evaluation. |
| 5 | **Confirmation of recommendations** | - | - | Make provision for the confirmation or amendment of the recommended action. |

**Section 1: Summary[[1]](#footnote-1)**

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
| **Tender / Contract / Project No.** |  |
| **Contract / project description** |  |
| **Purpose of expression of interest** |  |
| **Media in which advertisement was placed** |  |
| **Advertisement date(e)** |  |
| **Date from which documents were available** |  |
| **Estimated value of contract or orders which are likely to be awarded during the term of the contract[[2]](#footnote-2)** |  |
| **Number and title of addenda issued** |  |
| **Closing Date** |  |
| **Details of clarification meeting** | Date:  Place: |
| **Closing date for submissions** |  |
| **Number of submissions received** |  |
| **Number of responsive submissions** |  |
| **Recommended outcome of the process** |  |

**Section 2: Overview of the evaluation process**

* 1. **General**

Expressions of Interest were invited and evaluated strictly in accordance with the requirements of the SANS 10845-4, *Construction procurement – Part 4: Standard Conditions for the Calling for Expressions of Interest*, and the Submission Data contained in the procurement documents. The intended outcome for this procedure was stated in the Submission Data as follows:[[3]](#footnote-3)

* 1. **Eligibility Criteria**

The stated eligibility criteria were as follows:[[4]](#footnote-4)

|  |
| --- |
|  |

* 1. **List of Returnable Documents**

The List of Returnable Documents was as follows:[[5]](#footnote-5)

|  |
| --- |
|  |

* 1. **Evaluation Criteria**

The evaluation criteria were as follows: **[[6]](#footnote-6)**

The prompts for judgement for schedule . . . . were as follows:[[7]](#footnote-7)

|  |
| --- |
|  |

**2.5 Additional conditions for the calling for expressions of interest**

The following additional conditions for the calling for an expression of interest to those contained in SANS 10845-4 were included in the Submission Data: **[[8]](#footnote-8)**

|  |
| --- |
|  |

**2.6 Addenda issued**

There were no Addenda issued for this submission.[[9]](#footnote-9)

* 1. **Conflicts of interest**

The members of the Evaluation Committee have declared that they have no conflict of interest.

**Section 3: Evaluation process**

* 1. **Submissions Received**

Submissions were received from the following respondents:

|  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- |
| **Respondent No** | **Name of respondent** |  | **Number of copies submitted** |
|  |  |  |  |
|  |  |  |  |

There were no late submissions received / The following late submissions were received and were returned unopened to the respondent:[[10]](#footnote-10)

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
| **Respondent No** | **Name of respondent** |
|  |  |

* 1. **Completeness of submissions received**

The completeness of the submissions received were as follows:

|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| **Returnable document[[11]](#footnote-11)** | **Comments on returnable documents** | | | | | |
| **Respondent no** | | | | | |
| **1** | **2** | **3** | **4** | **5** | **6** |
|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |

The following clarifications were requested and received in terms of clause 4.10 of SANS 10845-4:

|  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- |
| **Respondent No** | **Clarification Sought** | **Clarification Received** |
|  |  |  |

* 1. **Responsiveness of respondents**

Submissions were tested for responsiveness in accordance with the provisions of clause 5.7 of SANS 10845-4. The following respondents were found to have submitted non-responsive submissions and are therefore rejected:

| **Tenderer No** | **Reason for declaring tenderer non-responsive** | **Reference in procurement documentation or SANS 10845-4 relating to tender offer being declared as non- responsive** |
| --- | --- | --- |
|  |  |  |
|  |  |  |

* 1. **Evaluation of submissions**

The evaluation of the responsive submissions was as follows:[[12]](#footnote-12)

The outcome of the evaluation is as follows:

The quality evaluations were undertaken by the following persons:[[13]](#footnote-13)

|  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- |
| **Name** | **Category of registration (PrArch, PrSArchT, PrEng, PrTechEng, PrLArch, PrLTechno, PrCPM, PrCM or PrQs)** | **Registration no** |
|  |  |  |
|  |  |  |

* 1. **Reasons for disqualification on the grounds of corrupt or fraudulent practice**

There were no respondents that needed to be considered for disqualification on the grounds of corrupt or fraudulent practice. / The following respondents are disqualified on the grounds of corrupt or fraudulent processes for the following reasons:[[14]](#footnote-14)

* 1. **Compliance with legal requirements**

The legal requirements stated in the Submission Data were as follows:

|  |
| --- |
|  |

All respondents satisfied the legal requirements / The following respondents who remain in contention failed to comply with the following legal requirements and, as a result, are eliminated:[[15]](#footnote-15)

**Section 4: Recommendations**

The following course of action is recommended:

This evaluation report was prepared by:

|  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| **Name** | **Category of registration (PrArch, PrSArchT, PrEng, PrTechEng, PrLArch, PrLTechno, PrCPM, PrCM or PrQs)** | **Registration no** | **Signature** | **Date** |
|  |  |  |  |  |

**Section 5: Confirmation of recommendations**

The recommendations are confirmed. / The recommendations are confirmed subject to the following amendments being effected:[[16]](#footnote-16)

     .

|  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- |
| **Name** | **Designation** | **Signature** | **Date** |
|  | Chairperson of the Evaluation Committee |  |  |

The members of the Evaluation Committee were as follows:

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
| **Name** | **Designation** |
|  |  |
|  |  |
|  |  |

1. Include information as relevant. Delete lines in summary if not applicable. [↑](#footnote-ref-1)
2. Include only if a framework agreement. Value is indicative to give a sense of the likely value [↑](#footnote-ref-2)
3. Describe the intended outcome preferably using the words contained in the procurement documents. Reproduce text used in the procurement document in a box, where appropriate. [↑](#footnote-ref-3)
4. Reproduce in the box the eligibility criteria stated in 4.1 of E1.2 Submission Data. [↑](#footnote-ref-4)
5. Reproduce in the box the contents of E.2.1 List of returnable documents. [↑](#footnote-ref-5)
6. Reproduce in the box the evaluation criteria contained in the Submission Data. [↑](#footnote-ref-6)
7. Reproduce in the box the prompts for judgement contained in the procurement document, if any. [↑](#footnote-ref-7)
8. Reproduce additional conditions for the calling for an expression of interest in the box or replace text with “There are no additional conditions for the calling for an expression of interest [↑](#footnote-ref-8)
9. If addenda were issued, modify statement and indicate the nature of the addenda that were issued [↑](#footnote-ref-9)
10. Delete text which is not applicable. [↑](#footnote-ref-10)
11. Link returnable documents to the contents of E.2.1 List of returnable documents [↑](#footnote-ref-11)
12. Describe evaluation process as relevant [↑](#footnote-ref-12)
13. Delete if not applicable [↑](#footnote-ref-13)
14. Amend as necessary [↑](#footnote-ref-14)
15. Amend as necessary [↑](#footnote-ref-15)
16. Amend as necessary [↑](#footnote-ref-16)