



EUROPEAN CENTRAL BANK

EUROSYSTEM

ECB-RESTRICTED

**Procurement procedure for the provision of services concerning the
establishment of the SSM (26133/F2013)**

Procedure in accordance with Article 29 of Decision ECB/2007/5

Evaluation report

20 September 2013

Contents

1.	Executive summary	3
2.	Opening of tenders	4
3.	Evaluation of tenders	4
3.1	Compliance with the formal tender requirements.....	5
3.2	Eligibility criteria	5
3.3	Selection criteria.....	5
3.4	Abnormally low offers	5
3.5	Award criteria	5
4.	Recommendations for contract award.....	6

1. Executive summary

This Evaluation report summarises the outcome of the evaluation of the written offers submitted by tenderers as part of the tender procedure for the provision of services concerning the establishment of the SSM (26133/F2013) and the outcome of the evaluation after negotiations.

The procurement procedure was carried out as a five-quote procedure in accordance with Article 29 of Decision ECB/2007/5 of 3 July 2007 laying down the Rules on Procurement¹. Seven (7) suitable bidders were invited to submit an offer:

- [REDACTED]
- [REDACTED]
- [REDACTED]
- [REDACTED];
- Oliver Wyman;
- [REDACTED]
- [REDACTED].

[REDACTED] declared in writing by e-mail dated 21 August 2013 that it will not submit an offer:

<https://darwin.escb.eu/livelink/livelink?func=ll&objId=80133189&objAction=viewheader>

[REDACTED] confirmed in writing by email dated 06 September 2013 that it had not submitted an offer:

<https://darwin.escb.eu/livelink/livelink?func=ll&objId=80927626&objAction=viewheader>

The following 5 bidders (“Tenderers”) have submitted an offer:

- [REDACTED] (for Lot 1 and Lot 2);
- [REDACTED] (for Lot 1 and Lot 2);
- Oliver Wyman (for Lot 1 and Lot 2);
- [REDACTED] (for Lot 2);
- [REDACTED] (for Lot 1 and Lot 2).

¹ OJ L 184, 14.7.2007, p. 34

2. Opening of tenders

The Request for Proposal (RfP) was sent out on 12 August 2013.

The (extended) time limit for the receipt of tenders was 3 September 2013.

For the opening protocol specifying the tenders received and the members of the opening team, please refer to:

<https://darwin.escb.eu/livelink/livelink?func=ll&objaction=overview&objid=80845057>

All tenderers submitted their offers in good time and in a sealed envelope as required. All tenders received were accepted for evaluation.

3. Evaluation of tenders

The evaluation took place from 4 September 2013 until 16 September 2013. The evaluation team was composed of the following members:

- Business Area: [REDACTED];
- DG/L: [REDACTED];
- CPO: [REDACTED].

Each member of the team was provided with the documents relating to this tender procedure and was made aware of the applicable formal requirements and the eligibility, selection and award criteria.

The evaluation of the formal requirements and eligibility criteria was performed by [REDACTED], supported by [REDACTED].

The technical and financial evaluation was performed by [REDACTED].

The CPO and DG/L representatives supported the work of the technical and financial evaluators throughout the process in order to ensure compliance with the evaluation guidelines in place (available at CPO Intranet Site) and therefore with the Decision ECB/2007/5 of the ECB laying down the Rules on Procurement of 3 July 2007 (as amended by Decision ECB/2009/2 and Decision ECB/2010/8).

3.1 Compliance with the formal tender requirements

The tenders were assessed against the formal requirements. One Tenderer [REDACTED] did submit a Tenderer's statement from a procurement conducted by the ECB in the recent past. Upon request of the ECB, the Tenderer submitted the correct Tenderer's statement.

It was concluded that all bidders submitted their tenders in accordance with the formal tender requirements set out in the Request for Proposal (RfP) and meet the eligibility criteria. The tenders received were then evaluated on the basis of the award criteria set out in Section 3.9 of the RfP.

3.2 Eligibility criteria

All tenderers confirmed that they comply with the eligibility criteria set out in Article 24 of Decision ECB/2007/5 (see Declaration of Honour, Section 3 Tenderer's Statement (see Annex 2 of the RfP)).

3.3 Selection criteria

In accordance with Article 3.8 of the RfP, the evaluation team was not aware of any reason why tenderers should not have the economic, financial, technical and professional capacity to perform the contract.

3.4 Abnormally low offers

None of the offers was considered by the evaluation team as being abnormally low.

3.5 Award criteria

The evaluation team evaluated the offers on the basis of the quality-related award criteria and financial award criteria set out in Section 3.9 of the RfP.

Lot 1: Project Management and Organisation Services

"Evaluation Matrix Lot 1 - Project management - **Before** negotiations.xls" can be accessed via the following link: <https://darwin.escb.eu/livelihood/livelihood/overview/80920271>

The offer of two Tenderers [REDACTED] were eliminated from further evaluation because they did not reach the required minimum score in at least one of the award criteria:

- [REDACTED]
 - The proposed approach, concept and methodology for the performance of the contract had been evaluated as poor in the context of the evaluation framework as set out in the RfP.
- [REDACTED]
 - The proposed approach, concept and methodology for the performance of the contract had been evaluated as poor in the context of the evaluation framework as set out in the RfP.

- Also the appropriateness of the experience and qualifications of the proposed project team members in view of the tasks assigned to them has been evaluated as poor in the context of the evaluation framework as set out in the RfP.

Lot 2: Financial Advisory Services

"Evaluation Matrix Lot 2 - Financial advisory services - **Before** negotiations.xls" can be accessed via the following link: <https://darwin.escb.eu/livelihood/livelihood/overview/79889421>

The offer of three Tenderers [REDACTED] were eliminated from further evaluation because they did not reach the required minimum score in at least one of the award criteria:

- [REDACTED]
 - The proposed approach, concept and methodology for the performance of the contract had been evaluated as poor in the context of the evaluation framework as set out in the RfP.
- [REDACTED]
 - The proposed approach, concept and methodology for the performance of the contract had been evaluated as poor in the context of the evaluation framework as set out in the RfP.
- [REDACTED]
 - The proposed approach, concept and methodology for the performance of the contract had been evaluated as poor in the context of the evaluation framework as set out in the RfP.

Negotiation

Based on the evaluation of the offers, Oliver Wyman had been ranked as best Tenderer for both lots and therefore had been invited for negotiations for both lots. Following the negotiations, the Tenderer was requested to submit a revised final offer. The evaluation team evaluated the revised final offer on the basis of the quality-related and financial award criteria set out in Section 3.9 of the RfP.

"Evaluation Matrix Lot 1 - Project management - **After** negotiations.xls" can be accessed via the following link: <https://darwin.escb.eu/livelihood/livelihood/overview/81543412>

"Evaluation Matrix Lot 2 - Financial advisory services - **After** negotiations.xls" can be accessed via the following link: <https://darwin.escb.eu/livelihood/livelihood/overview/81543436>

4. Recommendations for contract award

The evaluation team proposes the PRC to decide to award the contracts for Lot 1 (Project Management and Organisation services) and Lot 2 (Financial Advisory Services) to **Oliver Wyman**.