



Reference:	Open call for tenders No EEA/COM/10/001
Subject:	Framework contracts for the provision of communication services to the EEA

## 1. EVALUATION COMMITTEE

The Evaluation Committee was composed of:

- [REDACTED] Chair
- [REDACTED]
- [REDACTED]
- [REDACTED]
- [REDACTED]

The Evaluation Committee was assisted by the following persons appointed to assess compliance with the exclusion and selection criteria:

- [REDACTED] – Lots 1, 2 and 7
- [REDACTED] – Lot 3
- [REDACTED] – Lot 4
- [REDACTED] – Lot 5
- [REDACTED] – Lot 6
- [REDACTED] – Lot 9
- [REDACTED] – Lot 8 and 10

The Evaluation Committee was assisted also by the following persons appointed as external experts/observers:

- [REDACTED]
- [REDACTED] – Lot 2
- [REDACTED] – Lot 4
- [REDACTED] – Lot 3 and 8
- [REDACTED] – Lot 7

The evaluation process started and was finalized on 9 March 2011.

## 2. OPENING OF TENDERS

The opening committee<sup>1</sup> had identified 16 admissible tenders, from the following economic operators:

- [REDACTED]
- [REDACTED]
- [REDACTED]
- [REDACTED]

---

<sup>1</sup> For details please refer to the Record of opening of tenders.

- [REDACTED]
- [REDACTED]
- [REDACTED]
- [REDACTED]
- [REDACTED]
- [REDACTED]
- [REDACTED]
- [REDACTED]
- [REDACTED]
- [REDACTED]
- [REDACTED]
- [REDACTED]

There were some uncertainties with regards to tender No [REDACTED] submitted by [REDACTED] as to the lots covered. The Opening Committee contacted Tenderer No [REDACTED] in writing on 15.10.2010 and requested the following supplementary evidence to be submitted by e-mail or fax by 19.10.2010 (all correspondence is attached):

Summary of correspondence with Tenderer No [REDACTED]	
Request for clarification [sent: 15.10.2010 – deadline: 19.10.2010 – 16:00]:	
	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Please confirm for which lot you have placed an offer</li> </ul>
Reply by e-mail on 19 October:	
	<p>For the following lots, offers have been placed:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Lot 5 [REDACTED]</li> <li>• Lot 7 [REDACTED]</li> <li>• Lot 1 [REDACTED]</li> <li>• Lot 3 [REDACTED]</li> <li>• Lot 6 [REDACTED]</li> <li>• Lot 4 [REDACTED]</li> <li>• Lot 8 [REDACTED]</li> <li>• Lot 9 [REDACTED]</li> </ul>

Tender No [REDACTED] from [REDACTED] was submitted in only one copy. The Opening Committee contacted Tenderer No [REDACTED] in writing on 15.10.2010 and requested the following missing documentation:

Summary of correspondence with Tenderer No [REDACTED]	
Request for clarification [sent: 15.10.2010 – deadline: 19.10.2010 – 16:00]:	
	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Please submit the two missing copies of the tender</li> </ul>
Reply by e-mail on 18.10.2010:	
	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Tenderer submitted an electronic version of his offer</li> </ul>

Consequently, Tenders No ■ and ■ were found to comply with the formal requirements for submission of tenders and declared admissible.

### 3. SELECTION OF TENDERS

The Evaluation Committee, assisted by ■ checked the documents submitted to prove that every tenderer complied with the exclusion and selection criteria (financial, economic, technical and professional capacity to perform the contract) indicated in the tender documents<sup>2</sup>.

All tenders, except tender No ■, were found to comply with the applicable exclusion and selection criteria. Tender No ■ was found to lack proof of professional capacity in the form of the required number of CVs. Consequently, tender No ■ was rejected for non compliance with the selection criteria set in the tender specifications (section 9.2.3, selection criterion No 1) and not considered further for the contract award process.

### 4. EVALUATION OF TENDERS

Evaluation of tenders submitted by tenderers who have been found to comply with the exclusion and selection criteria was performed by applying the award criteria stated in the tender specifications.

#### Award Criteria

Tenders were evaluated following the award criteria and weights outlined below, producing a total score of maximum 58 points.

#### A. Technical Merit (TM) (max. 58, min. 35 points)

No	Award criteria	Maximum points (58)	Minimum points (35)
1	Proven general experience in producing documentaries with an environmental angle both in terms of interviewing the involved people and the provision of footage to support the stories as documented in a short presentation of a representative reference project undertaken by the tenderer	8	5
2	Proven experience in editing final versions of documentaries as documented in a short presentation of a representative reference project undertaken by the tenderer	8	5
3	Proven experience in working under difficult circumstances and in remote areas as documented in a short presentation of a representative reference project undertaken by the tenderer	8	5
4	Access to editing services in the EEA vicinity	8	5
5	Experience writing short stories on environmental subjects	7	4

---

<sup>2</sup> For details please refer to the attached evaluation sheets on the exclusion and selection criteria.

6	Proven access to distribution companies and TV networks	7	4
7	Access to high quality photographers preferably with experience in the environmental field	7	4
8	Description of the environmental policy of the tenderer	5	3

### Summary

Award criterion 1		Proven general experience in producing documentaries with an environmental angle both in terms of interviewing the involved people and the provision of footage to support the stories as documented in a short presentation of a representative reference project undertaken by the tenderer	
Tender No	Strengths and weaknesses	Score (max. 8, min 5 points)	
■	No proper description of environmental reference video project provided, merely some keywords on previous clients and projects	1	
■	Adequate presentation of a reference project of just acceptable quality	5	
■	No reference project presented	0	
■	Well presented reference project. Thematically relevant, though fairly traditional creative solutions. Good technical quality.	7	
■	Very good presentation of an excellent reference project. Thematically highly relevant, with creative solutions and a high technical quality	8	
■	Well presented reference project. Thematically relevant, though fairly traditional creative solutions. Good technical quality.	7	
■	The reference project lacks an environmental angle and is more oriented towards health issues	1	
■	Well presented reference project. Thematically relevant, though fairly traditional creative solutions. Good technical quality.	7	
■	Very good presentation of an excellent reference project. Thematically highly relevant, with creative solutions and a high technical quality	8	
■	Well presented reference project. Reasonably relevant content and of a fair quality	6	

■	No reference project presented	0
■	Very good presentation of an excellent reference project. Thematically highly relevant, with creative solutions and a high technical quality	8
■	The tenderer itself has not been involved at all in the reference project	0
■	Well presented reference project. Reasonably relevant content and of a fair quality	6
■	The tenderer itself has not been involved at all in the reference project	0

Award criterion 2		Proven experience in editing final versions of documentaries as documented in a short presentation of a representative reference project undertaken by the tenderer
Tender No	Strengths and weaknesses	Score (max. 8, min 5 points)
■	Several reference projects with highly creative virals that gives a very convincing documentation of the capacity to finalise editing of professional quality	8
■	Reference project of good quality that demonstrates solid capacity to finalise editing	7
■	No reference project presented	0
■	High quality reference project that gives a very convincing documentation of the capacity to finalise editing	8
■	High quality reference project that gives a very convincing documentation of the capacity to finalise editing of professional quality	8
■	High quality reference project that gives a very convincing documentation of the capacity to finalise editing of professional quality	8
■	No proper presentation of reference project provided, merely a few keywords of a DG SANCO video on health related matters	1
■	Reference project of fair quality, though using fairly conventional solutions	6
■	High quality reference project that gives a very convincing documentation of the	8

	capacity to finalise editing of professional quality	
■	High quality reference project that gives a very convincing documentation of the capacity to finalise editing of professional quality	8
■	No reference project presented	0
■	Reference project of good quality that demonstrates solid capacity to finalise editing	7
■	High quality reference project that gives a very convincing documentation of the capacity to finalise editing	8
■	High quality reference project that gives a very convincing documentation of the capacity to finalise editing	8
■	The tenderer itself has not been involved at all in the reference project	0

Award criterion 3		Proven experience in working under difficult circumstances and in remote areas as documented in a short presentation of a representative reference project undertaken by the tenderer
Tender No	Strengths and weaknesses	Score (max. 8, min 5 points)
■	No proper description of reference video project in difficult locations provided, merely some keywords on previous clients and projects	1
■	Tenderer documents having worked in some difficult locations	7
■	The experience demonstrated is deemed to be just sufficient	5
■	Tenderer documents having worked in a wide range of difficult locations	8
■	Tenderer documents having worked in some difficult locations	7
■	Tenderer documents having worked in a wide range of difficult locations	8
■	The experience demonstrated is deemed to be just sufficient	5
■	Tenderer documents having worked in a wide range of difficult locations	8
■	Tenderer documents having worked in a	8


	wide range of difficult locations	
■	Tenderer documents having worked in a wide range of difficult locations	8
■	No reference project presented	0
■	Tenderer documents having worked in a wide range of difficult locations	8
■	Tenderer documents having worked in a wide range of difficult locations	8
■	Tenderer documents having worked in a wide range of difficult locations	8
■	The tenderer itself has not been involved at all in the reference project	0
















Award criterion 4 Access to editing services in the EEA vicinity		
Tender No	Strengths and weaknesses	Score (max. 8, min 5 points)
■	Tenderer merely expresses a preparedness to find such facilities if a contract is awarded	1
■	Tenderer documents access to editing facilities in Copenhagen	8
■	Tenderer merely expresses a preparedness to find such facilities if a contract is awarded	1
■	Tenderer merely expresses a preparedness to find such facilities if a contract is awarded	1
■	Tenderer documents access to editing facilities in Copenhagen	8
■	Tenderer documents access to editing facilities in Copenhagen	8
■	Tenderer documents access to editing facilities in Copenhagen	8
■	Tenderer documents access to editing facilities in Copenhagen	8
■	Tenderer documents access to editing facilities in Copenhagen	8
■	Tenderer documents access to editing facilities in Copenhagen	8
■	Tenderer merely expresses a preparedness to find such facilities if a	1

	contract is awarded	
■	Tenderer documents access to editing facilities in Copenhagen	8
■	Tenderer documents access to editing facilities in Copenhagen	8
■	Tenderer documents access to editing facilities in Copenhagen	8
■	Tenderer documents access to editing facilities in Copenhagen	8

Award criterion 5		Experience writing short stories on environmental subjects
Tender No	Strengths and weaknesses	Score (max. 7, min 4 points)
■	No proper description of such experience provided, merely some keywords on previous clients and projects	1
■	Just adequate experience documented	4
■	Strong, convincing documentation of broad experience in writing journalistic pieces on environmental matters	7
■	Just adequate experience documented	4
■	Some experience documented, with fair quality of writing	5
■	Good writing experience documented, where the texts are of good quality, but somewhat long	6
■	Some experience documented, with fair quality of writing	5
■	Strong, convincing documentation of broad experience in writing journalistic pieces on environmental matters	7
■	Just adequate experience documented	4
■	Just adequate experience documented	4
■	No documentation provided	0
■	Just adequate experience documented	4
■	Strong, convincing documentation of broad experience in writing journalistic pieces on environmental matters	7
■	Some experience documented, with fair quality of writing	5



	Just adequate experience documented	4
---	-------------------------------------	---

Award criterion 6 Proven access to distribution companies and TV networks		
Tender No	Strengths and weaknesses	Score (max. 7, min 4 points)
	The documentation provided does not convincingly prove actual access	1
	Demonstrated access to a certain range of distributors and broadcasters	5
	No documentation provided	0
	Demonstrated access to a certain range of distributors and broadcasters	5
	Documented access to relevant distributors and broadcasters backed up by track record	6
	Solid documentation and convincing track record of distribution and broadcasting of tenderer's productions	7
	The documentation provided does not convincingly prove actual access	1
	Solid documentation and convincing track record of distribution and broadcasting of tenderer's productions	7
	The documented access to distributors and broadcasters is deemed to be just sufficient	4
	The documented access to distributors and broadcasters is deemed to be just sufficient	4
	The documentation provided does not convincingly prove actual access	1
	The documented access to distributors and broadcasters is deemed to be just sufficient	4
	The documented access to distributors and broadcasters is deemed to be just sufficient	4
	Demonstrated access to a certain range of distributors and broadcasters	4
	The documented access to distributors and broadcasters is deemed to be just sufficient	4

Award criterion 7		Access to high quality photographers preferably with experience in the environmental field
Tender No	Strengths and weaknesses	Score (max. 7, min 4 points)
■	Documents only access to film photographer, not stills photographer	1
■	Documents only access to film photographer, not stills photographer	1
■	Tenderer provides documented access to nature photographer of high international quality	7
■	Tenderer documents having access to stills documentary photographer	6
■	Documents only access to film photographer, not stills photographer	1
■	Tenderer provides documented access to nature photographer of high international quality	7
■	Has access to a stills photographer, but with no documented environmental photography experience	5
■	Tenderer provides documented access to nature photographer of high international quality	7
■	Tenderer documents having access to stills documentary photographer	6
■	Tenderer has art buying department used to hiring photographers, though no dedicated stills photographer	4
■	No documentation provided	0
■	Tenderer documents having access to stills documentary photographer	6
■	Tenderer provides documented access to nature photographer of high international quality	7
■	Just sufficient competence through film photographer with stills competence	5
■	Documents only access to film photographer, not stills photographer	1

Award criterion 8		Description of the environmental policy of the tenderer
Tender No	Strengths and weaknesses	Score (max. 5, min 3 points)
■	Environmental policy in place that follows an established certification scheme	4
■	Environmental policy in place	3
■	Environmental policy in place	3
■	Environmental policy in place	3
■	No information on environmental policy	0
■	Environmental policy in place that follows an established certification scheme	4
■	Environmental policy in place that follows an established certification scheme	4
■	Environmental policy in place	3
■	Environmental policy for only one of the consortium partners	1
■	Environmental policy in place that follows an established certification scheme	4
■	Environmental policy in place	3
■	Environmental policy in place	3
■	Environmental policy in place	3
■	Environmental policy in place that follows an established certification scheme	4
■	Environmental policy in place	3

Tender No ■ failed to achieve the minimum required score for award criteria No 1, 3, 4, 5, 6 and 7;  
 Tender No ■ failed to achieve the minimum required score for award criterion No 7;  
 Tender No ■ failed to achieve the minimum required score for award criteria No 1, 2, 4 and 6;  
 Tender No ■ failed to achieve the minimum required score for award criterion No 4;  
 Tender No ■ failed to achieve the minimum required score for award criteria No 7 and 8;  
 Tender No ■ failed to achieve the minimum required score for award criteria No 1, 2 and 6;  
 Tender No ■ failed to achieve the minimum required score for award criterion No 8;  
 Tender No ■ failed to achieve the minimum required score for award criteria No 1 to 7;  
 Tender No ■ failed to achieve the minimum required score for award criterion No 1;  
 Tender No ■ failed to achieve the minimum required score for award criteria No 1, 2, 3 and 7.

Consequently these tenderers were rejected as non-compliant in pursuance with section 9.3.5.A of the tender specifications and not considered further for the award of the contract

Only tenders which obtained the indicated minimum number of points, both for each award criterion and in total, were considered for the next stage, which involved determining the financial value of the tender (price index) and for the final assessment.

## B. Price (P) (max. 40 points)

Tenderers were requested to submit a financial offer giving (1) the daily price per film team, including all costs for equipment (light, camera, sound, etc..) but excluding travel costs, (2) the daily price for editing services, including costs for equipment but excluding travel costs and (3) the daily price for development and editing of written stories, the total average of which was taken into account for the price evaluation in function of the following formula:  $P = ((3 \times P_1) + (2 \times P_2) + P_3) / 3$ ), where:

$P_1$  = daily price per film team on location including equipment;

$P_2$  = daily price for editing services including equipment; and

$P_3$  = daily price for development and editing of written stories.

Tenders scored points in function of the following formula:  $P = (P_{\min}/P) \times 40$ , where:

$P_{\min}$  = the price of the lowest tender received

$P$  = the price of the tender being considered

Tender	Price in EUR	Score
■	2143.33	36
■	2033.33	38
■	2010	39
■	7512.96	10
■	1935	40

Based on the above, the final scores/rankings of the evaluated tenders are as follows<sup>3</sup>:

Tender	Technical merit (TM) (total score for award criteria 1 to 8)	Price (P) (total score)	Final score (TM + P)	Ranking
■	55	36	91	1
■	53	38	91	1
■	46	39	85	4
■	48	10	58	5
■	48	40	88	3

## 5. CONCLUSIONS

<sup>3</sup> For details, please refer to the attached evaluation sheet on the award criteria.

The Evaluation Committee considered all prices to be acceptable.

As the addition of points for technical merit and price resulted in a tie between tenderer No [REDACTED] and tenderer No [REDACTED], the winner will, in accordance with the last paragraph of section 9.3.5.B of the tender specifications, be the tender which achieved the highest score for price.

Based on the above, the Evaluation Committee recommends to the Authorising Officer to award the contract to:

Name: [REDACTED]

Address: [REDACTED]

## 6. SIGNATURES

Copenhagen,

[REDACTED] – Chair

[REDACTED]

[REDACTED]

[REDACTED]

[REDACTED]

## 7. ANNEX

1. Evaluation sheet – Exclusion and selection criteria
2. Evaluation sheet – Award criteria

