**< Letterhead of contracting authority >**

SHORTLIST REPORT

PUBLICATION REF: <reference>

< Contract title >

[Lot number and lot title:<insert number and title>]

Maximum budget: [EUR] [<ISO code of national currency>] <amount >
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**Annexes:** [Electronic submission: Appointment of Opening and Evaluation Committee from PPMT/Ares with the declarations of impartiality and confidentiality]

[Electronic submission: Record of opening of submissions generated from eSubmission]

Long list  
[Clarification correspondence with candidates]

Draft shortlist notice

# 1. Timetable

|  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- |
|  | **DATE** | **TIME** | **VENUE** |
| **Deadline for submission of requests to participate** |  |  |  |
| **Shortlist meeting** |  |  |  |

# 2. Observers

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
| **Name** | **Representing** |
|  |  |
|  |  |

# 3. Evaluation

< Number > requests to participate were received.

The evaluation committee identified all requests to participate which were submitted before the deadline, were administratively compliant, were from natural or legal persons with eligible nationalities and included declarations from the leader and all consortium members (if any), as recorded in the attached long list. All members of the evaluation committee and any observers signed declarations of impartiality and confidentiality.

The evaluation committee then applied the following selection criteria to these requests to participate, as specified in the additional information about the contract notice annex:

Economic and financial standing: [add text from the published additional information about the contract notice annex]

Professional capacity: [add text from the published additional information about the contract notice annex]

Technical capacity: [add text from the published additional information about the contract notice annex]

The results of this examination and the name of candidates who were rejected because they did not meet the selection criteria or did not comply with the requirements for submission are shown in the attached long list.

[If clarifications were requested for the requests to participate from any candidates:

With the agreement of the other evaluation committee members, the contracting authority wrote to the following candidates whose requests to participate required clarification, offering them the possibility to respond by e-mail within a reasonable time-limit fixed by the evaluation committee (all correspondence is attached in the annex indicated) The table also shows the name of candidates who are proposed to be rejected following the exchange of correspondence:

|  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- |
| **Request to participate number** | **Name of candidate** | **Annex number of exchange of correspondence** | **Reason for rejection**  **(if applicable)** |
|  |  |  | [The candidate is in an exclusion situation] |
|  |  |  | [The candidate has misrepresented or failed to supply the information required as a condition for participation] |
|  |  |  | [The candidate was previously involved in the preparation of procurement documents, this entailing a distortion of competition which cannot be remedied otherwise.] |
|  |  |  | <other reason, if any> |

]

[If the number of suitable requests to participate meeting the selection criteria is less than 4:

There were less than four suitable requests to participate which satisfied all the selection criteria. The contracting authority has verified that all of the following issues were satisfactory:

* Sufficient time has been given for the publication.
* The scope of service is in line with the budget.
* The selection criteria used were clear and non-discriminatory and not beyond the scope of the contract. ]

[If the number of suitable requests to participate meeting the selection criteria is more than 8:

There were more than eight suitable requests to participate which satisfied all the selection criteria. Consequently, the relative strengths and weaknesses of these candidates were re-examined using the additional selection criteria published in the additional information about the contract notice to identify the eight best requests to participate for the tender procedure. The following candidates were not short-listed as a result of this re-examination:

|  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- |
| **Request to participate number** | **Name of candidate** | **Reason for not being proposed to be included in the final shortlist** |
|  |  |  |
|  |  |  |
|  |  |  |

This resulted in a final shortlist of < number > candidates.]

The evaluation committee has ensured that there is no detection of the proposed short-listed candidates (i.e. leaders + members in their consortia and subcontractors, if any) in the early detection and exclusion system. [In indirect management if the contracting authority has no access to the early detection and exclusion system this has to be verified with the representative of the European Commission].

We therefore recommend using the draft short-list notice in annex for publication of the list of selected candidates.

# 4. Conclusion

**Short-listed candidates**

| **Request to participate number** | **Name of short-listed candidate** | **Reason for being included in the final shortlist** | **Contact details** |
| --- | --- | --- | --- |
|  |  |  |  |
|  |  |  |  |
|  |  |  |  |
|  |  |  |  |
|  |  |  |  |
|  |  |  |  |
|  |  |  |  |
|  |  |  |  |

# 5. Signatures

|  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- |
|  | **Name** | **Signature** |
| **Chairperson** |  |  |
| **Secretary** |  |  |
| **Evaluators** |  |  |
|  |  |  |
|  |  |  |
|  |  |  |

**Approved by the contracting authority:**

**Name and signature: Date:**