REQUEST FOR PROPOSAL

for the Public-Private Partnership Project on Development of the Biometric Passports and ID Cards Issuance Infrastructure and Services in the Republic of Armenia

10 October 2024

IMPORTANT NOTICE

This Request for Proposal has been approved by the dedicated evaluation commission established to carry out the Selection Procedure (the "**Evaluation Commission**") for the Project (as described further in this document). This document is intended solely for use by the Qualified Applicants in the Selection Procedure for the purposes of preparing and submitting the Bids.

This Request for Proposal has been prepared in accordance with the legislation of the Republic of Armenia (the "**Applicable Law**") and based on the information and documents owned by the Government, the Ministry of Internal Affairs of the Republic of Armenia (the "**Competent Authority**") and other competent authorities and entities involved in preparation of the Project from the Government's side.

This Request for Proposal sets out, among other matters, the formal and substantive requirements for the Bids, the procedure for submitting and evaluating the Bids, and the rules on determination of the Winner of the Selection Procedure, as required by Applicable Law.

This Request for Proposal does not aim to set out an exhaustive list of information and documents that may be required to take part in the Selection Procedure. The Qualified Applicants are advised to carry out their own analysis and due diligence for the purposes of preparing and submitting the Bids or taking any decision related to preparation for and participation in the Selection Procedure.

Neither the Government, nor the Evaluation Commission, nor their representatives or advisors, nor any other authorities of the Republic of Armenia, their representatives or advisors:

1) have carried out any independent procedures to verify any data contained herein, except the procedures required to prepare the Draft PPP Project and take the decision to implement the Project, the results of which (determined by the Government as relevant for the Selection Procedure) are reflected in the relevant parts of this Request for Proposal;

2) make any warranties or representations in respect of the correctness and completeness of the information contained in this Request for Proposal;

3) bear any responsibility or liability for any communications, actions, or information, both explicit or implied, arising out of, contained or resulting from any omission, mistake, or data that has not been rectified in this Request for Proposal after its issuance.

Certain part of information and documents provided to Qualified Applicants for the purposes of preparing Bids is subject to confidentiality requirements. The terms and conditions of data sharing and disclosure shall be governed by the undertaking on confidentiality and non-disclosure of information (the "**Confidentiality Undertaking**") executed with each Qualified Applicant in accordance with the Request for Qualification.

This Request for Proposal may refer to or cite certain Armenian laws, regulations or official documents. Any such references or citations are not meant to be complete or comprehensive. Qualified Applicants shall be responsible for carrying out their own independent analysis and review of Armenian laws, regulations and official documents for the purposes of participation in the Selection Procedure.

TABLE OF CONTENTS

1. INTRODUCTION

1.1. The Ministry of Internal Affairs of the Republic of Armenia (the "**Competent Authority**") is implementing a public-private partnership project for the issuance and distribution of identity documents and operation and servicing of the ID facilities in the Republic of Armenia (the "**Project**") through a fair and transparent competitive selection process in accordance with Armenian law and international best practice (the "**Selection Procedure**").

1.2. The main background information and materials regarding the Project are contained and can be found in the following sources:

(a) The general description of the key provisions (elements) of the Project is given in Annex 3 (*Key Provisions of the Project*) to the Request for Qualification.

(b) The preliminary non-binding outline of key provisions of the draft PPP contract for the Project (the "**Agreement**") is contained in the Project term sheet available at Mineconomy's official website.

(c) The Draft PPP Project (except for the feasibility study) is available at Mineconomy's official website.

(d) The draft Agreement is contained in Annex 6 (*Draft Agreement*) to this RFP.

1.3. According to the Decree of the Government on implementation of the Project No. 2346-A dated 28 December 2023, the Selection Procedure shall be carried out as the two-stage open procedure under the Applicable Law.

1.4. This document governs the matters of the Request for Proposal stage of the Selection Procedure, including requirements applicable to the format and contents of Bids, the procedure for submission and evaluation of Bids, and other information relevant for the bidding process.

1.5. This Request for Proposal is intended for Applicants that have been qualified to take part in the bidding process at the RFP stage according to the Request for Qualification, as well as have signed the Confidentiality Undertaking and provided it to the Competent Authority. By submitting a Bid, each Qualified Applicant agrees to be bound by the terms of this Request for Proposal.

1.6. This Request for Proposal has been prepared and issued in accordance with Applicable Law, including the Law of Armenia "On Public-Private Partnership" No. HO-113-N dated 28 June 2019 (as amended, the "**PPP Law**"), the Procedure of the Public-Private Partnerships approved by the Decree of the Government No.1183-N dated 28 July 2022 (as amended, the "**PPP Procedure**"), and in accordance with other applicable Armenian laws and regulations.

1.7. In this Request for Proposal, unless the context otherwise requires, the capitalized terms, expressions and abbreviations shall have the meaning given in Annex 8 (*Definitions and Interpretation*).

2. GENERAL INSTRUCTIONS TO QUALIFIED APPLICANTS. PARTICIPANTS OF BIDDING PROCEDURE

2.1. Form of Qualified Applicant

2.1.1. A Qualified Applicant may submit a Bid either as a single legal entity or as a consortium made up of several legal entities that agreed to jointly participate in the Selection Procedure (a "**Consortium**"). Qualified Applicants that are constituted as single entities and Qualified Applicants that are constituted as Consortia may be both resident and non-resident legal entities. For avoidance of doubt, a Consortium together with all its Consortium Members shall

be treated in the Selection Procedure as an Applicant (including as Qualified Applicant at the RFP stage of the Selection Procedure).

2.1.2. A Consortium shall appoint and authorize one of its members to represent and irrevocably bind all Consortium Members in all matters related to the Selection Procedure, including but not limited to the submission of the Bid on behalf of the Consortium (the "**Lead Member**"). The Lead Member shall comply with the requirements set in Clause 2.1.3 of the RFQ.

2.2. **Key Participation Requirements and Verifications**

2.2.1. The Qualified Applicant shall for the entire term of the Selection Procedure and up to the time of signing of the Agreement (in case such Qualified Applicant is designated as the Winner), comply (and shall ensure compliance by the other Consortium Members, as the case may be) with the general requirements to Applicants and other Consortium Members listed in Annex 4 (*General Requirements to Applicants*) of the RFQ and the Qualification Criteria established in Annex 5 (*Qualification Criteria*) of the RFQ.

2.2.2. Change of composition of the Consortium is not allowed after expiry of the Qualification Bids Submission Deadline (as stated in the RFQ). The violation of this requirement shall be the ground for rejecting a Bid and disqualifying an Applicant from participation in the Selection Procedure.

2.2.3. No person may simultaneously be a Consortium Member in one Consortium while also being (or its Related Company being) a Consortium Member in another Consortium. Any Applicant who participates in the Selection Procedure relying on a Consortium Member who is in breach of this rule shall be rejected from participation in the Selection Procedure.

2.2.4. Change of Control in Qualified Applicant at any stage of the Selection Procedure (until signing of the Agreement in case such Qualified Applicant is designated as the Winner of the Selection Procedure) resulting in Qualified Applicant's non-compliance with general requirements to Applicants set out in Annex 4 (*General Requirements to Applicants*) of the RFQ and/or Qualification Criteria set out in Annex 5 (*Qualification Criteria*) of the RFQ shall be prohibited. The violation of this requirement shall be the ground for rejecting a Bid and disqualifying an Applicant from participation in the Selection Procedure.

2.2.5. At any stage of the Selection Procedure the Evaluation Commission may disqualify the Applicant and the Competent Authority may refuse to sign the Agreement in case it is established that the Applicant has not passed the national security checks and/or has violated the national security requirements established by the Applicable Law.

2.3. **Authorized Persons**

2.3.1. The Authorized Persons shall be the individuals authorized to represent the Applicant under the relevant Authorizing Documents (as the case may be) in connection with the Selection Procedure, including (for the purposes of this RFP) in relation to such matters as signing and submission of a Bid, as well as exchange of all communications related to a Bid.

2.4. **Evaluation Commission**

2.4.1. The Government by its Decree on implementation of the Project No. 2346-A dated 28 December 2023, established a special body responsible for conducting the Selection Procedure (the "**Evaluation Commission**"), in particular (for the purposes of this RFP) for opening and evaluation of Bids.

2.4.2. The key provisions governing the status, powers and activities of the Evaluation Commission in the Selection Procedure (including at the RFP stage) are established in the PPP Law, the PPP Procedure, and separate rules of procedure of the Evaluation Commission approved by the Government. The RFQ and RFP may further refer to or clarify and supplement such provisions to the extent necessary for conducting the Selection Procedure and in accordance with Applicable Law.

2.4.3. Members of the Evaluation Commission shall not participate directly or indirectly in the preparation and/or submission of any Bid and shall not provide any assistance to any Qualified Applicant for the purposes thereof.

2.4.4. Members of the Evaluation Commission shall be independent and impartial in taking decisions within the scope of their powers and shall not have Conflict of Interest with any Applicant.

2.5. **Advisors**

2.5.1. The Evaluation Commission may invite external advisors to provide advice and other assistance on the matters within the scope of their expertise during the Selection Procedure, as well as during negotiations and signing of the Agreement (the "**Advisors**").

2.5.2. Advisors may be present at the meetings or sessions of the Evaluation Commission, participate in discussions, provide explanations and advice at such meetings/sessions, review documents submitted by Applicants to the Evaluation Commission, review minutes of the Evaluation Commission as well as documents considered during negotiations and signing of the Agreement. When performing their respective duties and activities, the Advisors shall be bound by the same confidentiality requirements as members of the Evaluation Commission.

2.5.3. Advisors are not members of the Evaluation Commission and shall not have voting rights on the matters considered at the meetings or sessions of the Evaluation Commission as well as with respect to decisions of the Competent Authority made during negotiations and signing of the Agreement. Presence or absence of Advisors at the meetings of the Evaluation Commission does not affect the quorum at such meetings or sessions.

2.6. **Authorized Officials**

2.6.1. The head and the secretary of the Evaluation Commission shall be designated as the Authorized Officials of the Competent Authority. The information on the Authorized Officials as of the date of approval of the RFP is set out in the Data Sheet. The Competent Authority shall notify Qualified Applicants of changes to the information on Authorized Officials indicated in the Data Sheet in the manner set out in Clause 6.1.1.

2.7. **Communications**

2.7.1. All communication envisaged by this RFP (including submission of Bids, provision of additional information in respect of Bids, and clarifications of Bids) shall be carried out by the Authorized Persons and Authorized Officials, unless the Request for Proposal provides otherwise.

2.7.2. Unless the RFP provides otherwise, communication, information and documents submitted and/or received under this RFP in paper form and in electronic form shall have the equal legal force. This includes, in particular, additional information in respect of Bids and communications with the Evaluation Commission.

3. ORGANIZATION OF BIDDING PROCEDURE

3.1. **Tender Documentation**

3.1.1. The Government has approved the Request for Qualification, the Request for Proposal and other documents for the implementation of the Selection Procedure (collectively, the "**Tender Documentation**"). Tender Documentation intended for the Qualified Applicants consists of the RFP and all annexes to the RFP.

3.1.2. Each Qualified Applicant must familiarize himself with all instructions, conditions, forms, technical requirements and other information contained in the Tender Documentation. The Qualified Applicant shall bear all risks related to non-fulfillment of the requirements of the Tender Documentation, including rejection of the Bid.

3.2. **Time Schedule**

3.2.1. The Request for Proposal contains the schedule with key milestones of the Selection Procedure and their indicative timeframes for the purposes of this RFP (the "**Time Schedule**") in ANNEX 2 *(Time Schedule)*. Qualified Applicants may use the Time Schedule for general reference but shall not in any way rely on the Time Schedule with respect to their participation in the Selection Procedure.

3.2.2. The Evaluation Commission may, in its sole discretion and without prior notice to the Candidates, amend the Time Schedule. The Evaluation Commission shall notify the Applicants of changes to the Time Schedule in the manner set out in Clause 6.1.1. The Competent Authority and the Evaluation Commission shall not incur any liability whatsoever arising out of amendments to the Time Schedule.

3.3. **Provision of Feasibility Study**

3.3.1. Qualified Applicants may address the Evaluation Commission with an email request for the provision of a copy of the feasibility study for the Project until expiry of the Bids Submission Deadline. The request shall be submitted by the Authorized Person in accordance with the form provided in ANNEX 3 (*Sample Form for Requesting a Copy of the Feasibility Study*).

3.3.2. The Evaluation Commission shall provide a Qualified Applicant with a copy of the feasibility study in the form in which it was requested (printed or electronic) within 1 (one) Business Day after the receipt of the Qualified Applicant's request.

3.3.3. If a copy of the feasibility study is provided in printed form, the Authorized Person shall have the original identity documents and the copies of the Authorizing Documents to be admitted to premises of the Evaluation Commission and receive a copy of the feasibility study by hand.

3.3.4. To simplify the information exchange process, Qualified Applicants are encouraged to request the electronic copy of the feasibility study for the Project under this Clause 3.3.

3.4. **Qualified Applicants' Due Diligence**

3.4.1. Each Qualified Applicant shall be solely responsible for conducting its own independent research, due diligence and any other work or investigation, as well as for seeking any other independent advice necessary for the preparation of Bids, negotiation of agreements, and the subsequent delivery of all services to be provided by the Project Company under the Agreement.

3.4.2. No representation or warranty, express or implied, is made and no responsibility of any kind is undertaken by the Competent Authority, Evaluation Commission or their advisors, employees, consultants or agents, for the completeness or accuracy of any information contained in the Tender Documentation or provided during the Selection Procedure.

3.4.3. The Competent Authority, Evaluation Commission and their advisors, employees, consultants and agents shall not be liable to any person or entity as a result of the use of any information contained in the Tender Documentation or provided during the Selection Procedure.

3.5. **Site Visits**

3.5.1. Each Qualified Applicant may address the Evaluation Commission with an email request for a site visit to familiarize itself with the Project area and to conduct due diligence necessary for future delivery of the Project. The request shall be submitted by the Authorized Person until expiry of the Bids Submission Deadline and shall:

(a) include the full name of the Qualified Applicant and the Authorized Person sending the request;

(b) contain the requested site visit period (number of days, with indication of the start and end dates);

(c) list the anticipated due diligence procedures with respect to the Project area during the requested site visit period (if applicable);

(d) contain a list of the Authorized Persons (up to 10 (ten) persons) for the site visit;

(e) contain copies (email attachments) of the identity documents of the Authorized Persons as per the list indicated in item (d) above.

Copies of identity documents indicated in item (e) above that are prepared in a foreign language (other than any of the Official Languages) shall be translated into any of the Official Languages.

3.5.2. Based on consultations with the Competent Authority, the Evaluation Commission shall schedule the dates of the site visits in the order in which the requests for such visits were submitted by the Qualified Applicants and taking into account the number of requests, requested periods for the site visits, working schedules and the time period remaining until the Bids Submission Deadline.

3.5.3. The Evaluation Commission shall send email notifications to the Qualified Applicants as per the order in which the site visit requests were submitted, specifying the site visit period (number of days, with indication of the start and end dates) and other information necessary for the site visit. Each notification of the Evaluation Commission shall be provided at least 2 (two) Business Days before the date of the scheduled site visit. The Authorized Person shall confirm by email the receipt of the notification on the scheduled site visit.

3.5.4. The Qualified Applicants and/or their Authorized Persons shall take part in any site visit at their own expense, at their own risk and responsibility.

3.5.5. The Evaluation Commission reserves the right to reject requests for site visits, in particular requests that do not meet the requirements of Clause 3.5.1, requests filed after the Bids Submission Deadline, or in case the Evaluation Commission does not have enough time to respond to such requests and organize site visits due to the expiration of the Bids Submission Deadline.

3.5.6. During the site visit, the Qualified Applicant must follow, among other things, the requirements for attending and moving about the Project area and Project assets. Failure to comply with these requirements by the Qualified Applicant's representatives may result in their suspension from the site visit.

3.5.7. If the Qualified Applicants and other persons visiting the site receive confidential information during the site visit (as set out in the Confidentiality Undertaking) they shall comply with the relevant requirements to confidentiality and non-disclosure of such information. The Qualified Applicant is responsible for compliance with the requirements to confidentiality and non-disclosure of confidential information which was provided in connection with the site visit by all recipients of such information (as set out in the Confidentiality Undertaking).

3.6. **Cost of Bidding**

3.6.1. The Qualified Applicant shall bear all costs associated with the preparation and submission of its Bid, including, without limitation, all costs and expenses related to the preparation of responses to questions or requests for clarification regarding the Bid, changes to the Bid, negotiations and signing of the Agreement, and establishment of the Project Company. Under no circumstances shall the Competent Authority, the Evaluation Commission, or any of their advisors be responsible or liable for such costs, regardless of the conduct or outcome of the Selection Procedure.

3.6.2. Whenever the Evaluation Commission incurs any expenses in connection with returning the Bids unopened to Qualified Applicants under this RFP (particularly, postal/delivery fees), any such expenses may be paid by the relevant Qualified Applicant.

3.6.3. Rejection of the Bid, voluntary withdrawal of the Qualified Applicant from participation in the Selection Procedure, declaration of the Selection Procedure void (not having taken place), as well as cancellation of the Selection Procedure in accordance with this RFP and Applicable Law shall not be grounds for compensating costs related to preparation and submission of Bids.

4. PREPARATION OF BIDS

4.1. General Requirements to Format and Content of Bids

4.1.1. Each Qualified Applicant shall submit the following documents (together the "**Bid**") in accordance with this Request for Proposal:

(a) a **Technical Proposal**, in accordance with the requirements of section 1 of ANNEX 4 *(Content of the Bid)*, and

(b) a **Financial Proposal**, in accordance with the requirements of section 2 of ANNEX 4 (*Content of the Bid)*.

4.1.2. Qualified Applicants shall prepare and further submit their Bids in paper-based format through in-hand delivery to the Evaluation Commission in accordance with the requirements of this RFP.

4.1.3. The Bids prepared for submission to the Evaluation Commission shall be subject to the following general form/preparation requirements:

(a) The Qualified Applicant shall prepare and submit one (1) printed original, one (1) printed copy, and two (2) electronic copies (on separate USBs) of each of the Technical Proposal and the Financial Proposal, clearly marking each one as "ORIGINAL", "COPY", and "ELECTRONIC COPY".

(b) In case of discrepancy between the written original and written copy and/or electronic copy of the Bid, the written original of the Bid shall prevail. Any such discrepancy, however, shall not be the ground for rejecting the Bid.

(c) The written original and written copy of the Bid shall be typed or written (where appropriate) in indelible ink and signed by an Authorized Person.

(d) All pages of the Bid as per the content requirements specified in ANNEX 4 (*Content of Bid*), shall be numbered, bound, and signed by the Authorized Person.

(e) Each electronic copy of the Bid prepared for the in-hand delivery shall be provided on a separate USB drive. The electronic copies of the Technical Proposal and the Financial Proposal shall follow the contents of their original written versions, shall be free of any virus or malware, and shall contain non-compressed and non-protected files in printable and reproducible PDF format.

(f) For the avoidance of doubt, each USB drive for each electronic copy of the Technical Proposal and the Financial Proposal should contain respectively (i) a scanned electronic copy of the complete original written version of the Technical Proposal and (ii) a scanned electronic copy of the complete original written version of the Financial Proposal, in PDF format.

4.1.4. Each Qualified Applicant, including a Consortium, may submit one (1) Bid only. Submission of more than one Bid by the Qualified Applicant, as well as submission of Bids in which one and the same entity is a Consortium Member in different Consortia (or one and the same entity is a single-entity Qualified Applicant in one Bid and a Consortium Member in another Bid or Bids), shall result in rejection of all Bids violating the requirements of this Clause 4.1.4.

4.1.5. By submitting the Bid, Qualified Applicants acknowledge that:

(a) provision of any information or documents that should be submitted as part of the Financial Proposal in the Technical Proposal (and vice versa) shall be the ground for rejection of the Bid;

(b) submission of any additional unnecessary pieces of information or documents as part of the Bid (such as marketing materials) may be the ground for rejecting the Bid in case the Evaluation Commission determines such submission constitutes a Material Deviation.

4.2. **Sealing and Marking of Bids: Inner Envelopes**

4.2.1. The Qualified Applicant shall submit the originals and copies of the Bid in inner envelopes prepared in the following manner:

(a) a sealed envelope bearing the indication "TECHNICAL PROPOSAL", which should contain the four (4) copies of Technical Proposal required under Clause (a) of this RFP (the "**Technical Proposal Envelope**"); and

(b) a sealed envelope bearing the indication "FINANCIAL PROPOSAL", which should contain the four (4) copies of Financial Proposal required under Clause (a) of this RFP (the "**Financial Proposal Envelope**").

4.2.2. Each inner envelope indicated in Clause 4.2.1 shall be formalized in accordance with the requirements set in paragraphs 107 and 108 of the PPP Procedure. Each inner envelope shall also have a free space sufficient for marking the registration details on such envelope (as per paragraph 110 of the PPP Procedure) at the meeting on opening of outer packages with Bids and Technical Proposal Envelopes conducted under Clause 7.2.

4.2.3. If the volume of documents does not make it possible to place all four (4) copies of the Technical Proposal or Financial Proposal in the respective one (1) inner envelope, the Qualified Applicant may place the written original and the copies (written and electronic) of the relevant documents (Technical Proposal or Financial Proposal, as the case may be) in two different inner envelopes. Each respective inner envelope shall in this case clearly indicate the marks "ORIGINAL" and "COPIES" for the relevant documents (Technical Proposal or Financial Proposal, as may be appropriate) and shall be otherwise formalized according to the requirements set in Clause 4.2.1.

4.2.4. If the inner envelopes do not meet the requirements indicated in this Clause 4.2, the Evaluation Commission shall assume no responsibility for misplacing or losing any part of the Bid as well as for safeguarding any restricted use information that may be contained therein.

4.3. **Sealing and Marking of Bids: Outer Packaging**

4.3.1. The Qualified Applicant shall put the inner envelopes with the Bid prepared under Clause 4.2 in the opaque outer envelope or postal box (in the latter case, if the volume of the inner envelopes with the Bid does not make it possible to place all of them into one (1) outer envelope).

4.3.2. The outer envelope or postal box shall be formalized in accordance with the requirements set in paragraphs 107 and 108 of the PPP Procedure. The outer envelope or postal box shall also bear a clear indication "OUTER ENVELOPE/POSTAL BOX WITH THE BID" and shall have a free space sufficient for marking the registration details on it (as per paragraph 110 of the PPP Procedure).

4.3.3. If the outer envelope or postal box do not meet the requirements indicated in this Clause 4.3, the Evaluation Commission shall assume no responsibility for misplacing or losing any part of the Bid as well as for safeguarding any restricted use information that may be contained therein.

4.4. **Language of Bids and Language of Correspondence**

4.4.1. Unless ANNEX 4 (*Content of Bid*) stipulates otherwise, the following rules shall apply to the language of the Bid and the language of correspondence:

(a) All forms and documents comprising the Bid as per ANNEX 4 (*Content of Bid*) shall be prepared in any of the Official Languages.

(b) If documents submitted as part of the Bid are originally prepared (issued) in a foreign language (other than any of the Official Languages), such documents shall be submitted together with their translation into any of the Official Languages in accordance with the requirements set out in ANNEX 4 (*Content of Bid*).

(c) All correspondence related to the Bid shall be carried out in any of the Official Languages.

4.4.2. In case of any discrepancies between the different versions of documents or correspondence indicated in items (a)-(c) of Clause 4.4.1 prepared in any of the Official Languages and in a foreign language (other than any of the Official Languages), the version of the relevant document or correspondence in any of the Official Languages shall prevail.

4.5. **Confidential Information**

4.5.1. Qualified Applicant is entitled to designate certain parts of the Bid as those containing confidential information. This shall be achieved by putting the words "CONFIDENTIAL INFORMATION" on each page of the Bid containing such information. The Qualified Applicant shall also highlight, in a free form manner, the specific pieces of information on each page of the Bid that shall be designated as confidential information. This Clause shall not preclude the Evaluation Commission from disclosing the Bid to Advisors.

4.5.2. The Evaluation Commission, the Competent Authority and Advisors shall treat the information marked confidential in the Bid under Clause 4.5.1 with due care and shall commit to respect the confidentiality obligations with regard to such information which are substantially the same as those imposed on a Qualified Applicant under the Confidentiality Undertaking (in particular, not disclose the confidential information to third parties and take appropriate measures for its protection).

4.5.3. The designation of data as confidential information shall not apply to information that does not qualify as confidential information under the Applicable Law.

4.6. **Bid Validity Period**

4.6.1. The Bid shall remain valid from the date of its submission until the conclusion of the Agreement, withdrawal of the Bid, rejection of the Bid or declaration of the Selection Procedure void pursuant to the Applicable Law ("**Bid Validity Period**").

4.7. **Bid Security**

4.7.1. Qualified Applicant’s compliance with its Bid and the Tender Documentation shall be secured by a bank guarantee, which should conform to the requirements of para. 3) of section 1 of ANNEX 4 (*Content of Bid*) (the "**Bid Security**"). Failure to comply with the requirements for Bid Security established by this RFP (particularly, failure to submit a Bid Security as part of the Bid or submission of a non-conforming Bid Security) shall be the ground for rejection of the Bid.

4.7.2. The Bid Security shall remain valid for a period (the "**Bid Security Validity Period**") starting on the day on which the Bid Security is first submitted to the Evaluation Commission and ending on the later of any of the following:

(a) nine (9) months after the end date of the Bids Submission Deadline;

(b) the provision of the Operation Security, as required under Clause 8.5.

4.7.3. Each Qualified Applicant shall be under a continuing obligation to ensure that its Bid Security remains in force during the Bid Security Validity Period. The Bid Security of the Winner shall remain valid until submission of the Operation Security to the Competent Authority, as required under Clause8.5. The Bid Security of the Winner shall be returned upon submission of the Operation Security under the terms and conditions of the Agreement.

4.7.4. The Bid Securities of Qualified Applicants that were not designated as the Winner of the Selection Procedure (with the exception of the Second Ranking Bidder, whose Bid Security will be retained until conclusion of the Agreement with the Winner) will be returned on the next Business Day after publication of the results of the Selection Procedure under Clause 7.5.3.

4.7.5. The Bid Security of a Qualified Applicant shall be forfeited in cases established in Article 14.11(4) of the PPP Law.

4.7.6. In case the Competent Authority calls on the Bid Security in accordance with this RFP, the respective amount of the Bid Security shall be transferred by a bank that issued the bank guarantee to the account indicated by the Competent Authority.

4.8. Responsibility for Correctness and Completeness of Bids

4.8.1. Qualified Applicant shall be responsible for providing correct and complete information in the Bid. By submitting the Bid, the Qualified Applicant also acknowledges that:

(c) all information contained in the Bid shall remain true and correct during the entire duration of the Selection Procedure, up to the conclusion of the Agreement (in case that Qualified Applicant is determined as the Winner);

(d) at any stage of the Selection Procedure the Evaluation Commission may disqualify the Applicant and the Competent Authority may refuse to sign the Agreement in case it is established that the Applicant submitted willingly incorrect or false information in its Bid;

(e) the Evaluation Commission and the Competent Authority shall not be responsible for correctness and completeness of the information contained in the Bid.

5. SUBMISSION AND REGISTRATION OF BIDS

5.1. Bids Submission Deadline

5.1.1. Qualified Applicants shall submit Bids to the Evaluation Commission within ninety (90) days of the publication date of the Request for Proposal at Mineconomy's official website ("**Bids Submission Deadline**"). Bids shall be in any case submitted no later than 18:00 of the last day of the Bids Submission Deadline. Any Bids submitted after the Bids Submission Deadline will be disregarded.

5.2. Arrangements for Submission of Bids

5.2.1. The Authorized Person shall send a prior request to the secretary of the Evaluation Commission to arrange submission of the Bid. The Authorized Person may submit this request:

(a) by hand at the address and according to the working schedule of the Evaluation Commission indicated in the Data Sheet, or

(b) by email to the email address of the Evaluation Commission indicated in the Data Sheet.

5.2.2. The request for submission of the Bid shall:

(a) indicate the full name of the Qualified Applicant;

(b) indicate the full name of the Authorized Person that will submit the Bid;

(c) indicate the requested date and time for submitting the Bid within the Bids Submission Deadline and according to the working schedule of the Evaluation Commission set out in the Data Sheet;

(d) contain copies of the identity documents and copies of the Authorizing Documents of the Authorized Person that will submit the Bid (hard copies – if the request is submitted at the address of the Evaluation Commission by hand; email attachments in the form of scanned copies – if the request is submitted via email).

If the request is submitted at the address of the Evaluation Commission by hand, the Authorized Person shall have the original identity documents and the copies of the Authorizing Documents to be admitted to premises of the Evaluation Commission.

Copies of identity documents indicated in item (d) above that are prepared in a foreign language (other than any of the Official Languages) shall be translated and certified in accordance with the requirements of ANNEX 4 (*Content of Bid*).

5.2.3. The secretary of the Evaluation Commission shall no later than on the next Business Day after the date of the Qualified Applicant's request for submission of the Bid provide an email reply to such a request. This reply shall set out the date and time for submitting the Bid (which shall by default be no later than on the third Business Day after the date requested by the Qualified Applicant under Clause 5.2.2, but in any case no later than the Bids Submission Deadline), as well as indicate other information which may be relevant for submission of the Bid. The Authorized Person shall acknowledge via email the receipt of the reply of the secretary of the Evaluation Commission with the scheduled date and time for submission of the Bid.

5.2.4. Qualified Applicants are advised to submit their Bids in a time-wise manner until expiry of the Bids Submission Deadline. Qualified Applicants shall bear all risks associated with improper planning of timing for submission of their Bids, particularly in cases where such submission is planned for the time imminently close to expiry of the Bids Submission Deadline, which does not make it possible to conduct all arrangements required for submission of Bids in accordance with this RFP.

5.3. **Submission and Registration of Bids**

5.3.1. The Authorized Person shall deliver the Bid by hand to the secretary of the Evaluation Commission at the time and date scheduled in accordance with Clause 5.2. The Authorized Person shall have the original identity documents and the copies of the Authorizing Documents to be admitted to premises of the Evaluation Commission.

For the avoidance of doubt, it is expressly specified that Qualified Applicants shall not be allowed to submit their Bids by mail or fax.

5.3.2. The secretary of the Evaluation Commission shall register the Bid in its records in presence of the Authorized Person upon checking and confirming that the outer envelope or the postal box with the Bid and the Authorizing Documents of the Authorized Person are prepared in accordance with this Request for Proposal. The outer envelope or postal box shall not be opened during registration of the Bid. The secretary of the Evaluation Commission shall note in its records the Bid registration details indicated in paragraph 110 of the PPP Procedure, as well as the full name of the Authorized Person and non-conformities with the requirements for preparing the outer envelope or postal box with Bids (if any) as per Clause 4.3. The secretary of the Evaluation Commission shall also mark the Bid registration details indicated in paragraph 110 of the PPP Procedure on the outer envelope or postal box with the Bid.

5.3.3. During the registration of the Bid, the Authorized Person shall sign off in the records to confirm that the Bid has been duly accepted and registered. Should the Authorized Person refuse to sign, the secretary of the Evaluation Commission shall make a note to this effect in the records. The same sign off rules may apply (where appropriate) in case the Bid is not subject to acceptance and registration, as set out in Clause 5.3.4.

The secretary of the Evaluation Commission shall provide the Authorized Person with a note containing the following information:

(a) Bid registration details as per Clause 5.3.2 above;

(b) indication of the scheduled date, time and location of the session on opening of outer packages with Bids;

(c) the full name of the secretary of the Evaluation Commission that carried out registration of the Bid.

5.3.4. The following Bids shall not be accepted and registered:

(a) Bids submitted by mail or fax. Bids submitted by mail shall be returned unopened (in outer envelope or postal box) to the sender with the relevant rejection notice. Bids submitted by fax shall be disregarded, with the relevant rejection notice sent by fax to the sender.

(b) Bids submitted in breach of Clause 4.3 or Clause 5.2, as well as Bids submitted by persons that did not present the identity documents or the Authorizing Documents upon request at submission of the Bids. Those Bids shall be returned unopened in outer envelope or postal box (if applicable) with the relevant rejection notice by hand to the Authorized Person and/or to a person that did not provide the identity documents or the Authorizing Documents (as the case may be).

(c) Bids submitted after the Bids Submission Deadline. Those Bids shall be returned unopened in outer envelope or postal box to the Qualified Applicant with the relevant rejection notice.

5.3.5. Each Qualified Applicant agrees and acknowledges that submission of a Bid under this Request for Proposal is deemed an acceptance of the terms of this RFP by such Qualified Applicant, including, but not limited to, the competitive and non-discriminatory nature of the Bids evaluation criteria. The Qualified Applicants agree to initiate any challenge of the conformity of the terms of this RFP to the Applicable Law before expiration of the Bids Submission Deadline.

6. ADDITIONAL INFORMATION REGARDING BIDS. CHANGES TO AND WITHDRAWAL OF BIDS

6.1. Procedure for Inquiries Regarding Bids

6.1.1. Qualified Applicant may receive additional information or clarifications regarding participation in the Selection Procedure and preparation and submission of Bids in response to their written requests in accordance with this Clause 6.1 or at the clarification meetings in accordance with Clause 6.2. The request for additional information or clarifications in relation to participation in the Selection Procedure and preparation and submission of Bids shall be submitted by the Authorized Person prior to expiry of Bids Submission Deadline. The request may be submitted:

(a) by hand at the address and according to the working schedule of the Evaluation Commission indicated in the Data Sheet;

(b) by email to the email address of the Evaluation Commission indicated in the Data Sheet.

If the request is submitted by hand, the Authorized Person submitting the request shall have the original identity documents and the copies of the Authorizing Documents to submit such a request.

6.1.2. The request for additional information or clarifications regarding the Bids shall contain the following information:

(a) full name of an entity (Qualified Applicant) filing the request, registration and contact details of such entity;

(b) reference to the Request for Proposal;

(c) clearly articulated request to provide information or clarifications regarding the Bid;

(d) date of the request.

6.1.3. The Evaluation Commission shall provide information or clarifications in response to the requests in the order in which they are received, at least within five (5) Business Days and no longer than twenty (20) Business Days from the receipt of each request. All responses of the Evaluation Commission to the requests for information/clarifications under this Clause 6.1 shall be publicly available and shall be published at the Mineconomy's official website in a depersonalized form, i.e. in the manner that should not enable identification of any information about the Qualified Applicants who submitted the requests.

The Evaluation Commission shall provide information or clarifications in response to the requests solely to the extent required for preparing and submitting Bids under this RFP. The Evaluation Commission may provide a consolidated response to several similar or identical (repeated) requests.

6.1.4. The Evaluation Commission reserves the right not to respond to certain requests, particularly those that do not meet the requirements of Clauses 6.1.1 and 6.1.2, were filed after the Bids Submission Deadline, or in case the Evaluation Commission does not have enough time to respond to such requests due to expiry of the Bids Submission Deadline.

6.2. **Clarification Meetings**

6.2.1. The Evaluation Commission may hold the open clarification meetings to discuss and clarify questions the Qualified Applicants may have regarding preparation and submission of Bids. The Evaluation Commission may conduct clarification meetings within the Bids Submission Deadline in accordance with the tentative timetable for such meetings contained in the Time Schedule, as well as taking into account the requests for such meetings from the Qualified Applicants. The Qualified Applicants may address the Evaluation Commission with the request for a clarification meeting in the manner provided in Clauses (a) and/or (b) and no later than the twentieth (20^{th}) day of the Bids Submission Deadline. The Evaluation Commission shall not be bound by the timetable of clarification meetings regarding Bids indicated in the Time Schedule and may set up such meetings as may be required and appropriate for the purposes of conducting the Selection Procedure at the RFP stage.

The Evaluation Commission shall publish the announcement of the clarification meeting regarding Bids at the official Mineconomy's website at least four (4) days prior to the scheduled date of such meeting. The announcement shall contain the key background details about each meeting determined by the Evaluation Commission, including the scheduled date, time, format (online/offline) and location / access details of the meeting.

6.2.2. The Qualified Applicants shall be entitled to participate in the clarification meeting subject to submission of a written notice to the Evaluation Commission within two (2) days prior to the scheduled date of the meeting. This notice shall contain the request for attendance of the meeting and the request for additional information or clarifications regarding the Bids which the Qualified Applicants would like to address at the meeting. The notice for participation in the clarification meeting shall be prepared and delivered in accordance with Clauses 6.1.1-6.1.2, subject to the following change: the notice shall additionally contain (i) the list of persons (up to seven (7) persons) who wish to attend the clarification meeting (the Authorized Persons of a Qualified Applicant) and (ii) the copies of the identity documents of the requested attendees of the clarification meeting.

6.2.3. The Authorized Persons attending the offline clarification meeting shall have the original identity documents and copies of the Authorizing Documents to be admitted to the premises of the Evaluation Commission and attend the meeting. Such persons shall sign the register of the secretary of the Evaluation Commission evidencing their attendance. In case these persons fail

to attend the meeting, the Evaluation Commission shall proceed with conducting the meeting without them and shall reflect the absence of such persons in its minutes.

Absence of any Authorized Person at the clarification meeting shall not affect the validity of any such meeting.

6.2.4. The clarification meetings shall be dedicated solely to discussion of issues related to preparation and submission of Bids, in response to the prior requests for additional information or clarifications filed by the Qualified Applicants as per Clause 6.2.2. The Evaluation Commission may further clarify the procedural details of the meeting (such as the agenda, deliberation procedure and timeframes of the meeting) to the Qualified Applicants in the announcement of such meeting and/or at the opening of such meeting.

6.2.5. The Evaluation Commission shall conduct and document the outcomes of the clarification meeting regarding Bids in accordance with the applicable terms and conditions of the PPP Procedure and the Evaluation Commission's rules of procedure. The minutes of the clarification meeting shall not be signed by the Authorized Persons attending the meeting.

The Evaluation Commission shall further publish the consolidated response to questions relating to preparation and submission of Bids which were discussed and addressed at the clarification meeting at the Mineconomy's official website within two (2) Business Days after the date of such meeting (such response should be depersonalized, i.e., should not enable identification of any information about the Qualified Applicants).

6.3. **Changes to Bids**

6.3.1. The Qualified Applicant may make changes to the Bid prior to the expiration of the Bids Submission Deadline. For the avoidance of doubt, no changes to Bids shall be allowed after the expiration of Bids Submission Deadline, with the exception of clarifications provided under Clause 7.3.2.

6.3.2. Changes to the Bid may cover the entire Bid or certain parts or documents comprising the Bid as per the structure provided in ANNEX 4 (*Content of Bid*) and may involve amendments (modifications) and addenda (supplements) to the Bid.

Changes to Bids shall be prepared and submitted in accordance with paragraph 113 of the PPP Procedure and the following requirements:

(a) The Qualified Applicant shall prepare the original and copies of changes to the paper-based Bid in accordance with the requirements of Clause 4.1, clearly marking the type of changes ("AMMENDMENT", "ADDENDUM") on each of them, as the case may be. The Qualified Applicant shall also summarize all changes to the Bid in the comparative table, the original and copies of which shall be prepared as part of the respective original and copies of changes to the Bid and shall be enclosed in the inner envelope with changes to the Bid, as indicated in item (b) below.

(b) The Qualified Applicant shall put the changes to the Bid into the inner envelope(s) that shall be prepared in accordance with the requirements of Clause 4.2 and shall clearly mark the type of changes ("AMMENDMENT", "ADDENDUM") and the part of the Bid which was changed ("TECHNICAL PROPOSAL", "FINANCIAL PROPOSAL"), as the case may be. The Qualified Applicant shall further place inner envelope(s) with changes to the Bid into the outer envelope or postal box prepared in accordance with the requirements of Clause 4.3 and clearly marked as "OUTER ENVELOPE/POSTAL BOX WITH CHANGES TO THE BID".

(c) The Authorized Person shall agree on the date and time of the submission and shall submit changes to the Bid to the secretary of the Evaluation Commission in the manner set out in Clauses 5.2-5.3, subject to necessary changes under this Clause 6.3. The secretary of the Evaluation Commission shall provide the Authorized Person with written confirmation of the receipt of changes to the Bid.

6.3.3. Qualified Applicants are advised to make changes to their Bids in a time-wise manner until expiry of the Bids Submission Deadline. Qualified Applicants shall bear all risks associated with improper planning of timing for changes to their Bids, particularly in cases where such changes are planned for the time imminently close to expiry of the Bids Submission Deadline, which does not make it possible to conduct all arrangements required for submission and acceptance of changes to the Bids in accordance with this RFP.

6.3.4. Violation of the requirements for making changes to the Bids established herein shall be the grounds for rejecting the Bid in accordance with this RFP.

6.4. **Withdrawal of Bids**

6.4.1. The Qualified Applicant may withdraw its Bid prior to the expiration of the Bids Submission Deadline. Withdrawal of Bids shall be carried out in accordance with paragraph 113 of the PPP Procedure and the following requirements:

(a) The Qualified Applicant shall prepare a written notice on withdrawal of the Bid. The notice shall refer to the Qualified Applicant's Bid and shall be clearly marked as "BID WITHDRAWAL NOTICE", as well as indicate the full name and contact details of the respective Qualified Applicant.

(b) The Authorized Person shall agree on the date and time of the submission and shall submit the Bid withdrawal notice to the secretary of the Evaluation Commission in the manner set out in Clauses 5.2-5.3, subject to necessary changes under this Clause 6.4. The secretary of the Evaluation Commission shall provide the Authorized Person with written confirmation of the receipt of the Bid withdrawal notice and shall return the unopened outer envelope or postal box with the Bid to the Authorized Person.

6.4.2. The Qualified Applicant that withdrew its Bid may submit another Bid prior to expiry of the Bids Submission Deadline in accordance with the requirements of this RFP.

6.4.3. Qualified Applicants are advised to withdraw their Bids in a time-wise manner until expiry of the Bids Submission Deadline. Qualified Applicants shall bear all risks associated with improper planning of timing for withdrawal of their Bids, particularly in cases where such withdrawal is planned for the time imminently close to expiry of the Bids Submission Deadline, which does not make it possible to conduct all arrangements required for submission and acceptance of the Bids withdrawal notice in accordance with this RFP.

7. OPENING AND EVALUATION OF BIDS

7.1. **Bids Evaluation Deadline and Organization of the Evaluation Procedure**

7.1.1. The Evaluation Commission shall evaluate the Bids and take decision on selection of the Winner within eighty (80) days after the day of the meeting on opening of outer packages with Bids and Technical Proposal Envelopes conducted under Clause 7.2 (the "**Bids Evaluation Deadline**").

7.1.2. The Evaluation Commission will open the contents of Bids at the open sessions, which shall be available for attendance by Qualified Applicants and their Authorized Persons. By decision of the Evaluation Commission, meetings of the Evaluation Commission on evaluation of Bids, as well as consultations with Advisors on such matters may be held privately. Such closed meetings and consultations shall not be considered to be the open sessions of the Evaluation Commission for the purposes of this RFP and shall not be available for attendance by the Qualified Applicants and the Authorized Persons.

7.1.3. The Evaluation Commission shall evaluate the Bids under the quality- and value-based selection method in accordance with the requirements of this RFP.

7.2. **Opening of Outer Packages with Bids and Contents of Technical Proposals**

7.2.1. The Evaluation Commission shall hold the session dedicated to opening of the outer packages with Bids (outer envelopes and/or postal boxes) and contents of Technical Proposals on the first Business Day following the expiration of the Bids Submission Deadline. The scheduled date, time and location of this session are specified in the Data Sheet.

7.2.2. At this session, the Evaluation Commission in the presence of the Authorized Persons who choose to attend the meeting shall conduct the following procedures:

(a) open the outer envelopes and postal boxes with registered Bids, including the outer envelopes and postal boxes with changes to Bids submitted pursuant to Clause 6.3;

(b) open the Technical Proposal Envelopes to verify completeness of Technical Proposal documents.

For the avoidance of doubt, session of the Evaluation Commission conducted under this Clause 7.2 shall not involve opening of the contents of Financial Proposals, as well as evaluation of Bids (both Technical Proposals and Financial Proposals) in accordance with this RFP.

7.2.3. The Authorized Persons shall have the original identity documents and copies of the Authorizing Documents to be admitted to the premises of the Evaluation Commission and attend the session conducted under this Clause 7.2. The Authorized Persons attending this session shall sign the register of the secretary of the Evaluation Commission evidencing their attendance. In case the Authorized Person fails to attend the session, the Evaluation Commission shall proceed with conducting the session and shall reflect the absence of the Authorized Person in its minutes. Absence of any Authorized Person at the session conducted under this Clause 7.2 shall not affect the validity of any such session.

7.2.4. During the opening of each outer envelope/postal box with the Bid, the Evaluation Commission shall announce the name of the Qualified Applicant, verify that the outer envelope/postal box contains the Technical Proposal Envelope(s) and the Financial Proposal Envelope(s) pursuant to Clause 4.2, and write down on each inner envelope the Bid registration details marked on the outer envelope/postal box at the time of the Bid's registration in accordance with Clause 5.3.2. The Evaluation Commission shall proceed in the same manner with the opening of outer envelopes/postal boxes with changes to Bids (if any), verifying in each case whether such outer envelopes/postal boxes contain the inner envelopes formalized in accordance with Clause 6.3.

7.2.5. After completion of the procedures provided in Clause 7.2.4, the Evaluation Commission shall open the contents of Technical Proposals (Technical Proposal Envelopes) to verify whether such contents:

(a) are complete and contain the Technical Proposal documents which generally conform to the structure of Technical Proposal provided in ANNEX 4 (*Content of Bid*); and

(b) in terms of their form and structure, conform to the requirements of this RFP without apparent Material Deviations, mistakes or other formal irregularities.

Non-compliance with the content requirements provided in items (a) and/or (b) of this Clause 7.2.5 shall be the ground for rejection of Bid.

7.2.6. The outcomes of the session conducted under this Clause 7.2 shall be documented in the minutes of the Evaluation Commission. The minutes shall not be signed by the Authorized Persons present at the meeting.

7.3. **Evaluation of Technical Proposals**

7.3.1. The Evaluation Commission shall evaluate the Technical Proposals within thirty five (35) days after the date of the opening session conducted under Clause 7.2 (the "**Technical Proposals Evaluation Deadline**") based on the criteria and methodology for evaluation of Technical Proposals provided in ANNEX 5 (*Evaluation of Bids*).

The Evaluation Commission may hold the closed meetings and consultations with Advisors on evaluation of Technical Proposals in accordance with its rules of procedure, as provided in Clause 7.1.2.

7.3.2. The Evaluation Commission should invoke the clarification process established in paragraphs 129-130 the PPP Procedure to clarify discrepancies in the Technical Proposal during its evaluation. The Evaluation Commission shall send the relevant notification to this effect to a Qualified Applicant in the manner set out in Clauses (a) and/or (b), but in any event prior to the Technical Proposals Evaluation Deadline.

The clarification process under this Clause 7.3.2 may substantially involve amendments in the Technical Proposal (including addition, removal, replacement, re-submission of documents constituting the Technical Proposal), which do not constitute the Material Change. For the purposes of this Clause 7.3.2, the "Material Change" shall mean any amendment in the Technical Proposal, which

(a) deviates from or violates the mandatory requirements of the Selection Procedure established by the Applicable Law or the Tender Documentation (in particular, the mandatory requirements for Qualified Applicants and their Bids provided in this RFP); and/or

(b) would unfairly affect, if implemented, the competitive position of other Qualified Applicants who are presenting substantially responsive Technical Proposals.

Qualified Applicant's failure to provide information in response to the clarification request under this Clause 7.3.2 will result in evaluation of the Bid on the 'as-is' basis and may result in rejection of the Bid in case the lack of the requested information constitutes a Material Deviation in evaluation of such Bid.

For the avoidance of doubt, this Clause 7.3.2 shall not allow making any changes whatsoever in the Financial Proposal.

7.3.3. The Evaluation Commission shall take decision on the outcomes of evaluation of Technical Proposals (including with an indication of the evaluation details provided in paragraph 121 of the PPP Procedure) no later than the last day of the Technical Proposals Evaluation Deadline. On the day of this decision, the secretary of the Evaluation Commission shall also provide the following notifications to the Authorized Persons in the manner set out in Clauses (a) and/or (b):

(a) notification on responsiveness of Technical Proposal – for Qualified Applicants whose Technical Proposals have been recognized as responsive to the requirements of the RFP based on the results of their evaluation. This notification shall contain (i) an indication that Qualified Applicant's Financial Proposal will be subject to further evaluation, and (ii) an invitation to the session on opening of contents of Financial Proposals to be conducted under Clause 7.4.

This notification should not contain any details of evaluation of Technical Proposals performed by the Evaluation Commission, including the number of points assigned to a Technical Proposal, evaluation ranking of a Technical Proposal, or any information on evaluation of Technical Proposals of other Qualified Applicants;

(b) notification on rejection of Bid – for Qualified Applicants whose Technical Proposals have been rejected as non-responsive to the requirements of the RFP based on the results of their evaluation. This notification shall contain (i) substantiation for determination of Qualified Applicant's Technical Proposal as non-responsive to the requirements of the RFP, and (ii) a statement that the entire Qualified Applicant's Bid is rejected and is subject to return to the Qualified Applicant, with the proposed arrangements for returning the Bid (Technical Proposal and unopened Financial Proposal).

This notification should not contain any information on evaluation of Technical Proposals of other Qualified Applicants.

7.4. **Opening of Contents of Financial Proposals**

7.4.1. The Evaluation Commission shall hold the session dedicated to opening of the contents of Financial Proposals no later than the second Business Day after the date of the decision on the outcomes of evaluation of Technical Proposals taken under Clause 7.3.3. This session will be available for attendance for the Authorized Persons of the Qualified Applicants that received notifications on responsiveness of their Technical Proposals. The scheduled date, time and location of this session will be provided in the notifications indicated in Clause (a).

This session will be subject to the same attendance requirements for the eligible Authorized Persons as those provided in Clause 7.2.

7.4.2. At this session, the Evaluation Commission shall open the contents of Financial Proposals (Financial Proposal Envelopes) of the Qualified Applicants who received notifications indicated in Clause (a) to verify whether such contents:

(a) are complete and contain the Financial Proposal documents which generally conform to the structure of Financial Proposal provided in ANNEX 4 (Content of Bid); and

(b) in terms of their form and structure, conform to the requirements of this RFP without apparent Material Deviations, mistakes or other formal irregularities.

Non-compliance with the content requirements provided in items (a) and/or (b) of this Clause 7.4.2 shall be the ground for rejection of Bid.

7.4.3. For the avoidance of doubt, session of the Evaluation Commission conducted under this Clause 7.4 shall not involve any of the following:

(a) disclosure of the details of evaluation of Technical Proposals performed by the Evaluation Commission, including the number of points assigned to each Technical Proposal, evaluation ranking of Technical Proposals, or any other information on evaluation of Technical Proposals of any Qualified Applicant;

(b) opening of contents of Financial Proposals of Qualified Applicants whose Technical Proposals have been rejected as non-responsive to the requirements of the RFP based on the results of their evaluation;

(c) evaluation of Financial Proposals in accordance with this RFP.

7.5. **Evaluation of Financial Proposals and Project Award**

7.5.1. The Evaluation Commission shall evaluate the Financial Proposals and determine the Winner within the period remaining from the date of session on opening of contents of Financial Proposals conducted under Clause 7.4 until the expiry of Bids Evaluation Deadline, based on the criteria and methodology for evaluation of Financial Proposals and determination of the Winner provided in in ANNEX 5 (*Evaluation of Bids*).

The Evaluation Commission may hold the closed meetings and consultations with Advisors on evaluation of Financial Proposals and determination of the Winner in accordance with its rules of procedure, as provided in Clause 7.1.2.

7.5.2. Once evaluation of Financial Proposals is complete and the Winner has been determined in accordance with the requirements of this RFP, the Evaluation Commission shall take decision on the outcomes of evaluation of Bids and declaration of the Winner (the "**Award Decision**"), including with an indication of the evaluation details provided in paragraph 127 of the PPP Procedure. The Evaluation Commission shall adopt the Award Decision no later than the last day of Bids Evaluation Deadline.

7.5.3. The Evaluation Commission shall publish the name of the Winner and other information about the outcomes of evaluation of Bids required under paragraph 135 of the PPP Procedure at its website within five (5) Business Days after the date of adopting the Award Decision.

7.6. Evaluation to Be Confidential

7.6.1. Information about the outcomes of evaluation of Bids shall not be disclosed to Qualified Applicants or any other persons not officially concerned with the evaluation process until announcement of the Winner under Clause 7.5.3.

7.6.2. Any effort by a Qualified Applicant to negotiate with or influence the Evaluation Commission or the Competent Authority in the process of evaluation of Bids may result in the rejection of the Bid.

8. PROJECT AWARD PROCEDURES

8.1. Notification of Award

8.1.1. Within ten (10) Business Days after adoption of the Award Decision, the Evaluation Commission shall send written notification to the Qualified Applicant designated as the Winner (the "**Notification of Award**") to inform the Winner about the subsequent procedures and requirements following the Project award.

8.1.2. The Notification of Award shall be sent in the manner set out in Clauses (a) and/or (b) and shall contain, in particular:

(a) invitation to take part in finalization and signing of the Agreement;

(b) instructions in relation to the procedure of finalization and signing of the Agreement;

(c) request to establish the Project Company.

8.2. Incorporation of a Project Company

8.2.1. The Winner shall incorporate a legal entity under the Applicable Law that will be a party to the Agreement and implement the Project as the private partner (the "**Project Company**"). The Winner shall incorporate the Project Company within thirty (30) days after the date of Notification of Award.

8.2.2. To evidence compliance with the requirement for establishment of the Project Company, the Winner shall in the manner set out in Clauses (a) and/or (b) provide the Competent Authority with the complete copies of (i) the constituent documents of the Project Company and (ii) the resolutions adopted by the shareholders authorizing the Project Company to conclude and perform the Agreement.

8.2.3. In case the Winner fails to incorporate a Project Company in accordance with this Clause, this shall be the ground for the Competent Authority to cancel the Selection Procedure.

8.3. Shareholding of the Project Company

8.3.1. At the time of conclusion of the Agreement the shareholding structure of the Project Company shall fully conform to the shareholding structure submitted by the Winner as part of its Bid, as well as comply with the provisions of Clauses 8.3.2-8.3.3.

8.3.2. The single-entity Winner shall hold individually 100% of voting rights or equity in the Project Company and have effective control over the technical and operational activities of the Project Company.

8.3.3. In case the Winner is the Consortium:

(a) The Lead Member shall hold individually at least 50%+1% of voting rights or equity in the Project Company, be the largest shareholder of the Project Company and have effective control over the technical and operational activities of the Project Company.

(b) Each Consortium Member of the winning Consortium other than the Lead Member of such Consortium shall hold no less than 10% of the voting rights or equity in the Project Company.

(c) All Consortium Members of the winning Consortium shall in aggregate hold 100% of the voting rights or equity in the Project Company.

8.3.4. After conclusion of the Agreement, the Winner and the Consortium Members, as shareholders of the Project Company, will have to comply with the shareholding and change-of-control requirements set out in the Agreement.

8.3.5. At any time before conclusion of the Agreement, the Competent Authority shall be entitled to address the Winner and/or the Project Company with the request to provide the up-to-date evidence that the requirements set forth in Clauses 8.3.2-8.3.3 (as may be appropriate) are met. If the Winner and/or the Project Company either (i) fails to submit such evidence within ten (10) Business Days after the date of the request, or (ii) provides evidence which does not substantially confirm that such requirements are met, this shall be the ground for the Competent Authority to cancel the Selection Procedure.

8.4. **Finalization and Signing of the Agreement**

8.4.1. Upon submission of the Notification of Award to the Winner, the Competent Authority shall initiate the procedure of finalization and signing of the Agreement. The details of this procedure shall be specified in the relevant instructions provided to the Winner as part of the Notification of Award.

8.4.2. During finalization of the signing version of the Agreement, the parties will be entitled to make limited changes and additions to the Agreement which should not affect or deviate from (i) essential conditions of the Project reflected in the feasibility study, (ii) essential conditions of the Agreement required under the PPP Law, and (iii) binding proposals and indicators contained in the Bid of the Winner. The outcomes of all discussions regarding finalization of the signing version of the Agreement shall be documented in the written minutes.

8.4.3. The Agreement shall be concluded with the Project Company no later than two (2) months after the date of the Notification of Award (the "**Execution Deadline**"). The Execution Deadline may be further extended for no more than one (1) month upon the written request for extension from the Winner and/or the Project Company. The decision on the extension of the Execution Deadline shall be within the sole discretion of the Competent Authority.

8.5. **Operation Security**

8.5.1. The Project Company will be required to provide the Operation Security to the Competent Authority in accordance with the terms and conditions of the Agreement.

8.5.2. The Winner and the Project Company will be responsible for the Bid Security to remain valid until provision of the Operation Security to the Competent Authority in the manner indicated in the Agreement.

8.5.3. The Winner shall extend the original Bid Security Validity Period from the day of receiving the Notification of Award for as long as it may be necessary and/or required by the Competent Authority, until the provision of the Operation Security. Such extension shall be made no later than fifteen (15) Business Days prior to the expiration of the original Bid Security Validity Period.

8.6. **Failure of the Winner**

8.6.1. In case any of the exclusion grounds provided in para. 47 of the PPP Procedure is discovered or arises with respect to Winner after announcement of the Award Decision, such Winner shall be rejected from further participation in the Selection Procedure (including from conclusion of the Agreement), and the Evaluation Commission shall take decision on determination of the Bidder with the second best Bid (the "**Second Ranking Bidder**") as the Winner.

Decision of the Evaluation Commission on determination of the Second Ranking Bidder as the Winner taken under this Clause 8.6.1 shall be treated as the Award Decision. The Second Ranking Bidder shall assume the status of the Winner from the date of publication of such decision (as required under Clause 7.5.3), and further award procedures should be carried out as if the Second Ranking Bidder had been announced as the Winner under this RFP (this will include, in particular, going through the steps provided in Clauses 8.1 to 8.5 above).

9. MISCELLANEOUS

9.1. Unethical Practice Reservation

9.1.1. Any effort by a Qualified Applicant to negotiate with or influence the Evaluation Commission in the process of evaluation of Bids and determination of the Winner shall be the ground to reject a Bid of such Qualified Applicant.

9.1.2. In cases where:

(a) a Qualified Applicant resorts to deceit and/or fraud in its interactions with the Competent Authority, the Evaluation Commission or other persons officially involved in the Selection Procedure, or

(b) a Qualified Applicant is proven to have personally or through an intermediary (either directly or indirectly) offered or attempted to offer a bribe to any representative of the Competent Authority and/or any member of the Evaluation Commission,

(c) the Bid of the respective Qualified Applicant shall be rejected, the results of the Selection Procedure shall be cancelled (if applicable), and the Qualified Applicant's Bid Security or the Operation Security (as the case may be) shall be forfeited.

9.1.3. The provisions of this Clause 9.1 shall apply without prejudice to any rights of the Competent Authority to claim damages and without prejudice to any criminal, administrative or other proceedings that can be carried out according to Applicable Law.

9.2. Declaration of the Selection Procedure Void (Not Having Taken Place) and Cancellation of the Selection Procedure

9.2.1. The Evaluation Commission shall declare the Selection Procedure at the RFP stage void (not having taken place) in cases established in the PPP Law. For the avoidance of doubt, the Evaluation Commission shall declare the Selection Procedure at the RFP stage void (not having taken place) under the following circumstances:

(a) no Bid has been submitted to the Evaluation Commission prior to the Bids Submission Deadline or all Bids submitted to the Evaluation Commission have been withdrawn according to the RFP;

(b) none of Bids submitted to the Evaluation Commission complies with the requirements of this RFP (i.e., all Bids submitted to the Evaluation Commission have been rejected in accordance with this RFP);

(c) no Agreement has been concluded.

9.2.2. The Evaluation Commission shall document its decisions taken under this Clause 9.2 in its minutes in accordance with the PPP Procedure (including as per the requirements of paragraphs 137 - 138 of the PPP Procedure).

9.2.3. At any stage of the Selection Procedure, the Competent Authority may, at its own initiative or based on the proposal of the Evaluation Commission, cancel (with or without further re-launch) the Selection Procedure. The Competent Authority's decision taken under this Clause 9.2.3 shall be published at the official websites of the Competent Authority and Mineconomy no later than the first Business Day after the date of such a decision.

9.2.4. None of the decisions taken by the Evaluation Commission or the Competent Authority under this Clause 9.2 shall give rise to any right or claim for compensation or indemnification of any Applicant.

9.3. **Changes to the Request for Proposal**

9.3.1. The Evaluation Commission may make non-material or material changes to the RFP (including changes to annexes to the RFP) during the Bids Submission Deadline.

Changes to the RFP shall not contradict the feasibility study for the Project and shall follow the principles of transparency, equality and non-discrimination.

9.3.2. Material changes to the RFP shall involve changes which significantly affect the nature, scope and requirements of the RFP or conduct of the Selection Procedure at the RFP stage. Material changes to the RFP may include, particularly:

(a) changes significantly affecting the requirements for Bids established in the RFP;

(b) changes significantly affecting the approach to evaluation of Bids in the RFP;

(c) changes significantly affecting other essential requirements of the RFP which were determined as material changes by the Evaluation Commission.

9.3.3. The Evaluation Commission may make and publish changes to the RFP without extension of the Bids Submission Deadline:

(a) no later than fifteen (15) days prior to expiry of the Bids Submission Deadline – for non-material changes, or

(b) no later than thirty (30) days prior to expiry of the Bids Submission Deadline – for material changes.

9.3.4. In case changes to the RFP are made and published after (later than) the timeframes established in Clause 9.3.3 (for non-material and material changes respectively), the Evaluation Commission shall:

(a) extend the Bids Submission Deadline so that to provide at least fifteen (15) days for submission of Bids from the date of publication of non-material changes to the RFP, or

(b) extend the Bids Submission Deadline so that to provide at least thirty (30) days for submission of Bids from the date of publication of material changes to the RFP,

unless all Qualified Applicants provide written consent to not extend the Bids Submission Deadline.

For this purpose, the Evaluation Commission shall share the draft changes to the RFP with all Qualified Applicants.

9.3.5. The Evaluation Commission shall publish changes to the RFP at the official Mineconomy's website on the next Business Day following the approval of such changes by the Evaluation Commission. The publication of changes to the RFP shall include (i) the new (updated) version of the RFP with the relevant changes, and (ii) the summary of changes to the RFP in a separate document.

9.3.6. The Evaluation Commission shall have the ultimate discretion in approval or rejection of changes to the RFP, as well as in determination of whether such changes are material or non-material in accordance with this RFP and may consult on these matters (if required) with the Competent Authority. The Competent Authority further reserves the right to cancel the Selection Procedure (with or without further re-launch) based on review of changes to the RFP proposed by the Evaluation Commission in accordance with Applicable Law.

ANNEX 1. DATA SHEET

The following data shall supplement the provisions of the Request for Proposal.

Project Name	Project on the Biometric Passport and National ID Card Issuance Services
Contacts of the Competent Authority	Ministry of Internal Affairs of the Republic of Armenia Republic Square, Government House 1, 0010 Yerevan, Republic of Armenia Website: https://www.gov.am
Contacts of the Evaluation Commission	Address: Ministry of Internal Affairs of the Republic of Armenia 130 Nalbandyan Street, Yerevan, 0025 Contact emails: mcs@gov.am, passidppp@isaa.am
Working Schedule of the Evaluation Commission	Monday – Friday 9:00 to 18:00
Authorized Officials for the Purposes of Communication Related to Bids	Arpine Sargsyan, the Head of EC, Deputy Minister of Internal Affairs, RA Nelly Davtyan, the Secretary of EC, Deputy Head of the Migration and Citizenship Service of MIA, RA
Language of Bids and Language of Correspondence	Armenian, English or Russian
Number of Copies of Bids	• One (1) printed original • One (1) printed copy • Two (2) electronic copies (on USB drive)
Details of the Session on Opening of Outer Packages with Bids and Contents of Technical Proposals	[To be added]

ANNEX 2. TIME SCHEDULE

Activity	Target Date/Period
Start of the RFP stage of Selection Procedure	Publication date of the RFP at the official Mineconomy's website (the "**RFP Date**")
Clarification requests regarding Bids	From the RFP Date until the Bids Submission Deadline
Communication of responses to clarification requests regarding Bids	During 5 Business Days and no longer than 20 Business Days from the receipt of each request
Clarification meetings	Non-binding tentative schedule First meeting: RFP Date + 10 Business Days Any subsequent meetings: RFP Date + no later than 5 days until expiry of Bids Submission Deadline
Bids Submission Deadline	RFP Date + 90 days
Opening of the outer packages with Bids and contents of Technical Proposals	Bids Submission Deadline + next Business Day (the "**First Opening Date**")
Bids Evaluation Deadline (including determination of the Winner)	The First Opening Date + 80 days
Opening of contents of Financial Proposals	Technical Proposals Evaluation Deadline + 2 Business Days (the "**Second Opening Date**")
Evaluation of Financial Proposals and determination of the Winner	From the Second Opening Date until expiry of Bids Evaluation Deadline
Adoption of Award Decision	No later than the last day of Bids Evaluation Deadline
Announcement of the Winner and outcomes of evaluation of Bids	Award Decision + 5 Business Days
Notification of Award	Award Decision + 10 Business Days
Incorporation of the Project Company	Notification of Award + 30 days
Finalization and signing of the Agreement (the Execution Deadline)	Notification of Award + 2 months

This Time Schedule is presented for general reference purposes.

ANNEX 3. SAMPLE FORM FOR REQUESTING A COPY OF THE FEASIBILITY STUDY

[QUALIFIED APPLICANT'S LETTERHEAD]

Date:___ _____ 2024

Re: Provision of a copy of the feasibility study for the Project on issuance and distribution of identity documents and operation and servicing of the ID facilities in the Republic of Armenia

To: The Evaluation Commission for carrying out the Selection Procedure for the Project

[Name of Qualified Applicant, entity registration details], submits the request for the provision of a copy of the feasibility study for the Project (the "**Feasibility Study**") in accordance with Clause 3.3 of the Request for Proposal. We kindly ask to provide [the printed/electronic] copy of the Feasibility Study.

[Name of Qualified Applicant] hereby:

a) recognizes that the provision and use of the Feasibility Study shall be governed by the Confidentiality Undertaking provided by the [Name of Qualified Applicant] to the Competent Authority, particularly with respect to the use and disclosure of the Confidential Information (as defined in the Confidentiality Undertaking) contained in the Feasibility Study;

b) undertakes not to publish the Feasibility Study or any part thereof;

c) undertakes not to provide or disclose in any form or manner the Feasibility Study or any part thereof to any third parties, with the exception of cases which do not qualify as wrongful disclosure under the Confidentiality Undertaking;

d) recognizes that violation of the obligations regarding the use and disclosure of the Feasibility Study (including the obligations indicated in items (b) and (c) above) may trigger the liability set out in the Confidentiality Undertaking;

e) recognizes the provisions of Clause 3.4 of the RFP in connection with Qualified Applicant's receipt and review of the Feasibility Study.

[signature]

In the capacity of _____[position of] _____[Name of Qualified Applicant]

Contact information of the Authorized Person(s) of the Qualified Applicant

[Address, telephone and email]

Attachments

1. Copies of the Authorizing Documents

ANNEX 4. CONTENT OF BID

The Bid shall consist of two (2) parts, each part being inserted in a separate inner envelope, and contain the following documents:

Part	Description
Part I	**Technical Proposal** containing:
1.1.	**Bid Submission Letter**, as required in para. 1) of section 1 below
1.2.	**Technical Proposal Form**, as required in para. 2) of section 1 below
1.3.	**Bid Security**, as required in para. 3) of section 1 below
1.4.	**Conflict of Interest Statement**, as required in para. 4) of section 1 below
1.5.	**Shareholding of the Project Company**, as required in para. 5) of section 1 below
Part II	**Financial Proposal** containing:
2.1.	**Financial Proposal Form**, as required in para. 1) of section 2 below
2.2.	**Financial Model**, as required in para. 2) of section 2 below

Unless this ANNEX 4 (*Content of Bid*) stipulates otherwise, the Bids shall be prepared and formalized in accordance with the following requirements:

a) All documents composing the Bid shall be in “A4” or “Letter” size format, unless separate parts of Bid require larger format.

b) Documents in a foreign language (other than the Official Languages) which are submitted as part of the Bid shall be duly translated into any of the Official Languages.

c) Electronic versions of the Bid may have the scanned copies of the written signatures of the Authorized Persons on them and/or the qualified digital signatures of a Qualified Applicant corresponding to the requirements of the Applicable Law.

1. Content of Technical Proposal

Each Qualified Applicant shall provide the documents specified in paragraphs 1)-5) of this section 1 below as part of the Technical Proposal.

1) Bid Submission Letter

Each Qualified Applicant shall provide a Bid Submission Letter in any of the Official Languages, using the form attached hereto as Form A (*Bid Submission Letter*). The Bid Submission Letter shall be signed by the Qualified Applicant.

2) Technical Proposal Form

The Technical Proposal Form shall be prepared in any of the Official Languages in accordance with Form B (*Technical Proposal Form*) of this ANNEX 4 (*Content of Bid*). It should encompass all the essential information necessary to demonstrate the Qualified Applicant's compliance with the criteria for evaluation of Technical Proposals provided in ANNEX 5 (*Evaluation of Technical Proposals*).

3) Bid Security

Each Qualified Applicant shall provide a Bid Security in the amount of AMD 170,000,000. The Bid Security shall be an independent, unconditional and irrevocable bank guarantee payable at first demand to the Competent Authority.

The Bid Security shall be provided as the letter of guarantee compliant with the requirements set out in Form C (*Content Requirements for Bid Security*) of this ANNEX 4 (*Content of Bid*), together with the relevant agreement (copy of the agreement) on the provision of Bid Security.

The Bid Security shall not be provided by banks which are not Reliable Banks according to **Error! Reference source not found.** (*Requirements to Reliable Banks*).

The Bid Security that is originally prepared (issued) in a foreign language (other than any of the Official Languages) shall be provided together with its translation into any of the Official Languages.

4) Conflict of Interest Statement

Each Qualified Applicant shall provide a written conflict of interest statement (or statements if the Qualified Applicant is the Consortium) in any of the Official Languages, prepared in the form attached hereto as Form D (*Conflict of Interest Statement*). The statement should be provided regarding any Potential Conflict of Interest or Real Conflict of Interest that a Qualified Applicant (and each Consortium Member, in case of a Consortium) may have with the Selection Procedure, the Project, the Competent Authority, the Evaluation Commission or any entity or person officially involved in the Selection Procedure.

If the Qualified Applicant is a Consortium, it shall submit (i) its conflict of interest statement signed by the Lead Member, which covers and applies to all the Consortium Members (including such Lead Member), and (ii) the conflict of interest statements from each Consortium Member signed by the respective Consortium Members, which shall cover and apply to each respective Consortium Member.

The conflict of interest statement that is originally prepared (issued) in a foreign language (other than any of the Official Languages) shall be provided together with its translation into any of the Official Languages.

5) Shareholding of the Project Company

Each Qualified Applicant shall provide information about the equity ownership structure of the Project Company which will be established to become party to the Agreement and carry out the Project. Such equity ownership structure should be prepared as a chart in any of the Official Languages showing the shares (as percentages) of equity ownership that each Project Company shareholder will have in the future Project Company in compliance with the requirements of the Request for Proposal (particularly, the requirements set in Clauses 8.3.2-8.3.3).

2. Content of Financial Proposal

Each Qualified Applicant shall provide the documents specified in paragraphs 1)-2) of this section 2 below as part of the Financial Proposal.

1) Financial Proposal Form

The Financial Proposal shall include a completed Financial Proposal Form, as provided in Form 0 (*Financial Proposal Form*) of this ANNEX 4 (*Content of Bid*), prepared in any of the Official Languages. It

should contain all the essential information necessary to demonstrate the Qualified Applicant's compliance with the criteria for evaluation of Financial Proposals stated in in ANNEX 5 (*Evaluation of Bids*).

The amounts in the Financial Proposal Form should be set in US dollars (USD), in numbers and words, with a precision of two (2) decimal points. In case of discrepancy, the amount in words will prevail.

2) Financial Model

The Qualified Applicant shall submit a financial model that explains the proposed fee schedule and justifies the proposed price-cost structure included in the Financial Proposal and covers the following metrics for the 11-year period of the PPP project:

a) Lifecycle analysis for the planned investments (CAPEX)

b) Lifecycle analysis for the variable and fixed costs (OPEX), indicating which costs have originated in EU and in Armenia

c) Estimated revenues (total and across product categories)

d) Scenario analysis (best / worst case scenarios), sensitivity analysis (including all inputs, such as CPI inflation and interest rates, used in the analysis)

e) Financial ratios: gross margin, operating margin, net profit margin, ROI, debt-to-equity ratio

f) Inputs and assumptions (e.g., inflation rate, salary rates, etc.).

The financial model shall be prepared in any of the Official Languages in .xlsx or .csv format, with no hidden formulas or enabled Macros.

FORM A – BID SUBMISSION LETTER

[QUALIFIED APPLICANT'S LETTERHEAD]

Date:___ _____ 2024

Re: submission of the Bid for participation in the Selection Procedure for the issuance and distribution of identity documents and operation and servicing of the facilities involved in the ID documents provision in the Republic of Armenia

To: the Evaluation Commission for carrying out the Selection Procedure related to issuance and distribution of identity documents and operation and servicing of the facilities involved in the ID documents provision in the Republic of Armenia

[Name of Qualified Applicant], [legal form and registration details], submits the Bid for participation in the Selection Procedure on issuance and distribution of identity documents and operation and servicing of the facilities involved in the ID documents provision in the Republic of Armenia according to the Tender Documentation and requests to accept this Bid for evaluation.

[Name of Consortium Member of Consortium Members] [("**Consortium Member**") / ("**Consortium Members**")] and [name of the Lead Member] [(the "**Lead Member**") have agreed to jointly cooperate with regard to Lead Member's participation in the Selection Procedure and, should the Consortium be determined as the Winner of the Selection Procedure, to jointly implement the Project and comply with the terms and conditions of the Agreement.] (*To be provided if the Qualified Applicant is a Consortium*).

[Name of the Qualified Applicant] hereby:

a) confirms that it has read and reviewed all requirements of the Tender Documentation (including Annexes) and has sufficient capacity to participate in the Selection Procedure and conclude the Agreement in case [Name of the Qualified Applicant] is designated as the Winner;

b) undertakes to comply with the rules of the Selection Procedure and the requirements of Applicable Law governing the Selection Procedure;

c) represents and warrants that all information and documents submitted as part of the Bid are true, complete and accurate;

d) accepts the right of the Competent Authority or the Evaluation Commission to (i) request additional information reasonably required to evaluate the Bid, (ii) amend or clarify applicable procedures and rules, and (iii) reject the Bid as per the rules and procedures set out in the Request for Proposal and Applicable Law;

e) accepts the exclusive application of Applicable Law to the procedure of submission and evaluation of the Bids, as well as determination of the outcomes of the Selection Procedure.

If the Bid is accepted, [name of the Qualified Applicant] undertakes to:

a) abide by all requirements, rules and procedures of the Tender Documentation and Applicable Law related to the review, evaluation of the Bid, and determination of the outcomes of the Selection Procedure;

b) maintain the Bid Security Validity Period in effect in accordance with the requirements of Clause 4.6.1 of the Request for Proposal;

c) finalize in good faith and conclude the Agreement without any reservation or limitation, in conformity with the Tender Documentation and the Bid, as soon as possible after the receipt of the Notification of Award, should [name of the Qualified Applicant] be designated as the Winner.

Until the Agreement is prepared and concluded, the Bid, together with your written acceptance thereof and your Notification of Award, shall constitute a binding contract between us.

We understand that the Evaluation Commission is not bound to accept any Bid it may receive.

We acknowledge and agree that the Competent Authority and Evaluation Commission will not be responsible for any errors or omissions on our part in preparing this Bid, and we hereby irrevocably undertake to indemnify the Competent Authority and Evaluation Commission in full in connection therewith.

We are responsible for any expenses and losses incurred in the preparation and submission of our Bid. The Government shall not be liable in any way to compensate us for any such expenses or losses, regardless of the outcome of the Selection Procedure.

[Signature]

In the capacity of _____[position of] _____[name of the Qualified Applicant]

Authorized to sign this Bid Submission Letter for _____[name of the Qualified Applicant]

Contact information of the Authorized Person(s) of the Applicant

[Address, telephone and email]

FORM B – Technical Proposal Form

Date:___ _____ 2024

Re: the Selection Procedure for the Project on the issuance and distribution of identity documents and operation and servicing of the facilities involved in the ID documents provision in the Republic of Armenia

To: the Evaluation Commission for carrying out the Selection Procedure

[Name of the Qualified Applicant] submits this Technical Proposal Form as part of its Bid for participation in the Selection Procedure for the issuance and distribution of identity documents and operation and servicing of the facilities involved in the ID documents provision in the Republic of Armenia in accordance with the requirements of the Tender Documentation and asks to accept it.

[Name of the Qualified Applicant] confirms that all the information and statements presented in this Technical Proposal Form are true and valid, and takes all risks associated with non-conformity of this Technical Proposal Form to the requirements of the Tender Documentation, including rejection of the Bid according to the Tender Documentation.

[Name of the Qualified Applicant] confirms that certain information and statements presented in this Technical Proposal Form will impose obligations on [name of the Qualified Applicant], which the Qualified Applicant will have to fulfil in accordance with the terms and conditions of the Agreement in case [name of the Qualified Applicant] is designated as the Winner of the Selection Procedure.

[Name of the Qualified Applicant] intends to engage the following third parties (contractors) to implement the Project under the Agreement, should [name of the Qualified Applicant] become the Winner of the Selection Procedure: (*if applicable, indicate the information on contractors in the table below*)

No.	Name of the contractor	Address and contact details	Proposed share of responsibilities (%) and type of services/operations to be performed by contractor
1			
2			
3			

The contents and the subject matter of our Technical Proposal Form are provided below.

[Please provide the further text of your completed Technical Proposal Form following the content requirements indicated in table below. Each section/other structural part of your completed Technical Proposal Form will be checked against the criteria and requirements for evaluation of Technical Proposals indicated in ANNEX 5 (*Evaluation of Technical Proposals*)].

CONTENT REQUIREMENTS

No.	Section	Scope
1.	**Description of the proposed physical infrastructure**	**Up to 15 pages**
1.1.	Accessibility of enrolment facilities' geographical network	Up to 15 pages
1.2.	Concept / layout and design guidelines of the enrolment facilities	

No.	Section	Scope
2.	**Description of the proposed travel and identity documents concept**	**Up to 25 pages**
2.1.	Proposed biometric passport concept	Up to 10 pages
2.1.1.	*Biometric passport aesthetic design concept*	
2.1.2.	*Biometric passport security concept*	
2.2.	Proposed ID card concept	Up to 15 pages
2.2.1.	*ID card aesthetic design concept*	
2.2.2.	*ID card security concept*	
2.2.3.	*ID card applet*	
2.2.4.	*Middleware for ID card*	
3.	**Description of the proposed identity and document management information system**	**Up to 25 pages**
3.1.	Citizen eService application (web portal)	Up to 25 pages
3.2.	Enrolment solution	
3.3.	Identity management and document issuance solution	
3.4.	Biometric data and document registry	
3.5.	Automated Biometric Identification Solution (ABIS)	
3.6.	Public key infrastructure	
3.7.	On-site queuing management solution	
3.8.	Reports and statistics solution	
3.9.	Integrations with external data sources	
4.	**Description of the suggested approach with respect to requested services**	**Up to 15 pages**
4.1.	Service level agreement KPIs	Up to 3 pages
4.1.1.	*Proposed governance mechanism*	
4.1.2.	*Suggested improvements to the minimum service levels*	
4.2.	Design and implementation approach	Up to 7 pages
4.2.1.	*Project plan*	
4.2.2.	*Proposed project team*	
4.2.3.	*Structure and roles of the Consortium members and suppliers*	
4.3.	End-to-end service operations'	Up to 3 pages
4.3.1.	*Customer service quality control measures*	
4.3.2.	*Quality control and security measures*	
4.4.	Approach to handover at the end of the contract	Up to 2 pages
5.	**Addendum 1. Compliance with technical requirements [*see the content requirements further below*]**	-

[*Further text of completed Technical Proposal Form as per content requirements provided above*]

Addendum 1 to Technical Proposal Form. Compliance with technical requirements – Content requirements

Note: *the table below and the requirements depicted in the table are only exemplary and not complete. Please note that in the Compliance with technical requirements table based on the form provided below the Qualified Applicant shall cover all Technical requirements.*

No.	Required / Optional	Description	Requirement met (Yes / No)	Evidence (reference to the text of completed Technical Proposal Form)
2.2. Requirements for Physical Infrastructure				
2.2.1. Requirements for enrolment facilities (service points)				
Req. 1	Required	The number of enrolment facilities operated in the territory of Armenia will be defined by the Service Provider, considering the following requirements: […]		
[…]	[…]	[…]		
2.2.2. Requirements for personalization facility				
Req. 7	Required	[…]		
[…]	[…]	[…]		
2.2.3. Requirements for technological infrastructure				
Req. 13	Required	[…]		
[…]	[…]	[…]		
2.3. Requirements for Travel and Identity Documents				
2.3.1. Blank documents' manufacturing				

No.	Required / Optional	Description	Requirement met (Yes / No)	Evidence (reference to the text of completed Technical Proposal Form)
Req. 24	Required	[…]		
[…]	[…]	[…]		
2.3.2. Specifications for ID card				
Req. 38	Required	[…]		
[…]	[…]	[…]		
2.3.3. Specifications for Passports				
Req. 50	Required	[…]		
[…]	[…]	[…]		
2.3.4. Specimen and test documents				
Req. 101	Required	[…]		
[…]	[…]	[…]		
2.3.5. Chip and OS specifications for ID Cards				
Req. 124	Required	[…]		
[…]	[…]	[…]		
2.3.6. Chip and OS specifications for Passports				
Req. 151	Required			
[…]	[…]	[…]		

No.	Required / Optional	Description	Requirement met (Yes / No)	Evidence (reference to the text of completed Technical Proposal Form)
2.3.7. Middleware for ID card				
Req. 161	Required	[…]		
[…]	[…]	[…]		
2.4. Requirements for the Identity and Document Management Information System				
2.4.1. Non-functional requirements for IDMIS				
Req. 175	Required	[…]		
[…]	[…]	[…]		
2.4.2. Functional requirements for IDMIS				
Req. 220	Required	1. […]		
[…]	[…]	[…]		
2.5 Service level agreement KPIs				
Req. 323	Required	[…]		
[…]	[…]	[…]		
2.6. Requirements for the requested services				
2.6.1. Design and implementation requirements				
Req. 339	Required	[…]		
[…]	[…]	[…]		

No.	Required / Optional	Description	Requirement met (Yes / No)	Evidence (reference to the text of completed Technical Proposal Form)
2.6.2. End-to-end service operations' requirements				
Req. 357	Required	[…]		
[…]	[…]	[…]		
2.6.3. Hand back requirements				
Req. 396	Required	[…]		
[…]	[…]	[…]		
2.6.4. Special provisions for design, implementation, and hand back of the Biometric data and document registry (Registry)				
Req. 443	Required	[…]		
[…]	[…]	[…]		

[*End of completed text of Technical Proposal Form*]

[Signature]

In the capacity of _____[position of] _____[name of the Qualified Applicant]

Authorized to sign this Technical Proposal Form for _____[name of the Qualified Applicant]

FORM C – Content Requirements for Bid Security

The Bid Security shall be an independent, unconditional and irrevocable bank guarantee payable at first demand to the Competent Authority. The Bid Security shall be prepared in the form of the letter of guarantee and in the form of the relevant agreement on the provision of Bid Security, and shall be submitted as part of Technical Proposal. The Bid Security shall contain:

a) full name and registration details of the bank;

b) the Bid Security amount as of the date of issuance of Bid Security, which should be AMD 170,000,000;

c) the bank's obligation to pay the amount of Bid Security to the Competent Authority on demand;

d) confirmation from the bank that such bank is the Reliable Bank in accordance with **Error! Reference source not found.** (*Requirements to Reliable Banks*) of the RFP;

e) Bid Security Validity Period in accordance with the requirements of Clause 4.6.1 of the RFP;

f) issuance date of the Bid Security, full name and signature of the bank's authorized person.

Sample form of the letter of guarantee is given below. This sample form is not mandatory and may be used as an indicative form for execution of the letter of guarantee as part of the Bid Security. In any event, the Bid Security shall comply with the content requirements set out in this Form C above.

SAMPLE FORM OF LETTER OF GUARANTEE

[OFFICIAL LETTERHEAD]

LETTER OF GUARANTEE

Date:___ _____ 2024

The Ministry of Internal Affairs of the Republic of Armenia is organizing and implementing a public-private partnership project for the issuance and distribution of identity documents and operation and servicing of the facilities involved in the ID documents provision in the Republic of Armenia (the "**Project**") through a fair and transparent competitive selection (the "**Selection Procedure**"). For this purpose, the Request for Proposal (the "**RFP**") dated [date] has been issued to conduct the Selection Procedure and determine the Winner.

[Name of the Qualified Applicant] (the "**Qualified Applicant**") has prepared its bid for participation in the Selection Procedure for the Project (the "**Bid**") and requested us to provide the Bid Security in accordance with the requirements of the RFP.

In this regard, we, [name of bank], the legal entity established and existing under the laws of [jurisdiction], having our registered office at [address] [add other registration details, if appropriate] (the "**Bank**") hereby unconditionally and irrevocably undertake to pay the Ministry of Internal Affairs of the Republic of Armenia (the "**Competent Authority**"), on demand, the amount indicated as of the date of issuance of this guarantee (the "**Bid Security**"), namely AMD 170,000,000, in accordance with the following terms:

[list of terms]

We confirm that our bank is the Reliable Bank under the terms of the RFP.

We shall pay the Competent Authority the due amount of Bid Security (or its part) that the Competent Authority can require within fifteen (15) days from receipt of an official written request by the Competent Authority and irrespective of any objection by the Qualified Applicant or any other party, provided that this amount does not exceed in the aggregate the abovementioned amount of Bid Security, by transferring this amount to the account specified by the Competent Authority.

All payments made based on the Competent Authority's demand shall be free and clear of, and without any present or future deduction for payment of, any taxes, duties, or withholdings of any nature whatsoever imposed.

The undertakings contained in this Bid Security constitute direct and fundamental obligations of the Bank and are unconditional and irrevocable. We shall not be excused from any or all of these obligations for any reason of whatever nature or source or any omission, act or proceeding by the Competent Authority or by the third party which would excuse us from the obligations and liabilities stated in this Bid Security.

This Bid Security will remain valid up to and including [insert the date, which should be in conformity with the Bid Security Validity Period provided in Clause 4.6.1 of the RFP].

This Bid Security shall be governed by and construed in accordance with Applicable Law, and any dispute with respect to it is subject to resolution by the competent authorities in Armenia and according to the Applicable Law.

The copy of the bank guarantee agreement (the agreement on the Bid Security) is attached hereto.

Yours sincerely,

[signature]

[name and position of the authorized signatory]

FORM D – Conflict of Interest Statement

[LETTERHEAD OF THE QUALIFIED APPLICANT / LEAD MEMBER / CONSORTIUM MEMBER]

Date:___ _____ 2024

Re: the Selection Procedure for the Project on the issuance and distribution of identity documents and operation and servicing of the facilities involved in the ID documents provision in the Republic of Armenia

To: the Evaluation Commission for carrying out the Selection Procedure

We, the undersigned [name of the Qualified Applicant / Lead Member / Consortium Member] (*insert as appropriate*), are not aware of any Potential Conflict of Interest or Real Conflict of Interest arising from prior or existing contract or relationship, which could materially affect our capability to fulfil our obligations under the Tender Documentation within the present Project.

In particular, other than as disclosed below, we have no prior or existing contracts, negotiations or relationships with the Competent Authority, Evaluation Commission, their representatives or advisors, which could materially affect our capability to fulfil our obligations under the Tender Documentation or the Project Company's capability to fulfil its obligations under the Agreement.

We disclose the information about the following transactions which may be in Potential Conflict of Interest or Real Conflict of Interest with the Project:

Name of Project	Date Started	Description of Conflict

Yours sincerely,

[Signature]

In the capacity of _____ [position]

Authorized to sign the Bid for _____ [name of the Qualified Applicant]

FORM F – Financial Proposal Form

Date:___ _____ 2024

Re: submission of the bid for participation in the Selection Procedure for the issuance and distribution of identity documents and operation and servicing of the facilities involved in the ID documents provision in the Republic of Armenia

To: the Evaluation Commission for carrying out the Selection Procedure related to issuance and distribution of identity documents and operation and servicing of the facilities involved in the ID documents provision in the Republic of Armenia

[Name of the Qualified Applicant] submits this Financial Proposal Form as part of its Bid for participation in the Selection Procedure for the issuance and distribution of identity documents and operation and servicing of the facilities involved in the ID documents provision in the Republic of Armenia in accordance with the requirements of the Tender Documentation and asks to accept it.

[Name of the Qualified Applicant] confirms that the indicators and proposals presented in this Financial Proposal Form will impose obligations on [name of the Qualified Applicant], which the Qualified Applicant will have to fulfil in accordance with the terms and conditions of the Agreement in case [name of the Qualified Applicant] is designated as the Winner of the Selection Procedure.

The subject matter of our Financial Proposal is presented in sections 1-3 of this Financial Proposal Form below.

1. Proposed fees[1]: estimated volumes

No.	**Item**	**Estimated volume[2]** *(F)*	**Average fee per document, AMD (including taxes and charges)**					**Total amount, AMD** *(E x F)*
			Total avg. fee per unit *(E = (A+B)/2 + (C+D)/2)*	**Avg. fee per blank document**		**Avg. fee for services per unit**		
				Regular[3] *(A)*	**All-in-one[3]** *(B)*	**Regular[3]** *(C)*	**All-in-one[3]** *(D)*	
1.1	Biometric passports within the estimated volume	2,261,111						
1.2	Biometric ID card within the estimated volume	4,969,450						
							Total	

[1] For the 11-year period.

[2] Estimated volume is only indicative and not binding. Fees shall be paid on actual issued unit basis, subject to volume guarantees and other clauses defined in the Draft Agreement

[3] Different prices for each type of document using both regular and all-in-one enrolment solutions shall be indicated

2. Proposed fees: volumes exceeding the estimates

No.	Item	Avg. fee per blank document (incl. taxes and charges), AMD		Avg. fee for services per unit (incl. taxes and charges), AMD		Total avg. fee per document (incl. taxes and charges), AMD *(A+B)/2 + (C+D)/2*
		Regular[4] *(A)*	**All-in-one[4]** *(B)*	**Regular[4]** *(C)*	**All-in-one[4]** *(D)*	
2.1	Fee per one biometric passport above the estimated volume					
2.2	Fee per one biometric ID card above the estimated volume					

3. Proposed fees: for Maintenance and support services after the end of the Project

No.	Item	Fee per unit, AMD (including taxes and charges)
3.1	Fee for maintenance and support services per year (for 3 (three) years after the end of the Project)	

4. Other proposed fees: for enrolment stations at the Armenian embassies and foreign missions that may be opened after the Award of Contract and exceeding the number of 69 enrolment stations indicated in the Technical Requirements

No.	Item[5]	Fee per unit, AMD (including taxes and charges)	
		Regular solution	**All-in-one solution**
4.1	Fee per 1 (one) mobile enrolment station, incl. instalment and maintenance related costs		
4.2.	Fee per 1 (one) fixed enrolment station, incl. instalment and maintenance related costs		

5. Share of EU-originated cost and share of Armenia-originated cost in all costs

No.	Item	Share, %
5.1	Share of EU-originated cost, excluding financing costs, in all costs	
5.2.	Share of Armenia-originated cost, excluding financing costs, in all costs	

[4] Different prices for each type of document using both regular and all-in-one enrolment solutions shall be indicated

[5] Price must be indicated for a single enrolment station. Contracting Authority will purchase the enrolment solutions only for the operational service stations. When new service station is planned to be opened during the implementation of the Contract, additional purchase order shall be signed, and the unit fee indicated in this proposal shall be applied.

[Signature]

In the capacity of _____[position of] _____[name of the Qualified Applicant]

Authorized to sign this Financial Proposal Form for _____[name of the Qualified Applicant]

ANNEX 5. EVALUATION OF BIDS

1. Specification of quality- and value-based selection method in evaluation of Bids

The Bids will be evaluated consecutively (with opening and evaluation of Technical Proposals first and the subsequent opening and evaluation of Financial Proposals) and cumulatively (with assignment of the total score for the Bid following completed evaluation of both Technical Proposal and Financial Proposal), based on the technical quality and price criteria summarized in the table below.

No.	Evaluation criteria	Required confirmation	Maximum score	Comparative weight of functional parameter	Comparative weight in evaluation of the Bid
1.	**Quality of the Technical Proposal (T)**				**Y = 70**
1.1.	**Compliance with technical requirements and quality, completeness, and feasibility of suggested approach with respect to physical infrastructure (T_1)**				**Y_1 = 17,5**
1.1.1.	Quality, completeness, and feasibility of suggested approach to **enrolment facilities:** 1) Accessibility of **geographical network**, incl. suggested locations, types of premises 2) **Concept / layout and design guidelines** of the enrolment facilities (centers) of different category (e.g., small, medium, large, stationary, movable), incl. amount of the workstations in each of the service station	Technical Proposal Form – see para. 2) of section 1 of ANNEX 4 (*Content of Bid*)	$R_{1, max}$ = 100	L_1 = 0,8	
1.1.2.	Compliance with requirements in the technical specification in respect to sections on: 1) Enrolment facilities 2) Personalization facility 3) Data center and Disaster Recovery Site	Addendum 1 to Technical Proposal Form – see para. 2) of section 1 of ANNEX 4 (*Content of Bid*)	$R_{2, max}$ = 100	L_2 = 0,2	
1.2.	**Compliance with technical requirements and quality, security, and commitment to evolution (innovation) with respect to travel and identity documents (T_2)**				**Y_2 = 17,5**
1.2.1.	**Proposed biometric passport concept:** 1) Aesthetic design concept: overall layout, aesthetic, and functional design of the biometric passport	Technical Proposal Form – see para. 2) of section 1 of ANNEX 4 (*Content of Bid*)	$R_{3, max}$ = 100	L_3 = 0,1	
1.2.2.	2) Security concept: quality, security, and	Technical Proposal Form –	$R_{3, max}$ = 100	L_3 = 0,2	

No.	Evaluation criteria	Required confirmation	Maximum score	Comparative weight of functional parameter	Comparative weight in evaluation of the Bid
	commitment to evolution (innovation) of the design of the biometric passport	see para. 2) of section 1 of ANNEX 4 (*Content of Bid*)			
1.2.3.	Compliance with requirements in the technical specification in respect to passports	Addendum 1 to Technical Proposal Form – see para. 2) of section 1 of ANNEX 4 (*Content of Bid*)	$R_{4, max}$ = 112	L_4 = 0,2	
1.2.4.	**Proposed ID card concept:** 1) Aesthetic design concept: overall layout, aesthetic, and functional design of the ID cards	Technical Proposal Form – see para. 2) of section 1 of ANNEX 4 (*Content of Bid*)	$R_{5, max}$ = 100	L_5 = 0,075	
1.2.5.	2) Security concept: quality, security, and commitment to evolution (innovation) of the design of the ID cards	Technical Proposal Form – see para. 2) of section 1 of ANNEX 4 (*Content of Bid*)	$R_{5, max}$ = 100	L_5 = 0,075	
1.2.6.	3) ID card applet: quality, security, and commitment to evolution (innovation) of the proposed chip, approach to the product road-map, maintenance and certification	Technical Proposal Form – see para. 2) of section 1 of ANNEX 4 (*Content of Bid*)	$R_{6, max}$ = 100	L_6 = 0,075	
1.2.7.	4) Middleware: quality, security, and commitment to evolution (innovation) of the proposed middleware, approach to the maintenance	Technical Proposal Form – see para. 2) of section 1 of ANNEX 4 (*Content of Bid*)	$R_{7, max}$ = 100	L_7 = 0,075	
1.2.8.	Compliance with requirements in the technical specification in respect to: 1) ID card 2) ID card applet 3) Middleware	Technical Proposal Form – see para. 2) of section 1 of ANNEX 4 (*Content of Bid*)	$R_{8, max}$ = 109	L_8 = 0,2	
1.3.	**Compliance to technical requirements and quality, security, and commitment to evolution (innovation) with respect to identity and document management information system (T_3)**				**Y_3 = 17,5**
1.3.1.	**IT software, hardware, and equipment solution**: technology innovation, a proven	Technical Proposal Form – see para. 2) of section 1 of	$R_{9, max}$ = 100	L_9 = 0,6	

No.	Evaluation criteria	Required confirmation	Maximum score	Comparative weight of functional parameter	Comparative weight in evaluation of the Bid
	approach to ensuring the citizen facing solutions providing a good user experience, and approach to IT security for the following components: 1. Citizen eService application (web portal) 2. Enrolment solution 3. Identity management and document issuance solution 4. Biometric data and document registry 5. Automated Biometric Identification Solution (ABIS) 6. Public key infrastructure 7. On-site queuing management solution 8. Reports and statistics solution 9. Integrations with external data sources	ANNEX 4 (*Content of Bid*)			
1.3.2.	Fulfilment of required **demonstration scenarios** from user experience, innovation and security point of view: 1) Citizen eService application (web portal): booking of appointment 2) Citizen enrolment in Armenia 3) Citizen enrolment in an embassy 4) Identity proofing and validation workflow at the back-end system 5) Biometric data matching	Demonstration – see further below	$R_{10, max}$ = 100	L_{10} = 0,2	
1.3.3.	Compliance with requirements in the technical specification in respect to all IT software, hardware, and equipment components	Addendum 1 to Technical Proposal Form – see para. 2) of section 1 of ANNEX 4 (*Content of Bid*)	$R_{11, max}$ = 100	L_{11} = 0,2	
1.4.	**Compliance to technical requirements and quality, completeness, and feasibility of suggested approach with respect to requested services (T_4)**				**Y_4 = 17,5**
1.4.1.	**SLAs:**	Technical	$R_{12, max}$ =	L_{12} = 0,2	

No.	Evaluation criteria	Required confirmation	Maximum score	Comparative weight of functional parameter	Comparative weight in evaluation of the Bid
	1) Proposed governance mechanism: monitoring of KPIs, approach to improvement plan, if needed 2) Suggested improvements to the minimum service levels	Proposal Form – see para. 2) of section 1 of ANNEX 4 (*Content of Bid*)	100		
1.4.2.	Quality, completeness, and feasibility of the **design and implementation approach:** 1) Project plan 2) Proposed project team 3) Structure and roles of the Consortium Members and suppliers	Technical Proposal Form – see para. 2) of section 1 of ANNEX 4 (*Content of Bid*)	$R_{13, max}$ = 100	L_{13} = 0,2	
1.4.3.	Quality, completeness, and feasibility of **approach to operations:** 1) Customer service quality control measures 2) Quality control of the processes, the organization, and the security measures for the whole of the supply chain (incl. production, inventory management, personalization, logistics).	Technical Proposal Form – see para. 2) of section 1 of ANNEX 4 (*Content of Bid*)	$R_{14, max}$ = 100	L_{14} = 0,2	
1.4.4.	Quality, completeness, and feasibility of approach to **handover at the end of the contract**	Technical Proposal Form – see para. 2) of section 1 of ANNEX 4 (*Content of Bid*)	$R_{15, max}$ = 100	L_{15} = 0,2	
1.4.5.	Compliance with requirements in the technical specification in respect to: 1) SLAs 2) Design and implementation requirements 3) End-to-end service operations' requirements 4) Hand back requirements	Addendum 1 to Technical Proposal Form – see para. 2) of section 1 of ANNEX 4 (*Content of Bid*)	$R_{16, max}$ = 100	L_{16} = 0,2	

No.	Evaluation criteria	Required confirmation	Maximum score	Comparative weight of functional parameter	Comparative weight in evaluation of the Bid
2.	**Price (C)**				**X = 30**
2.1.	Total value of proposed fees (and charges) for the Competent Authority's estimated volume of biometric passports and biometric ID cards	Financial Proposal Form – see para. 1) of section 2 of ANNEX 4 (*Content of Bid*)	$C_{1,max}$ = 100	ω_1 = 0.875	**X_1 = 26.25**
2.2.	Sum of proposed fees (and charges) for one biometric passport and one biometric ID card above Competent Authority's estimated volume	Financial Proposal Form – see para. 1) of section 2 of ANNEX 4 (*Content of Bid*)	$C_{2,max}$ = 100	ω_2 = 0.075	**X_2 = 2.25**
2.3.	Total value of proposed fees (and charges) for maintenance and support of IDMIS after the end of the Project	Financial Proposal Form – see para. 1) of section 2 of ANNEX 4 (*Content of Bid*)	$C_{3,max}$ = 100	ω_2 = 0.05	**X_2 = 1.5**

1.2. Evaluation of Technical Proposals

The Evaluation Commission shall evaluate the Technical Proposals under the detailed approach to scoring of each technical criterion provided in Appendix A to this ANNEX 5 (*Evaluation of Bids*) below. In case the evaluation provided by the member of Evaluation Commission differs from the evaluation provided by other members of Evaluation Commission by 40% or more, such differing member shall provide a separate written substantiation for assigning that score to the Evaluation Commission.

The technical criteria (T) points provided in the summary table in section 1 of this ANNEX 5 (*Evaluation of Bids*) above will be calculated by adding up the individual criteria (T_i) points:

$$T = \sum_i T_i$$

The technical criteria (T_i) points will be calculated by multiplying the sum of the evaluations (P_s) of this criterion's parameters by the comparative weight (Y_i) of the evaluated technical criterion:

$$T_i = \left(\sum_s P_s \right) \cdot Y_i \text{ , where:}$$

T_i – weighted total score for criterion *i*

P_s – score for functional parameter *s*

Y_i – comparative weight for functional parameter *s*

The evaluation of the technical criteria parameter (P_s) will be calculated by comparing the parameter value (R_s) with the best value of the same parameter (R_{max}) and multiplying it by the comparative weight of the evaluated technical criterion parameter (L_s):

$P_s = \frac{R_s}{R_{s,\max}} \times L_s$, where:

P_s – score for functional parameter *s*

R_s – value of functional parameter *s*

$R_{\max}$ – maximum value scored by a Qualified Applicant for the functional parameter *s*

L_s – comparative weight of functional parameter *s*

Demonstration

The Evaluation Commission will organize a demonstration of the proposed system to verify whether the functionality described in the Technical Proposal can be implemented in the system proposed by the Qualified Applicant (the "**Demonstration**").

The Demonstration will take place remotely via the Microsoft Teams program within the Technical Proposals Evaluation Deadline. The proposed options for time and date as well as meeting link will be sent to each Qualified Applicant separately at least 2 (two) weeks prior the Bids Submission Deadline. Demonstrations of functionalities must be carried out in a fully operational demonstration environment (i.e., a video recording cannot be presented).

The Qualified Applicant must specify which Demonstration scenario they are preparing to demonstrate. The Qualified Applicant may choose the order of scenarios and/or their steps if it allows them to perform the Demonstration more accurately and promptly while maintaining and revealing the logic and continuity of the process itself.

The total duration of the Demonstration session shall be no longer than three (3) hours: two (2) hours shall be allocated for the demonstration itself and one (1) hour after the demonstration shall be allocated to a questions and answers session.

Appendix A – Technical Proposals scoring approach (para. 1.2 of ANNEX 5 (*Evaluation of Bids*) cont.)

Evaluation criteria	Score for the quality criterion	Sub-criteria / assessment aspect	Assessment basis	Reference to technical req.	Assessment approach	Assessment scale	Maximum score for the sub-criterion	Sub-criteria score in total evaluation
1. Physical infrastructure	25%	Quality, completeness, and feasibility of suggested approach to **enrolment facilities:** 1) Accessibility of **geographical network**, incl. suggested locations, types of premises 2) **Concept / layout and design guidelines** of the enrolment facilities (centers) of different category (e.g., small, medium, large, stationary, movable), incl. amount of the workstations in each of the service station	Description **Up to 15 pages.**	2.2.1	Description of suggested approach to enrolment facilities provided but lacks justification and only / mainly repeats the requirements. The proposed approach to enrolment facilities is very general – the proposed geographical network of facilities (locations, their convenience for citizens, etc.) as well as concept / layout and design guidelines (incl. number of workstations in each service station) is not specific and not adequately described. There is little emphasis and evidence on ensuring optimal geographical access and functionality in terms of location and layout design.	1-25	80%	20.0%
					Suggested specific enrolment facility locations provided, but lacks details, evidence / justifications for the chosen approach based on estimated volume of applications in each location (work-load). The proposal lacks justification on mechanism how to ensure optimal geographical access. Types of facilities in each location are not specifically indicated (their size, type of the premises, ownership, etc.). No or little evidence provided on availability of indicated enrolment facility premises, their fit for purpose based on estimated work-load and demographic situation. The estimated number of workstations in each location is provided and somewhat justified but lacks detailed calculations and considerations. Design concept / layout guidelines are generic, different category of facilities (e.g., small, medium, large, stationary, movable) is not adequately considered, lacks specificity	26-50		

Evaluation criteria	Score for the quality criterion	Sub-criteria / assessment aspect	Assessment basis	Reference to technical req.	Assessment approach	Assessment scale	Maximum score for the sub-criterion	Sub-criteria score in total evaluation
					and commitment to high customer experience standard.			
					The proposal provides a justified approach to the setup of enrolment facilities based on international standards / practices as well as some understanding of local specifics (e.g., consider demographics, real estate rental market, etc.). The Applicant provides specific locations for the facilities and information on type of facility in each location, the suggestions are somewhat justified, based on demographic situation, estimated work-load calculations. However, the availability of all required facilities is not clearly guaranteed / justified. Suggested number of workstations reflect accurate understanding of needs for specific location and facility operations. Justifications with rather detailed calculations are provided. There is room for improvement regarding more innovative and adaptive considerations for the flexibility to reflect peak period demands. The concept / layout and design guidelines for each type of the site (e.g., small, medium, large, stationary, movable) is provided, it lacks focus on high customer experience standard and (or) innovation.	51-75		
					The proposal provides an exemplary approach to the distribution and setup of enrolment facilities based on practical experience, insights and internationally recognized best practices. It also very well reflects understanding of local specifics (e.g., consider demographics, real estate rental market, etc.). The Applicant provides specific locations for the facilities and information on type, size and category (e.g., small, medium, large,	76-100		

Evaluation criteria	Score for the quality criterion	Sub-criteria / assessment aspect	Assessment basis	Reference to technical req.	Assessment approach	Assessment scale	Maximum score for the sub-criterion	Sub-criteria score in total evaluation
					stationary, movable) of facility for each location. The chosen locations are well-justified and reflect a strategic consideration for easy access and demographic coverage. In addition, the Applicant provides reliable evidence for availability of suggested premises (e.g., information on preliminary rent commitments or potential alternatives). Suggested number of workstations reflect accurate understanding of needs for specific location and facility operations. Justifications with rather detailed calculations based on demographical situation, estimated workload are provided. In addition, proposal outlines a forward-looking strategy, including flexibility to reflect changes in demand (e.g., peak period demand.) The concept / layout and design guidelines for each different size and category enrolment facility is provided with detailed descriptions, reflecting an innovative utilization of space and resource, focus on high customer experience standard. It proposes contemporary design solutions for the enrolment facilities' spaces. The proposal shows an excellent level of understanding regarding the unique requirements of each site (e.g., differences in Yerevan and remote regional facilities) and maintains comprehensive plans for upholding top-tier operational standards throughout the contract period.			
		Compliance with requirements in the technical specification in respect to sections on: 1) Enrolment facilities 2) Personalization	Compliance matrix	2.2.	The Applicant demonstrates commitment and provides justification for meeting some or all relevant mandatory technical requirements. Score for each requirement is assigned based on the justifications provided: - 0 – no justification is provided; - 1 – formal justification is provided;	1-100	20%	5.0%

Evaluation criteria	Score for the quality criterion	Sub-criteria / assessment aspect	Assessment basis	Reference to technical req.	Assessment approach	Assessment scale	Maximum score for the sub-criterion	Sub-criteria score in total evaluation
		facility 3) Data center and Disaster Recovery Site			- 2 – detailed and comprehensive justification is provided. Final score is calculated proportionally based on the number of relevant requirements.			
2. Travel and Identity documents	25%	**Proposed biometric passport concept:** 1) Aesthetic design concept: overall layout, aesthetic, and functional design of the biometric passport	Description **Up to 10 pages.** (physical samples are not included in the count of pages)	2.3.1., 2.3.3.	The passport aesthetic design concept is provided, but lacks thoughtful integration of national identity, cultural symbols or motifs. Design does not maintain a minimalistic approach. There is little to no consideration for smart materials, contributing to visual appeal or a refined aesthetic. Little to no attention is given to inclusive design features - to be easily accessible for all age groups or individuals with disabilities. Justifications for design decisions are not provided or lack clarity and convincing argumentation.	1-25	10%	2.5%
					The passport aesthetic design concept lacks some of the following features: - Thoughtful integration of national identity, cultural symbols or motifs. - A minimalistic approach. - Consideration for smart materials, contributing to visual appeal or a refined aesthetic. - inclusive design features - to be easily accessible for all age groups or individuals with disabilities. Justifications for design decisions lack clarity and convincing argumentation.	26-50		
					The passport aesthetic design concept lacks some of the following features: - Thoughtful integration of national identity, cultural symbols or motifs. - A minimalistic approach.	51-75		

Evaluation criteria	Score for the quality criterion	Sub-criteria / assessment aspect	Assessment basis	Reference to technical req.	Assessment approach	Assessment scale	Maximum score for the sub-criterion	Sub-criteria score in total evaluation
					- Consideration for smart materials, contributing to visual appeal or a refined aesthetic. - Inclusive design features - to be easily accessible for all age groups or individuals with disabilities. Comprehensive justifications, incl. physical generic samples, are provided for all design decisions, demonstrating how the passport's layout, material choice, and overall structure will maximize durability, ease of handling, and visual clarity.			
					The design features a sophisticated combination of visual elements and functional enhancements that provide an outstanding user experience. The passport aesthetic design concept meets all of the following features: - Thoughtful integration of national identity, cultural symbols or motifs. - A minimalistic approach. - Consideration for smart materials, contributing to visual appeal or a refined aesthetic. - Inclusive design features - to be easily accessible for all age groups or individuals with disabilities. Comprehensive justifications are provided, incl. physical generic samples, for all design decisions, demonstrating how the passport's layout, material choice, and overall structure will maximize durability, ease of handling, and visual clarity. The design aligns with the highest international standards and draws on case studies and proven best practices	76-100		

Evaluation criteria	Score for the quality criterion	Sub-criteria / assessment aspect	Assessment basis	Reference to technical req.	Assessment approach	Assessment scale	Maximum score for the sub-criterion	Sub-criteria score in total evaluation
		2) Security concept: quality, security, and commitment to evolution (innovation) of the design of the biometric passport			Description of minimum biometric passport security concept (combination of suggested security measures) provided, but lacks justification for the specific security feature choice, only / mainly repeats the technical requirements. There is none or only formal, not clearly specified commitment to innovation or evolution, suggesting a potential lack of foresight for emerging technologies and future security challenges.	1-25	20%	5%
					The proposed design of the biometric passport incorporates improved security features when compared to minimum technical requirements and industry standards. Some justifications on the choice of security measures are provided; however, lacking clarity on how their combination will ensure the highest security levels. There's some justification on commitment to future evolution, indicating that plans are in place for security measures updates. There's evidence of some forward planning for responding to new technology developments or security threats. However, plans for security updates and evolution are not very specific and comprehensive.	26-50		
					The design includes high-standard security features when compared to minimum technical requirements and industry standards. Justifications, incl. physical generic samples, on the proposed security measures are provided, showing how the proposed security measure combination will ensure highest security levels. Justifications are based on experience and international best practices. There's a clear commitment to evolution with outlined plans for future design enhancements	51-75		

Evaluation criteria	Score for the quality criterion	Sub-criteria / assessment aspect	Assessment basis	Reference to technical req.	Assessment approach	Assessment scale	Maximum score for the sub-criterion	Sub-criteria score in total evaluation
					and security upgrades, including proposals on security measure updates. Planning for future scenarios in technology development and potential threats is evident and well-structured. Specific approach on biometric passport security evolution provided; however, there is no commitment to provide any updates without additional change orders. In addition, Applicant demonstrates commitment to meet not only mandatory, but also some of the optional requirements for biometric passport production (or their equivalent alternatives in terms of technology sophistication and effectiveness).			
					The proposed biometric passport security concept shows commitment to most up to date industry practices, showcasing a superior level of security and sophisticated features. The proposal provides state-of-the-art security features that clearly exceed minimum technical requirements with comprehensive and detailed justifications, including clear arguments on the choice of security features and how their combination will ensure the highest security levels. The justifications, incl. physical generic samples, are based on practical experience, international best practices and (or) case studies and if possible, provide links to relevant sources. There is a solid commitment to future evolution with a well-established strategy to implement technological advancements as they become available, including specific proposal on how security measures will be updated – update frequency, cooperation with government and other decision makers, etc. Through a proactive approach, industry leadership in terms of incorporating emerging technologies, security threats preemptive	76-100		

Evaluation criteria	Score for the quality criterion	Sub-criteria / assessment aspect	Assessment basis	Reference to technical req.	Assessment approach	Assessment scale	Maximum score for the sub-criterion	Sub-criteria score in total evaluation
					measures, and user experience is clearly demonstrated. Specific approach on biometric passport security evolution provided, including commitment to provide some of periodic updates without additional change orders. In addition, Applicant demonstrates commitment to meet not only mandatory, but also all or most of the optional requirements (or their equivalent alternatives in terms of technology sophistication and effectiveness) for biometric passport production.			
		Compliance with requirements in the technical specification in respect to passports	Compliance matrix	2.3.1., 2.3.3., 2.3.4., 2.3.6.	The Applicant demonstrates commitment and provides justification for meeting some or all relevant mandatory technical requirements. Score for each requirement is assigned based on the justifications provided: - 0 – no justification is provided; - 1 – formal justification is provided; - 2 – detailed and comprehensive justification is provided. Final score is calculated proportionally based on the number of relevant requirements.	1-100	20%	5.0%
					The Applicant demonstrates commitment and provides justification for meeting all relevant mandatory and one or several relevant optional technical requirements (6 optional requirements in total, 2 additional points for each requirement).	(additional) 2-12		
		Proposed ID card concept: 1) Aesthetic design concept: overall layout, aesthetic, and functional design of the ID cards	Description **Up to 15 pages.** (physical samples are not included in the count of pages)	2.3.1., 2.3.2.	The ID card aesthetic design concept is provided, but lacks thoughtful integration of national identity, cultural symbols or motifs. Design does not maintain a minimalistic approach. There is little to no consideration for smart materials, contributing to visual appeal or a refined aesthetic.	1-25	7.5%	1.875%

Evaluation criteria	Score for the quality criterion	Sub-criteria / assessment aspect	Assessment basis	Reference to technical req.	Assessment approach	Assessment scale	Maximum score for the sub-criterion	Sub-criteria score in total evaluation
					Little to no attention is given to inclusive design features - to be easily accessible for all age groups or individuals with disabilities. Justifications for design decisions are not provided or lack clarity and convincing argumentation.			
					The ID card aesthetic design concept lacks some of the following features: - Thoughtful integration of national identity, cultural symbols or motifs. - A minimalistic approach. - Consideration for smart materials, contributing to visual appeal or a refined aesthetic. - Inclusive design features - to be easily accessible for all age groups or individuals with disabilities. Justifications for design decisions lack clarity and convincing argumentation.	26-50		
					The ID card aesthetic design concept lacks some of the following features: - Thoughtful integration of national identity, cultural symbols or motifs. - A minimalistic approach. - Consideration for smart materials, contributing to visual appeal or a refined aesthetic. - Inclusive design features - to be easily accessible for all age groups or individuals with disabilities. Comprehensive justifications, incl. physical generic samples, are provided for all design decisions, demonstrating how the passport's layout, material choice, and overall structure will maximize durability, ease of handling, and visual clarity.	51-75		

Evaluation criteria	Score for the quality criterion	Sub-criteria / assessment aspect	Assessment basis	Reference to technical req.	Assessment approach	Assessment scale	Maximum score for the sub-criterion	Sub-criteria score in total evaluation
					The design features a sophisticated combination of visual elements and functional enhancements that provide an outstanding user experience. The ID card aesthetic design concept meets all of the following features: - Thoughtful integration of national identity, cultural symbols or motifs. - A minimalistic approach. - Consideration for smart materials, contributing to visual appeal or a refined aesthetic. - Inclusive design features - to be easily accessible for all age groups or individuals with disabilities. Comprehensive justifications, incl. physical generic samples, are provided for all design decisions, demonstrating how the passport's layout, material choice, and overall structure will maximize durability, ease of handling, and visual clarity. The design aligns with the highest international standards and draws on case studies and proven best practices.	76-100		
		2) Security concept: quality, security, and commitment to evolution (innovation) of the design of the ID cards			Description of minimum ID card security concept (combination of suggested security measures) provided but lacks justification for specific security measures choice and only / mainly repeats the technical requirements. There is none or only formal commitment to innovation or evolution, suggesting a potential lack of foresight for emerging technologies and future security challenges.	1-25	7.5%	1.875%
					The proposed design of the ID card incorporates improved security features when compared to minimum technical requirements and industry standards. Some justifications on the choice of security measures are provided;	26-50		

Evaluation criteria	Score for the quality criterion	Sub-criteria / assessment aspect	Assessment basis	Reference to technical req.	Assessment approach	Assessment scale	Maximum score for the sub-criterion	Sub-criteria score in total evaluation
					however, lacking clarity on how their combination will ensure the highest security levels. There's a moderate commitment to future evolution, indicating that plans are in place for security measures updates. There's evidence of some forward planning for responding to new technology developments or security threats. However, plans for security updates and evolution are not specific and comprehensive.			
					The design includes high-standard security features when compared to minimum technical requirements and industry standards. Justifications, incl. physical generic samples, on the proposed security measures are provided, showing how the proposed security measure combination will ensure highest security levels. Justifications are based on experience and international best practices. There's a clear commitment to evolution with outlined plans for future design enhancements and security upgrades. Planning for future scenarios in technology development and potential threats is evident and well-structured. Specific approach on ID card security evolution provided; however, there is no commitment to provide updates without additional change orders.	51-75		
					The proposed ID card security concept goes beyond industry standards, showcasing a superior level of security and sophisticated features. The proposal provides state-of-the-art security features that clearly exceed minimum technical requirements with comprehensive and specific justifications on the choice of security features and how their combination will ensure the highest security	76-100		

Evaluation criteria	Score for the quality criterion	Sub-criteria / assessment aspect	Assessment basis	Reference to technical req.	Assessment approach	Assessment scale	Maximum score for the sub-criterion	Sub-criteria score in total evaluation
					level, incl. physical generic samples. The justifications are based on practical experience, international best practices and case studies and if possible, provide links to relevant sources. There is a solid commitment to future evolution with a well-established strategy to implement technological advancements as they become available, including specific proposal on how security measures will be updated – update frequency, cooperation with government and other decision makers, etc. Through a proactive approach, industry leadership in terms of incorporating emerging technologies, security threats preemptive measures, and user experience is clearly demonstrated. Specific approach on ID card security evolution provided, including commitment to provide periodic updates without additional change orders.			
		3) ID card applet: quality, security, and commitment to evolution (innovation) of the proposed chip, approach to the product road-map, maintenance and certification		2.3.5.	Description of quality and security of ID card applet lacks justification and only / mainly repeats the technical requirements. The proposed chip has basic quality and security elements, with unclear or undefined plans for future evolution and innovation. The approach to product roadmap, maintenance, and certification is vague and not specific.	1-25	7.5%	1.875%
					The chip incorporates improved quality and security elements when compared to minimum technical requirements and industry standards. The proposal provides hints on improved capacity, processing speed and durability, however, lacks details and proof. There's a moderate commitment to future evolution, indicating that plans are in place for the chip updates. There's evidence of some forward planning for responding to new technology developments or security threats;	26-50		

Evaluation criteria	Score for the quality criterion	Sub-criteria / assessment aspect	Assessment basis	Reference to technical req.	Assessment approach	Assessment scale	Maximum score for the sub-criterion	Sub-criteria score in total evaluation
					however, plans are not very detailed and comprehensive. The product roadmap, maintenance, and certification plans are adequality laid out, giving in some insight into timelines and processes based on typical industry approach.			
					The chip demonstrates high-level quality with modern security measures, justified by internationally recognized best practices. Commitment on improved capacity, processing speed and durability of the ID card applet is provided along with proof and justifications. Justifications are based on experience and international best practices. Approach to innovation and future evolution is present, reflected in a detailed product roadmap, including frequency of updates and some details on the process. However, there is no commitment to provide updates without additional change orders. The maintenance and certification process are well-structured and aligned with international standards ensuring resilience and longevity of the product.	51-75		
					The proposed chip is of exceptional quality, showing high precision and data capacity to accurately store and process personal information, biometrics, and other necessary data, and fast processing speed. The applet is durable and made from high-grade materials to ensure longevity and resist damage. The proposal outlines robust security features, including capacity to support advanced encryption and decryption techniques to safeguard data. Commitment to innovative evolution that surpasses common industry standards is provided, including frequency of updates and commitment to provide periodic updates	76-100		

Evaluation criteria	Score for the quality criterion	Sub-criteria / assessment aspect	Assessment basis	Reference to technical req.	Assessment approach	Assessment scale	Maximum score for the sub-criterion	Sub-criteria score in total evaluation
					without additional change orders. The product roadmap is detailed and strategic, anticipating future developments while maintaining optimal product condition. Specific and comprehensive justifications based on practical experience and internationally recognized practices are provided. The maintenance and certification processes are comprehensive and future-proof, setting benchmarks for the industry. The applet requires minimal or no maintenance, and complies with stringent global and local standards to ensure it meets the highest benchmarks for performance, safety, and reliability.			
		4) Middleware: quality, security, and commitment to evolution (innovation) of the proposed middleware, approach to the maintenance		2.3.7.	Description of quality and security of ID card middleware lacks justification and only / mainly repeats the technical requirements. The proposed middleware has basic quality and security elements, with unclear or undefined plans for future evolution and innovation and no justification. The approach to product roadmap and maintenance is vague and incomplete, showing none or minimal alignment with recognized standards or best practices.	1-25	7.5%	1.875%
					The proposed middleware offers improved quality and security elements when compared to minimum technical requirements and industry standards. The proposal provides hints on improved compatibility, speed of processing and functionalities, however, lacks details and proof. There's a moderate commitment to future evolution, indicating that plans are in place for the middleware updates. There's evidence of some forward planning for responding to new technology developments or security threats;	26-50		

Evaluation criteria	Score for the quality criterion	Sub-criteria / assessment aspect	Assessment basis	Reference to technical req.	Assessment approach	Assessment scale	Maximum score for the sub-criterion	Sub-criteria score in total evaluation
					however, plans are not very specific and comprehensive. The product roadmap and maintenance plans are adequality laid out, giving in some insight into timelines and processes based on typical industry approach.			
					The proposed middleware demonstrates high-level quality with modern security measures, justified by internationally recognized best practices. Commitment on improved compatibility, speed of processing and functionalities is provided along with proof and justifications. Approach to innovation and future evolution is present, reflected in a detailed product roadmap, including frequency of updates and some details on the process. Rather specific justifications based on experience and best practices are provided. However, there is no commitment to provide updates without additional change orders. The product roadmap and maintenance process are well-structured and aligned with international standards ensuring resilience and longevity of the product.	51-75		
					The proposed middleware is of exceptional quality, showing high compatibility with various operating systems, devices, browsers, and applications, high-speed processing capabilities to facilitate quick data retrieval and transactions from the ID card, and advanced functionalities, including reading and writing, encryption and decryption, and connection with different databases or applications. The proposal outlines robust security features, including the most advanced encryption standards and protocols to prevent data leaks and unauthorized access.	76-100		

Evaluation criteria	Score for the quality criterion	Sub-criteria / assessment aspect	Assessment basis	Reference to technical req.	Assessment approach	Assessment scale	Maximum score for the sub-criterion	Sub-criteria score in total evaluation
					Justification for the security measures is comprehensive and specific. Commitment to innovative evolution that surpasses common industry standards is provided, including frequency of updates and commitment to provide periodic updates without additional change orders. The product roadmap is detailed and strategic, anticipating future developments while maintaining optimal product condition. Comprehensive justifications based on practical experience and internationally recognized practices are provided. The product roadmap and maintenance processes are comprehensive and future-proof, setting benchmarks for the industry. The Applicant offers reliable technical support and regular maintenance to ensure the middleware continues to function optimally with minimum downtime. The middleware also complies with stringent global and local standards to ensure it meets the highest benchmarks for performance, safety, and reliability.			
		Compliance with requirements in the technical specification in respect to: 1) ID card 2) ID card applet 3) Middleware	Compliance matrix	2.3.2., 2.3.5., 2.3.7.	The Applicant demonstrates commitment and provides justification for meeting some or all relevant mandatory technical requirements. Score for each requirement is assigned based on the justifications provided: - 0 – no justification is provided; - 1 – formal justification is provided; - 2 – detailed and comprehensive justification is provided. Final score is calculated proportionally based on the number of relevant requirements.	1-100	20%	5.0%
3. Identity and Document Management	25%	**IT software, hardware and equipment solution**: technology innovation,	Description **Up to 25 pages.**	2.4.	The proposed IT solution demonstrates little or no technological innovation with only general descriptions of hardware, software, and equipment. No product specifications	1-25	60%	15%

Evaluation criteria	Score for the quality criterion	Sub-criteria / assessment aspect	Assessment basis	Reference to technical req.	Assessment approach	Assessment scale	Maximum score for the sub-criterion	Sub-criteria score in total evaluation
Information System		a proven approach to ensuring the citizen facing solutions providing a good user experience, and approach to IT security for the following components: 1. Citizen eService application (web portal) 2. Enrolment solution 3. Identity management and document issuance solution 4. Biometric data and document registry 5. Automated Biometric Identification Solution (ABIS) 6. Public key infrastructure 7. On-site queuing management solution 8. Reports and statistics solution 9. Integrations with external data sources			(including what specific IT software, hardware and equipment solutions will be used and the numbers required) are provided with no justification on how they meet the technical requirements. The approach to ensuring good user experience and IT security appears minimal, following a basic method without clear reference to industry trends or standards.			
					The proposed IT solution shows some evidence of technological innovation with some description of hardware, software and equipment, which is rather limited. Product specifications and numbers with some justifications are provided; however, rather limited. Suggested software, hardware and equipment solutions are not based on advanced technologies and / or not extensively justified. The approach to user experience is acceptable, while the IT security plan aligns with industry standards. However, it lacks a proactive strategy for future enhancement or adaptation to emerging trends.	26-50		
					The proposed IT solution is well-designed with distinct signs of technology innovation. Hardware, software and equipment specifications and numbers provided and well-justified. The suggested technologies are advanced and justifications on how they meet or exceed the technical requirements are detailed and based on practical experience and international best practices. There is a strong focus on ensuring a good user experience and comprehensive IT security measures. Commitment to future improvements, including support, maintenance and frequency of IT solution updates is apparent with strategic planning	51-75		

Evaluation criteria	Score for the quality criterion	Sub-criteria / assessment aspect	Assessment basis	Reference to technical req.	Assessment approach	Assessment scale	Maximum score for the sub-criterion	Sub-criteria score in total evaluation
					based on technology forecasts and industry trends. However, there is no commitment to provide updates any without additional change orders.			
					The proposed IT solution excels in technology innovation with detailed specifications of proposed hardware, software and equipment, and extensive calculations and justifications based on case studies, practical experience and best practices. Suggested technologies incorporate state-of-the-art hardware, software, and equipment and based on detailed justifications clearly exceed the minimum technical requirements. The approach to user experience is exceptional, focusing on intuitive, user-friendly interfaces and systems. The IT security approach is exceptional, anticipating future threats and aligning with the most stringent industry standards. There is clear evidence of strategic planning for continuous adaptation to emerging trends and maintaining industry leadership. Specific approach on support, maintenance and IT solution updates is provided, including commitment to provide some periodic updates without additional change orders.	76-100		
		Fulfilment of required **demonstration scenarios** from user experience, innovation and security point of view: 1) Citizen eService application (web portal): booking of appointment 2) Citizen enrolment in Armenia	Demonstration	As noted above in para. 1.2.	The demonstration does not cover all required scenarios, system performs at a basic level, only showcasing essential functionalities. The user experience is poor, with minimal effort put into designing an intuitive and user-friendly interface. The security protocols are basic and might be prone to vulnerabilities, thus showing a lack in organizations risk management efforts. Little to no innovation is presented, suggesting a lack of future-proofing. The progression of tasks during the demonstration is disorganized and non-	1-25	20%	5%

Evaluation criteria	Score for the quality criterion	Sub-criteria / assessment aspect	Assessment basis	Reference to technical req.	Assessment approach	Assessment scale	Maximum score for the sub-criterion	Sub-criteria score in total evaluation
		3) Citizen enrolment in an embassy 4) Identity proofing and validation workflow at the back-end system 5) Biometric data matching			cohesive, indicating poor process management.			
					The system demonstration adequately covers the majority of required scenarios. The user experience is suitable, indicating consideration for usability but there is room for improvements. Security safeguards provided are industry standard but not extraordinary, indicating a mediocre risk management system. The system displays modest innovation, however, the flow of steps within the scenarios lacks smoothness, potentially show slight jumps from one process to another, indicating the need for better process sequencing and organization.	26-50		
					The system demonstration performs at a high level, showcasing all required scenarios comprehensively. The system presentation suggests good user experience with well-thought-out interface and process flow. Security measures are comprehensive, indicating a strong commitment to risk management. The evident innovative features suggest a forward-thinking approach. However, minor irregularities in the process flow may appear, suggesting that there's still scope for improving the process. In addition, Applicant demonstrates commitment to meet not only mandatory, but also some of the optional requirements for IT software, hardware and equipment components.	51-75		

Evaluation criteria	Score for the quality criterion	Sub-criteria / assessment aspect	Assessment basis	Reference to technical req.	Assessment approach	Assessment scale	Maximum score for the sub-criterion	Sub-criteria score in total evaluation
					The system demonstration is exceptional, going beyond the basic requirements of the scenarios. User experience is exemplary, indicating an in-depth understanding of user needs, preferences and behaviors. The system features comprehensive security protocols, suggesting a top-tier risk management system. The demonstration showcases differentiating innovation in multiple features and designs. The steps within each scenario have a seamless flow, demonstrating flawless process transition and management. This indicates industry leadership and technical excellence. In addition, Applicant demonstrates commitment to meet not only mandatory, but also all of the optional requirements for IT software, hardware and equipment components.	76-100		
		Compliance with requirements in the technical specification in respect to all IT software, hardware and equipment components	Compliance matrix	2.4.	The Applicant demonstrates commitment and provides justification for meeting some or all relevant mandatory technical requirements. Score for each requirement is assigned based on the justifications provided: - 0 – no justification is provided; - 1 – formal justification is provided; - 2 – detailed and comprehensive justification is provided. Final score is calculated proportionally based on the number of relevant requirements.	1-100	20%	5%
					The Applicant demonstrates commitment and provides justification for meeting all relevant mandatory and one or several relevant optional technical requirements (3 optional requirements in total, 3 additional points for each requirement).	(additional) 3-9		

Evaluation criteria	Score for the quality criterion	Sub-criteria / assessment aspect	Assessment basis	Reference to technical req.	Assessment approach	Assessment scale	Maximum score for the sub-criterion	Sub-criteria score in total evaluation
4. Requested services	25%	**SLAs:** 1) Proposed governance mechanism: monitoring of KPIs, approach to improvement plan, if needed 2) Suggested improvements to the minimum service levels	Description **Up to 3 pages.**	2.5.	The proposal only / mainly repeats the technical requirements and does not propose any specific KPI monitoring measures or improvements based on KPI monitoring results. Any suggested improvements to the minimum service levels (e.g. fast-track document issuance services exceeding minimum service levels or improved enrolment and document issuance turnaround time) are minimal and do not demonstrate a solid understanding of the service's needs or potential growth.	1-25	:20%	5%
					The proposed governance mechanism for KPI monitoring is somewhat defined by providing some KPI monitoring measures, however, the approach to improvements based on the KPI monitoring results is not provided. The suggested improvements to the minimum service levels show some insight into enhancing the services but lack a comprehensive or innovative approach.	26-50		
					A rather strong governance mechanism, including KPI monitoring measures is proposed with rather clear provisions for improvements based on KPI monitoring results, showing an understanding of continual service optimization. Suggested improvements to the minimum service levels are well considered, practical, and aligned with industry best practices.	51-75		
					The proposed governance mechanism displays an excellent approach to KPI monitoring, including detailed and well-justified KPI monitoring measures based on experience and industry best practices. Proactive approach to improvements is suggested, indicating a comprehensive strategy for quality assurance and service enhancement.	76-100		

Evaluation criteria	Score for the quality criterion	Sub-criteria / assessment aspect	Assessment basis	Reference to technical req.	Assessment approach	Assessment scale	Maximum score for the sub-criterion	Sub-criteria score in total evaluation
					The suggested improvements to minimum service levels are insightful, innovative, and precisely calibrated to potentially elevate service standards and performance. Improvements are justified based on experience and industry best practices.			
		Quality, completeness, and feasibility of the **design and implementation approach:** 1) Project plan 2) Proposed project team 3) Structure and roles of the Consortium Members and suppliers	Description **Up to 7 pages.**	2.6.1.	The proposed project plan meets minimum technical requirements but lacks detail and justification. The project team structure and members are provided, however, little details on the suggested members' experience are provided. Structure, roles and responsibilities of Consortium Members and suppliers is very clear or justified.	1-25	20%	5%
					The proposal offers a somewhat comprehensive project plan, generally aligned with the technical requirements. Some justifications are provided. The proposed project team structure and members are provided, their experience is described, however, relevant experience is rather limited. Roles of Consortium Members and suppliers are defined, displaying a grasp of necessary roles and expertise and somewhat justified, but lacking specifics. Overall justifications based on best practices and international experiences, offer moderate support to the plan, but lack clear strategies for innovative improvement and risk mitigation.	26-50		
					The proposal provides a comprehensive and specific project plan that meets the timeline requirements and proposes some optimizations. Justifications are rather detailed and based on experience and best practices. Proposal includes clearly defined project team structure, roles and responsibilities and shows quite extensive relevant experience and expertise. Applicant also provides consortium	51-75		

Evaluation criteria	Score for the quality criterion	Sub-criteria / assessment aspect	Assessment basis	Reference to technical req.	Assessment approach	Assessment scale	Maximum score for the sub-criterion	Sub-criteria score in total evaluation
					structure that shows efficient utilization of members and suppliers. Justifications on optimal team and consortium structure are provided. Overall design and implementation approach shows an understanding of best practices and addresses all required aspects with credible justifications. The approach to handling risks, potential future changes and innovative improvements is proactive, industry-informed, and geared towards continual improvement.			
					The proposal offers a meticulously comprehensive and specific project plan that meets timeline requirements and provides suggestions to optimize the minimum requirements for duration of different project stages. Justifications are comprehensive and informative, demonstrating an impressive knowledge of industry best practices, innovative trends, and successful project experiences. Detailed project team structure is provided, including specific experts, their roles and their profiles with relevant experience. Detailed justifications on the optimal structure and success of the team are provided and based on long-term relevant experience, expertise in the field and success in other projects. Detailed structure of the Consortium and specific and roles of each Consortium Member is provided. Relevance and role of each member is specifically described, showing high expertise in the field, which results in the most optimal structure of the Consortium. The overall implementation approach, including both project plan and structure of the Consortium and team, is well-structured and justified based on authoritative references,	76-100		

Evaluation criteria	Score for the quality criterion	Sub-criteria / assessment aspect	Assessment basis	Reference to technical req.	Assessment approach	Assessment scale	Maximum score for the sub-criterion	Sub-criteria score in total evaluation
					successful case studies, and industry trends, taking into account potential risks, future trends and changes and strategic improvements. This suggests an unusually high standard of project management, technical expertise, and industry excellence.			
		Quality, completeness, and feasibility of **approach to operations:** 1) Customer service quality control measures 2) Quality control of the processes, the organization, and the security measures for the whole of the supply chain (incl. production, inventory management, personalization, logistics).	Description **Up to 5 pages.**	2.6.2.	The approach to operations is described very generally and only / mainly repeats the technical requirements. Customer service quality control measures as well as quality control of the processes, the organization, and the security measures for the whole supply chain are rather basic and general, no specific means for control and improvement of service quality provided.	1-25	20%	5%
					The approach to operations is provided and somewhat justified and offers improved measures when compared to technical requirements. Some means to measure and improve customer service quality is provided. Also, the proposal includes some means to measure and improve the quality control of the processes as well as the security of different supply chain elements. The measures are somewhat justified, however lack specific or comprehensive planning. The organizational structure of future company is provided, however, it is not very clear and / or optimal. The processes of hiring and training the employees are rather vague. Some justifications are provided, but they are not very specific and convincing and do not leverage recognized best practices for efficiency.	26-50		

Evaluation criteria	Score for the quality criterion	Sub-criteria / assessment aspect	Assessment basis	Reference to technical req.	Assessment approach	Assessment scale	Maximum score for the sub-criterion	Sub-criteria score in total evaluation
					The approach to operations is comprehensive, with well-planned provisions and measures that exceed minimum technical requirements. It shows a strong commitment to customer service and processes quality control and improvement as well as control and improvement of security of different supply chain elements, showcasing a clear and feasible approach to oversee all operational domains. Rather specific measures are included and well-justified. The Applicant also provides clear structure of organization and rather detailed description of number, roles and responsibilities of employees, the qualifications required and approach to employee hiring and training process, which follows recognized best practices in operations management. Nevertheless, some areas of proposal lack unique elements for operational efficiency and security.	51-75		
					The proposed operational approach excels in detailing exceptionally well-thought-out plans for customer service quality control measures, quality control of the processes, the organization, and the security measures for the whole of the supply chain. The proposal outlines extensive and detailed means that will be used to measure customer service quality and how to improve it. The Applicant also provides comprehensive means to measure and improve the quality control of the processes as well as the security of different supply chain elements. The means are well-justified and based on practical experience, internationally recognized best practices and innovative measures.	76-100		

Evaluation criteria	Score for the quality criterion	Sub-criteria / assessment aspect	Assessment basis	Reference to technical req.	Assessment approach	Assessment scale	Maximum score for the sub-criterion	Sub-criteria score in total evaluation
					The proposal also outlines clear, comprehensive and meticulously described structure of the organization – number, roles and responsibilities of employees, the qualifications required and approach to employee hiring and training process. The optimal structure of organization and described approach is well-justified taking into account practical experience and internationally recognized best practices. The overall approach shows a strong commitment to continual improvement, future-readiness, and refined user experience, portraying a high degree of feasibility and mastery in operations management.			
		Quality, completeness, and feasibility of approach to **handover at the end of the contract**	Description **Up to 2 pages.**	2.6.3., 2.6.4.	The proposed approach to end-of-contract handover delivers minimum alignment with the technical requirements for asset transfer, warranty and maintenance services, training, operations, and maintenance. Plan for transition (incl. encompassing personnel training, quality control measures, lifecycle management, and ongoing service provision) is only superficially addressed, indicating a weak strategy and potential setbacks in meeting the project's necessities and timeline.	1-25	20%	5%
					The end-of-contract handover approach shows some understanding of the required aspects such as timely asset transfer, continuation of document issuance during transition, personnel training, and warranty and maintenance services. However, it lacks detailed strategies for an effective transition including a detailed handover procedure, clear time-frames for various handover aspects, detailed description of maintenance services, and a well-structured plan for handling errors and/or problems during warranty and	26-50		

Evaluation criteria	Score for the quality criterion	Sub-criteria / assessment aspect	Assessment basis	Reference to technical req.	Assessment approach	Assessment scale	Maximum score for the sub-criterion	Sub-criteria score in total evaluation
					maintenance services. The approach to ongoing operations post-handover remains average with scope for more comprehensive strategies.			
					The proposal outlines a well-structured approach to the contract handover process, adhering closely to requirements including asset transfer, continuation of document issuance during transition, provision of warranty and maintenance services, and a well-thought-out personnel training plan. The proposed methods ensure clear communication, effective training, and maintenance post-handover. The proposal also mentions comprehensive strategies for error handling and client service during the warranty and maintenance services periods. However, some aspects such as proactivity and comprehensive approach in identifying improvements, addressing customer complaints, and long-term asset management could be further optimized.	51-75		
					The handover approach is exemplary, showing high compliance to the requirement criteria and demonstrating a well-structured plan that ensures a smooth transition with minimum disruption to services. There's a clear focus on every aspect of the handover, from transferring assets and software licenses to high-quality training for new employees and documentation of every relevant process. The approach to ensuring ongoing smooth operations, strict quality controls, efficient error management and proactive service improvement post-handover shows expertise in the aspect of project management, technical acumen, and customer interaction. The proposal reflects a high standard of operations handover strategy that is likely to	76-100		

Evaluation criteria	Score for the quality criterion	Sub-criteria / assessment aspect	Assessment basis	Reference to technical req.	Assessment approach	Assessment scale	Maximum score for the sub-criterion	Sub-criteria score in total evaluation
					ensure a seamless transition and post-handover warranty and maintenance services provision.			
		Compliance with requirements in the technical specification: 1) SLAs 2) Design and implementation requirements 3) End-to-end service operations' requirements 4) Hand back requirements	Compliance matrix	2.5., 2.6.	The Applicant demonstrates commitment and provides justification for meeting some or all relevant mandatory technical requirements. Score for each requirement is assigned based on the justifications provided: - 0 – no justification is provided; - 1 – formal justification is provided; - 2 – detailed and comprehensive justification is provided. Final score is calculated proportionally based on the number of relevant requirements.	1-100	20%	5%
	100%							**100.0%**

1.3. Evaluation of Financial Proposals

The points for the price component (C) of the Bid will be calculated by summing up the Qualified Applicant's score for price criteria 2.1 and 2.2 provided in the summary table in section 1 of this ANNEX 5 (*Evaluation of Bids*) above, multiplied by their respective weights, such that:

$C = \frac{C_{1min}}{C_1} \times X_1 + \frac{C_{2min}}{C_2} \times X_2 + \frac{C_{3min}}{C_3} \times X_3$, where:

C – Qualified Applicant's total score for the price component of the Bid.

$C_{1_{min}}$ – lowest proposed average fees (including taxes and charges) for the estimated volume level of biometric passports and biometric ID cards by a Qualified Applicant.

C_1– Qualified Applicant's proposed average fees (including taxes and charges) for the estimated volume level of biometric passports and biometric ID cards.

X_1 – comparative weight of price component C_1.

$C_{2_{min}}$ – lowest proposed sum of average fees (including taxes and charges) for one biometric passport and one biometric ID card above the Competent Authority's estimated volume level by a Qualified Applicant.

C_2 – Qualified Applicant's proposed sum of average fees (including taxes and charges) for one biometric passport and one biometric ID card above the Competent Authority's estimated volume level.

X_2 – comparative weight of price component C_2.

$C_{3_{min}}$ – lowest proposed annual fee (including taxes and charges) for maintenance and support of IDMIS after the end of the Project by a Qualified Applicant.

C_3 – Qualified Applicant's proposed annual fee (including taxes and charges) for maintenance and support of IDMIS after the end of the Project.

X_3 – comparative weight of price component C_3.

The sub-components C_1 and C_2 will be calculated as follows:

a) $C_1 = P_{BP_1} \times \mathrm{V}_{BP} + P_{ID_1} \times V_{ID}$, where:

C_1 – total proposed value of the tender for the estimated volume of biometric passports and biometric ID cards.

P_{BP_1} – Qualified Applicant's proposed average fees (including taxes and charges) per one biometric passport for the estimated volume of biometric passports.

V_{BP} – estimated volume of biometric passports.

P_{ID_1} – Qualified Applicant's proposed average fees (including taxes and charges) per one biometric ID card for the estimated volume of biometric ID cards.

V_{ID} – estimated volume of biometric ID cards.

b) $C_2 = P_{BP_2} + P_{ID_2}$, where:

C_2 – sum of the Qualified Applicant's proposed average fees (including taxes and charges) for one biometric passport and one ID card above the estimated volume.

P_{BP_2} – Qualified Applicant's proposed average fee (including taxes and charges) for one biometric passport when the volume exceeds the estimate. The proposed fee shall not be higher than 90% of P_{BP_1} and lower than 30% of P_{BP_1}.

P_{ID_2} – Qualified Applicant's proposed average fee (including taxes and charges) for one biometric ID card when the volume exceeds the estimate. The proposed fee shall not be higher than 90% of P_{ID_1} and lower than 30% of P_{ID_1}.

2. Total scoring

The economic benefit (S) of the Bid will be calculated by adding the points for Qualified Applicant's proposed price (C) and points for the quality of technical proposal (T) provided in the summary table in section 1 of this ANNEX 5 (*Evaluation of Bids*) above:

$S = C + T$

Qualified Applicant that received the highest economic benefit (S) score for a Bid (the highest total score for Technical Proposal and Financial Proposal) will be determined as the Winner of Selection Procedure.

3. Non-responsive Bids

The Bid shall be determined as non-responsive if during its evaluation any of the following is identified:

a) any document that should be submitted as part of Technical Proposal and/or Financial Proposal does not conform to the substance and/or content requirements to such document provided in ANNEX 4 (*Content of Bid*);

b) the substance of any part of the Technical Proposal Form does not comply with any of mandatory technical requirements provided in Addendum 1 to Technical Proposal Form, as per para. 2) of section 1 of ANNEX 4 (*Content of Bid*);

c) any part of the Technical Proposal Form does not contain the description (textual input) that should be provided under the content requirements to the Technical Proposal Form set in para. 2) of section 1 of ANNEX 4 (*Content of Bid*);

d) the score for evaluation of any technical proposal criterion (evaluation criteria No. 1.1.-1.4. in the evaluation criteria table provided in section 1 of this ANNEX 5 (*Evaluation of Bids*) above) is below 70% of the maximum score.

ANNEX 6. DRAFT AGREEMENT

Added by reference as part of Tender Documentation published for the RFP stage of the Selection Procedure and available at Mineconomy's website.

ANNEX 7. REQUIREMENTS TO RELIABLE BANKS

For the purposes of this RFP, Reliable Bank shall be:

a) any resident bank that complies with one of the following requirements:

   1) the bank is a member of a foreign banking group; or

   2) the bank has a rating not lower than the sovereign rating (-) one notch of the Republic of Armenia at the time of submission of the Bid;

b) any non-resident bank that has a rating not lower than A- (according to the Standard and Poor's or Fitch ratings) or A3 (according to the Moody's rating).

c) Any of the following shall not qualify as Reliable Bank:

   1) any bank that is subject to (or any persons having Control over the bank which are subject to) the restrictions provided in paragraph 47 of the PPP Procedure;

   2) any bank that is subject to (or any persons having Control over the bank which are subject to) sanctions in accordance with Applicable Law or international law;

   3) any resident bank that violated the requirements set by the Central Bank of Armenia regarding the capital adequacy ratio during the previous 12 months.

ANNEX 8. DEFINITIONS AND INTERPRETATION

1.1. Capitalized terms, expressions and abbreviations used in this RFP shall have the meaning ascribed to them in this Clause 1.1.

Advisors	means individuals and/or legal entities that have expertise in the relevant area and can provide conclusions, clarifications, recommendations and advice on issues that require such expertise (such as (such as legal, technical, commercial, financial matters) during the Selection Procedure.
Agreement	means, depending on the context, the draft Agreement for the Project approved as part of the RFP or the Agreement that will be entered into between the Competent Authority and the Project Company.
Applicable Law	means the law of Armenia, including the Constitution of Armenia, laws, decrees, decisions or regulations and other forms of primary and secondary legislation which are in force in Armenia, including international treaties.
Applicant	means legal persons or Consortia that participate in the Selection Procedure, as provided in item 5 of Article 2(1) of the PPP Law.
Armenia	means the Republic of Armenia.
Authorized Officials	means the head and the secretary of the Evaluation Commission.
Authorized Persons	means individuals authorized to represent the Applicant under the relevant Authorizing Documents in connection with the Selection Procedure.
Authorizing Documents	means a document or documents confirming the authority of the Authorized Person to represent the Applicant under the Selection Procedure. The Authorizing Documents may take form of a power of attorney, the content requirements for which are set out in Form B (*Content Requirements for Power of Attorney*) of Annex 6 (*Content of Qualification Bid*) of the RFQ, or other documents that expressly confirm the authority of the Authorized Person to represent the Applicant and set forth at least the same scope of authority as that indicated in Form B of Annex 6 (*Content of Qualification Bid*) of the RFQ.
Award Decision	means the decision of the Evaluation Commission on the outcomes of evaluation of Bids and declaration of the Winner, as provided in Clause 7.5.2.
Bid	means a set of documents composed of Technical Proposal and Financial Proposal, which should be prepared and submitted by a Qualified Applicant in accordance with the RFP.
Bid Security	means the document securing fulfilment of obligations assumed under the Bid at the Request for Proposal stage and conforming to the requirements set in Clause 4.6.1.

Bid Security Validity Period	means the period of validity of Bid Security specified in Clause 4.7.2.
Bids Evaluation Deadline	has the meaning given in Clause 7.1.1.
Bids Submission Deadline	has the meaning given in Clause 5.1.1.
Bid Validity Period	means the period during which the Bid should remain valid, as set out in Clause 4.6.
Business Day	means a day when banks are open for business in Armenia, and which is not a Saturday or Sunday, a public holiday or a non-business day under Applicable Law.
Candidate	means the Applicant that submitted a Qualification Bid but in relation to whom the Evaluation Commission has not yet taken the decision on qualification in accordance with the terms and conditions of the RFQ.
Competent Authority	means the Ministry of Internal Affairs of the Republic of Armenia.
Confidentiality Undertaking	means the document in the form set out in Annex 7 (*Form of Confidentiality Undertaking*) of the RFQ that should be executed by the Candidate qualified to take part in the Selection Procedure at the RFP stage in accordance with the RFQ and submitted to the Competent Authority, and that sets out the terms and conditions on confidentiality and non-disclosure of information to be provided as part of the Selection Procedure.
Consortium	means legal entities (Lead Member and other Consortium Members), resident and/or non-resident, that participate in the Selection Procedure as an Applicant on the basis of joint activities and have agreed, among other matters, on the joint implementation of the Project and compliance with the terms and conditions of the Agreement in case the Consortium becomes the Winner.
Consortium Member	means a legal entity being part of the Consortium, whether the Lead Member or other Consortium Members.
Control	means decisive influence on business activities of a business entity or its part that is exercised by one or several related legal entities and/or individuals directly or through other persons, in particular by: the right to own or use all the assets or their considerable part; the right ensuring a decisive impact on determining the composition, voting results, and decisions of the business entity's governing bodies; the execution of such agreements and contracts that make it possible to define the conditions of business activities, give binding instructions or perform functions of the business entity's governing body; occupying the position of a head or a deputy head of the supervisory board, the board of directors or other supervisory or executive body of a business entity by a person that occupies one or several of the aforementioned positions at other business entities; occupying more than half of the positions of members of the supervisory board, the board of directors, other supervisory or executive bodies of a business entity by persons that occupy one or several of the

	aforementioned positions at another business entity. Legal entities and/or individuals that jointly or concertedly perform business activities, including those that jointly or concertedly influence business activities of a business entity, shall be considered as related. The related individuals include, inter alia, spouses, parents and children, brothers and/or sisters. The term "to Control" shall be construed accordingly.
Data Sheet	means the data sheet attached as ANNEX 1 (*Data Sheet*).
Draft PPP Project	has the meaning given in item 1 of paragraph 7 of the PPP Procedure.
Evaluation Commission	means a special body responsible for conducting the Selection Procedure, in particular (for the purposes of this RFP) for opening and evaluation of Bids.
Execution Deadline	means the deadline for conclusion of the Agreement provided in Clause 8.4.3.
Financial Proposal	means the financial and price proposal that should be submitted by the Qualified Applicant as part of the Bid in compliance with the financial/price evaluation criteria and other requirements set by the RFP.
Financial Proposal Envelope	means the inner envelope with the original and copies of the Financial Proposal, as required under Clause (b).
Government	means the Government of Armenia.
Lead Member	means the Consortium Member which is designated to represent and irrevocably bind all Consortium Members in all matters related to the Selection Procedure, including but not limited to the submission of the Bid on behalf of the Consortium, and which should meet the requirements set in Clause 2.1.3 of the RFQ.
Material Change	has the meaning given in Clause 7.3.2.
Material Deviation	means with respect to the Bid any material deviation, objection, conditionality or reservation: (a) that affects in any substantial way the scope, quality or performance of the Agreement; (b) that limits in any substantial way, inconsistent with the Tender Documentation, the Competent Authority's or the Winner's, or the Project Company's obligations under the Agreement; (c) the rectification of which would unfairly affect the competitive position of other Qualified Applicants who are presenting substantially responsive Bids; (d) that otherwise has a substantial negative effect on the rights of the Competent Authority or the obligations of the Qualified Applicant in the Selection Procedure and subsequently under the Agreement.
Mineconomy	means the Ministry of Economy of Armenia.

Notification of Award	means the written notification provided by Evaluation Commission to the Winner after adoption of the Award Decision, as set out in Clause 8.1.
Official Languages	means Armenian, English or Russian.
Parent Company	means any legal entity which Controls the Applicant or Consortium Member.
Potential Conflict of Interest	means evidence of a person's Private Interest in the area of person's official or representative powers which may affect independence or impartiality of that person's decisions or affect that person's actions within the performance of his/her powers.
Private Interest	means any pecuniary or non-pecuniary interest of a person, including interest arising out of personal, family, amicable or other non-official relationships with individuals or legal entities, including relationships in connection with membership or engagement in civic, political, religious or other organizations.
Project	means public-private partnership project for the issuance and distribution of identity documents and operation and servicing of the facilities involved in the ID documents provision in Armenia.
Project Company	means a company that should be established by the Winner as a resident company in Armenia in accordance with the requirements of the RFP to conclude the Agreement and implement the Project.
Qualification Bid	means the set of documents prepared and submitted by a Candidate in order to be qualified to take part in the Selection Procedure at the RFP stage, as per the format and contents set out in the RFQ.
Qualification Criteria	means the technical criteria and financial criteria set forth in Annex 5 (*Qualification Criteria*) of the RFQ.
Qualified Applicant	means the Applicant that has been qualified to take part in the Selection Procedure at the RFP stage in accordance with the terms and conditions of the RFQ and submitted the Confidentiality Undertaking to the Competent Authority.
Real Conflict of Interest	means the conflict between a person's Private Interest and official or representative authority that may affect such person's neutrality or unbiased decision-making or influence his/her action or lack of action during exercising the specified authority.
Related Companies	means one or several of the following legal entities: a) a Parent Company; b) a legal entity Controlled by the Applicant or Consortium Member; and/or c) a legal entity which is Controlled by the same Parent Company that Controls the Applicant or Consortium Member.

	For the purposes of this RFP, the relations of Control between the Related Companies shall in any case be deemed to exist where: a) the Parent Company holds, directly or indirectly, over 50% of voting rights or equity interest in the Applicant or the Consortium Member; b) the Applicant or a Consortium Member holds, directly or indirectly, over 50% of the voting rights or equity interest in the relevant legal entity; and/or c) a Parent Company holds, directly or indirectly, over 50% of the voting rights or equity interest in a legal entity and the Applicant or Consortium Member.
Reliable Bank	means a bank that meets the requirements of ANNEX 7 (*Requirements to Reliable Banks*).
Request for Qualification (RFQ)	means the document setting out the Qualification Criteria and conditions for qualification of Applicants under the Selection Procedure, as well as other terms and conditions which should and/or may be reflected in the RFQ under the Applicable Law.
Request for Proposal (RFP)	means this document setting the conditions for Applicants for the purposes of concluding the Agreement, as well as other terms and conditions which should and/or may be reflected in the RFP under the Applicable Law and is intended for the Qualified Applicants.
Second Ranking Bidder	has the meaning given in Clause 8.6.1.
Selection Procedure	means the entirety of actions aimed at implementing the procedures, exercising rights and responsibilities provided by the Applicable Law for the purpose of selecting a private partner for implementation of the Project.
Technical Proposal	means the proposal that should be submitted by the Qualified Applicant as part of the Bid in compliance with the technical evaluation criteria and other requirements set by the RFP.
Technical Proposal Envelope	means the inner envelope with the original and copies of the Technical Proposal, as required under Clause (a).
Tender Documentation	means the RFQ, the RFP, draft of the Agreement provided in ANNEX 6 (*Draft Agreement*), and other documents for carrying out the Selection Procedure approved and published by the Competent Authority and/or Evaluation Commission.
Time Schedule	means the schedule with key milestones of the Selection Procedure and their indicative timeframes for the purposes of this RFP provided in ANNEX 2 (*Time Schedule*).
Winner	means a Qualified Applicant with the highest score Bid invited for finalization and signing of the Agreement in accordance with the RFP.

	The term “Winner” may also refer to the Second Ranking Bidder under the conditions provided in Clause 8.6.

1.2. In this Request for Proposal, unless the context otherwise requires:

(a) any reference to a "Clause" or "Annex" is a reference to a respective clause or annex of this Request for Proposal;

(b) any reference to "AMD " or "dram" is a reference to the lawful currency of Armenia;

(c) terms and expressions that are not defined elsewhere in this Request for Proposal shall have the meaning ascribed to them under the Applicable Law.