

Annex: Award criteria - Requirements for the provider

Lot 1 - Facilitators

The contract will be awarded to the most economical tender. The most economically advantageous tender is determined on the basis of the best price-performance ratio.

In addition to the price or costs, the organisation, availability, qualifications and experience of the personnel entrusted with the execution of the contract are also taken into account.

JUGEND für Europa has the following expectations of the service provider:

Evaluation criteria

Besides these exclusion criteria, the service provider is expected to convince us by abiding to the following criteria (evaluation criteria):

Evaluation criteria	
<i>Experience facilitation I</i>	Extensive experience; multiple relevant examples; clear description of roles and responsibilities; strong inclusion and creativity demonstrated
<i>Experience facilitation II</i>	Demonstrated experience in moderating comparable international events, including work with diverse stakeholder groups (including high-level representatives from umbrella organisations, ministries, European Commission, national agencies, etc.) and collaboration with multidisciplinary teams (e.g. scientific experts, rapporteurs).
<i>Methodology</i>	Three clear, well-structured and convincing examples are provided, demonstrating highly innovative, creative, and inclusive methods. The examples show strong engagement of diverse stakeholders
<i>Expertise I</i>	Comprehensive and well-structured knowledge of the specified European Commission strategies is demonstrated.
<i>Expertise II</i>	A clear and convincing understanding of the role of youth work and youth engagement in the context is shown.
<i>Expertise III</i>	The response confirms substantial professional engagement and clearly indicates experience in moderating or facilitating events on these topics, including a brief description of roles and settings.

Degree of fulfillment: Evaluation criteria

Here below is further explanation of how the evaluation criteria will be assessed.

Criteria	Points	Target achievement
Experience facilitation I	18-25	Extensive experience; multiple relevant examples; clear description of roles and responsibilities; strong inclusion and creativity demonstrated
	9-17	Some experience; few examples; moderate clarity in roles

	0-8	Very limited or no experience; no examples or roles unclear
Experience facilitation II	18-25	Demonstrated experience in moderating comparable international events, including work with diverse stakeholder groups (including high-level representatives from umbrella organisations, ministries, European Commission, national agencies, etc.) and collaboration with multidisciplinary teams (e.g. scientific experts, rapporteurs).
	9-17	Relevant experience in moderating events is demonstrated, including some work with diverse stakeholder groups and/or collaboration with multidisciplinary teams.
	0-8	Limited experience in moderating events is demonstrated, with little or no evidence of work with diverse stakeholder groups or collaboration with multidisciplinary teams
Methodology	13-20	Three clear, well-structured and convincing examples are provided, demonstrating highly innovative, creative, and inclusive methods. The examples show strong engagement of diverse stakeholders
	7-12	Examples provided demonstrate some innovative and inclusive elements and show engagement with different stakeholders. Consideration of diverse needs and backgrounds is evident but not consistently or comprehensively elaborated.
	0-6	Examples are limited, insufficiently detailed, or lack innovation and inclusivity. Little or no evidence is provided of effective engagement with diverse stakeholders or consideration of different needs and backgrounds.
Expertise I	8-10	Excellent and well-structured knowledge of the specified European Commission strategies and policy priorities is demonstrated.
	4-7	Good general knowledge of the specified strategies and priorities is demonstrated.
	0-3	Limited or insufficient knowledge of the specified strategies and priorities is demonstrated.
Expertise II	8-10	Extensive and relevant professional engagement with the topics is demonstrated.
	4-7	Some relevant professional engagement with the topics is demonstrated.
	0-3	Limited or no relevant professional engagement with the topics is demonstrated.
Expertise III	8-10	Clear and relevant professional engagement with the topics is demonstrated, including substantial moderation or facilitation experience in related contexts.
	4-7	Some professional engagement and/or moderation experience related to the topics is demonstrated.
	0-3	Limited or no relevant professional engagement or moderation experience is demonstrated.

Evaluation matrix

The table below summarises the exclusion and evaluation criteria, together with the related evaluation keys, and the relevant documents that should be submitted with the bid.

Criterion	Weight	Subcriterion	Evaluation key (content specification)	Documents to be submitted, required evidence
Experience Facilitation I	25 %	Preparation, moderation, delivery	Assessed based on relevance and number of events facilitated, creativity in methods, inclusion measures, clear roles and responsibilities	CV, description of 3 examples
Experience Facilitation II	25 %	International event moderation, stakeholder engagement	Assessed based on demonstrated experience in moderating comparable international events, including work with diverse stakeholder groups (including high-level representatives from umbrella organisations, ministries, European Commission, national agencies, etc.) and collaboration with multidisciplinary teams (e.g. scientific experts, rapporteurs)	CV, description of 1 example
Methodology	20 %	Innovative methods, inclusive approaches	Assessed based on creativity of methods, engagement of participants, inclusive approaches, demonstrable results	CV, description of 3 examples
Expertise I	10 %	Knowledge of EU programmes, youth policy, participation	Assessed based on knowledge of the specified European Commission strategies and policy priorities, and their relevance for youth work and youth engagement.	CV, description outlining thematic expertise and relevant professional experience.
Expertise II	10%	Understanding of the role of youth work and youth engagement	Assessed based on the demonstrated understanding of how youth work and youth engagement contribute to European policy priorities, participatory processes, democratic engagement, and social inclusion.	CV, description demonstrating thematic understanding and practical application.
Expertise III	10%	Professional engagement and moderation experience in the thematic field	Assessed based on previous professional involvement with the relevant topics and demonstrated experience in moderating or facilitating events related to European youth policy, participation, democracy, inclusion, or related EU priorities.	CV, description of relevant moderation/facilitation assignments, including role and thematic focus

Lot 2 - Rapporteurs

The contract will be awarded to the most economical tender. The most economically advantageous tender is determined on the basis of the best price-performance ratio.

In addition to the price or costs, the organisation, availability, qualifications and experience of the personnel entrusted with the execution of the contract are also taken into account.

JUGEND für Europa has the following expectations of the service provider:

Evaluation criteria

Besides these exclusion criteria, the service provider is expected to convince us by abiding to the following criteria (evaluation criteria):

Evaluation criteria	
Experience as rapporteur	Demonstrated experience as a rapporteur in international or European multi-stakeholder events.
Methodological approach	Demonstrated ability to ensure accurate, structured, and accessible documentation of discussions, including effective real-time capture of key messages, differing perspectives, and outcomes in complex multi-stakeholder settings.
Thematic understanding	Understanding of the thematic focus of the conference, including the EU Youth Programmes Erasmus+ Youth and European Solidarity Corps, as well as relevant European Commission strategies, including the Intergenerational Fairness Strategy, EU Civil Society Strategy, EU Preparedness Union Strategy, European Democracy Shield, and the Union of Skills.

Degree of fulfillment: Evaluation criteria

Here below is further explanation of how the evaluation criteria will be assessed.

Criteria	Points	Target achievement
Experience as rapporteur	20-30	Extensive experience as a rapporteur in international or European multi-stakeholder events; at least 3 relevant examples provided; clear description of roles and responsibilities.
	10-19	Some relevant experience; limited number of examples; roles and responsibilities described with moderate clarity.
	0-9	Very limited or no relevant experience; no examples provided or roles not clearly described.

Methodological approach	28-40	Clear and well-structured methodological approach for rapporteur work, ensuring accurate, structured, and accessible documentation of discussions; ability to capture key messages, differing perspectives, and outcomes in real time; approach is clearly adapted to complex multi-stakeholder settings
	15-27	Adequate methodological approach with some structure for documenting discussions; generally able to capture key messages and outcomes, but limited depth, clarity, or consistency in handling complex multi-stakeholder dynamics.
	0-14	Weak or unclear methodological approach; limited evidence of structured documentation or real-time synthesis; insufficient ability to capture key messages, perspectives, or outcomes.

Thematic understanding	16-30	Clearly demonstrated understanding of the conference themes, including the EU Youth Programmes Erasmus+ Youth and European Solidarity Corps, as well as relevant European Commission strategies. Shows ability to correctly situate topics within the broader EU policy context.
------------------------	-------	--

	7-15	Adequate understanding of the main conference themes, including some awareness of EU Youth Programmes and related European Commission strategies, but limited depth, detail, or policy contextualisation.
	0-6	Limited or no demonstrated understanding of the conference themes; insufficient or incorrect knowledge of relevant EU programmes and strategies.

Evaluation matrix

The table below summarises the exclusion and evaluation criteria, together with the related evaluation keys, and the relevant documents that should be submitted with the bid.

Criterion	Weight	Subcriterion	Evaluation key (content specification)	Documents to be submitted, required evidence
Experience as rapporteur	30 %	Preparation, documentation, reporting	Assessed based on demonstrated experience as a rapporteur in international or European multi-stakeholder events, including number and relevance of assignments and clarity of roles and responsibilities.	CV, description of 3 examples
Methodological approach	40 %	Structuring, synthesis, and real-time documentation	Assessed based on clarity and robustness of the rapporteur methodology, including ability to structure discussions, ensure accurate real-time capture of key messages and differing perspectives, and produce clear and accessible syntheses of outcomes.	CV, description of 1 example
Thematic understanding	30 %	EU youth policy and strategic context	Assessed based on understanding of the conference themes, including EU youth policy context such as Erasmus+ Youth and European Solidarity Corps, as well as relevant European Commission strategies, and ability to accurately reflect these in reporting.	CV, description of relevant experience