

AI development services in the RAISE project

Open procedure

Procurement Document

**KIRAHub (KIRA-InnoHub ry)
2026**

RAISE

1. Description of the public procurement

You are invited to submit a tender in the open procurement procedure entitled “AI development services in the RAISE project”.

Regional AI Initiative for Scaling Enterprises (hereinafter RAISE) (website: <https://centralbaltic.eu/project/raise/>) is a Central Baltic Programme project that aims to support growth-stage SMEs in Finland, Estonia, Latvia and Sweden in developing and launching AI-based products and services. The project brings together companies requiring the procured services, AI solution providers and mentors to implement pilot projects, provide expert support to companies and support their growth and scaling.

The contracting authority intends to establish a framework arrangement (hereinafter the agreement) with up to two tenderers in each lot of the procurement for ordering AI solutions (hereinafter the service) during the RAISE project. The procurement procedure will be conducted electronically in accordance with Finnish public procurement legislation and other legislation in force in Finland. Please submit your tender in accordance with the terms set out in the procurement documents.

2. Contracting authority:

KIRAHub (KIRA-InnoHub ry)
Business ID 2958830-3
Lapinlahdenkatu 16, 00180 Helsinki

3. General information

- 3.1. The title of the public procurement is “AI development services in the RAISE project”.
- 3.2. This procurement is financed under European Union funds under the grant agreement signed by the Regional Council of Southwest Finland and SA Tallinna Teaduspark Tehnopol on 15 April 2026, within project No. CB1000544, “Regional AI Initiative for Scaling Enterprises (RAISE)”. The lead partner is the Tallinn Science Park Tehnopol Foundation. The project is funded under the Central Baltic Programme.
- 3.3. The procurement will result in framework agreements with up to two tenderers in Lot I and up to two tenderers in Lot II for the provision of AI development services to small and medium-sized enterprises (hereinafter SMEs) participating in the RAISE project. A more detailed service description is provided in Annex 4 (Technical Description).
- 3.4. The estimated cost of the procurement is a maximum of EUR 112,000 (one hundred and twelve thousand), including VAT. The contracting authority is not obliged to order services up to the estimated procurement cost. The actual financial volume of the framework agreement will depend on the number of companies receiving services and the volume of services provided to them.
- 3.5. CPV codes:
 - 3.5.1. 72230000-6 – Custom software development services;
 - 3.5.2. 72262000-9 – Software development services;
 - 3.5.3. 72263000-6 – Software implementation services;
 - 3.5.4. 72254000-0 – Software testing;
 - 3.5.5. 72310000-1 – Data-processing services;
 - 3.5.6. 72312100-6 – Data preparation services;
 - 3.5.7. 72316000-3 – Data analysis services;
 - 3.5.8. 72320000-4 – Database services;
 - 3.5.9. 72420000-0 – Internet development services;
 - 3.5.10. 72421000-7 – Internet or intranet client application development services;
 - 3.5.11. 72422000-4 – Internet or intranet server application development services.
- 3.6. The procurement documents for this public procurement (hereinafter the procurement documents) consist of the main text of this file and its annexes, and the contract notice published on the KIRAHub website and on Hanketori (<https://hanketori.fi>). All procurement documents and the documents referred to therein complement one another. The tenderer is bound by all obligations, terms and requirements set out in the underlying document.
- 3.7. In preparing the procurement documents, the contracting authority has taken account of the public procurement legislation in force in Finland.

RAISE

- 3.8. In the event of a discrepancy between a Finnish-language document and a document in another language, the Finnish-language document shall prevail.
- 3.9. The procurement is divided into two lots. Tenderers may submit tenders for both lots. Each lot will be evaluated separately.
- 3.10. The procurement procedure will be conducted electronically through the contracting authority's website, by email and on Hanketori.
- 3.11. The contracting authority is not liable for delays, disruptions or interruptions caused by circumstances beyond its control, such as force majeure, power outages, or malfunctions in the tenderer's or contracting authority's telephone or internet connections or other electronic equipment and systems, including software. The contracting authority is not liable for damage or loss of income arising from the use or non-use of Hanketori.
- 3.12. Clarifications concerning the contents of the procurement documents may be requested from the contracting authority by email at the address published on the website and on Hanketori. Please submit clarification requests well in advance, as under public procurement legislation the contracting authority is not obliged to respond if fewer than six days remain between receipt of the request and the tender submission deadline.
- 3.13. Any reference by the contracting authority to a specific source, process, trademark, patent, type, origin, method of manufacture or other specified basis shall be read as supplemented by the words "or equivalent". Equivalence means the same performance characteristics and functions. Where equivalence is claimed, the tenderer must include documents demonstrating it in the tender.
- 3.14. Persons whose residence or registered office is in the Russian Federation or the Republic of Belarus may not participate in the public procurement.
- 3.15. In performing the procurement contract, the tenderer may not use a subcontractor or supplier accounting for more than 10 per cent (ten per cent) of the contract value, or rely on the capacities of an economic operator to meet the selection requirements, where that subcontractor, supplier or economic operator is:
 - 3.15.1. A national of or person resident in the Russian Federation, or an economic operator established in the Russian Federation, including a self-employed person, legal person, body or other entity;
 - 3.15.2. An entity more than 50 per cent of which is owned, directly or indirectly, by a person, body or other entity referred to in section 4.4.1;
 - 3.15.3. A representative of, or a person acting on the instructions of, a person, body or other entity referred to in section 4.4.1 or 4.4.2.The contracting authority may request information on subcontractors, suppliers and entities whose capacities are relied upon, and on their representatives, other members of their management, administrative or supervisory bodies, direct and indirect owners and beneficial owners. The information requested may include copies of natural persons' identity documents showing their nationality and, for legal persons, a certificate or extract from the trade register or another competent authority in the country in which the legal person is registered.
The contracting authority may request information on the value of the part of the procurement contract
- 3.16. that will be performed by the subcontractor or supplier.
- 3.17. Alternative solutions are not permitted.
- 3.18. There is no need to visit the place of performance of the contract.
- 3.19. The contracting authority does not require guarantees.

4. Definitions

- 4.1. SME – a small or medium-sized enterprise.
- 4.2. AI development is the collective term for the AI development service provided to an SME (beneficiary). The content of the service provided to an SME is determined by its needs and objectives. The services include applications and services based on machine learning models (AI-based data preparation, processing and modelling services; AI-based process optimisation solutions; training of machine learning models, including computer vision, time series forecasting, anomaly detection, prediction and optimisation; customer segmentation; recommendation systems, etc.) and applications and services based on generative AI (development of pilot solutions based on generative AI; development of AI agents; development of workflow automation solutions; installation, testing and maintenance of platforms and integrations).

RAISE

- 4.3. Artificial intelligence (AI) is technology capable of perceiving its environment, making decisions based on inputs received from that environment and influencing its environment in accordance with those decisions.
- 4.4. For the purposes of this procurement, a company means an SME participating in the RAISE project to which the tenderer provides the service defined in section 4.2.

5. Exclusion of tenderers from the procurement procedure

- 5.1. The contracting authority shall exclude a tenderer from the procurement procedure in accordance with the grounds for exclusion. Throughout the procurement procedure, the contracting authority may verify that no grounds for exclusion apply to the tenderer.
- 5.2. The contracting authority may request from the tenderer the information or documents necessary to verify the absence of grounds for exclusion. It will not require the submission of information or documents if they are available to it free of charge from a database, or if it already holds them and they remain relevant to verifying the absence of grounds for exclusion. The tenderer must provide the requested information within the specified period. The contracting authority may extend that period on its own initiative or at the tenderer's reasoned request.
- 5.3. The contracting authority shall issue a written decision on whether or not to exclude a tenderer.
- 5.4. Sections 5.1–5.3 of this procurement document apply separately to each joint tenderer when verifying grounds for exclusion.
- 5.5. The contracting authority may carry out the checks on grounds for exclusion and compliance with the selection requirements after selecting the successful tenderer.
- 5.6. On the basis of the grounds for exclusion and selection requirements established in procurement legislation and the procurement documents, the contracting authority will verify that the successful tenderer (including any joint tenderer and any person whose capacities the tenderer has relied upon) is not subject to grounds for exclusion and meets the selection requirements.
- 5.7. Before concluding the framework agreement, the contracting authority will require the successful tenderer to provide all necessary documents demonstrating compliance with the procurement requirements. If, at the contracting authority's request, the tenderer fails to provide the documents necessary to demonstrate the absence of grounds for exclusion or compliance with the selection requirements within the five working days specified by the authority, and the information or documents are not freely available to the authority from public database records, the contracting authority may exclude the tenderer from the procurement or find that it does not meet the selection requirements.

6. Assessment of tenderers' suitability

- 6.1. When admitting tenderers, the contracting authority will take account of the conditions stated in the tender document and the information provided by the tenderer. The contracting authority may verify the tenderer's qualifications throughout the procurement procedure.
- 6.2. The selection requirements are as follows:
 - 6.2.1. Turnover must have been at least EUR 100,000 in each of the two most recent financial years completed before the start of the tendering procedure. Sector-specific economic activity may be regarded as the service provider's activity in the field covered by the framework agreement. The tenderer must provide information on its sector-specific turnover for the two most recent financial years completed before the start of the procurement. The contracting authority will verify the turnover of a service provider established in Finland through public registers. If the information is unavailable from public registers, the tenderer must submit reports for the two financial years completed before the start of the procurement, or extracts from those reports, showing its sector-specific turnover.
- 6.3. The contracting authority may request by email the information or documents necessary to verify compliance with the selection requirements, and the tenderer must provide the requested information within the specified period. The contracting authority will not require documents if those documents or equivalent information are available to it free of charge from a database, or if it already holds them and they remain relevant to assessing the tenderer's suitability.
- 6.4. The contracting authority will issue a written decision on whether the tenderer meets the selection requirements. A tenderer that does not meet them will not proceed to the next stage of the procurement procedure.

RAISE

7. Tender requirements and compliance

- 7.1. All required documents must be submitted by email to the address stated in the contract notice. By submitting a tender, the tenderer confirms its acceptance of all terms set out in the procurement documents. Conditional tenders are not permitted.
- 7.2. The tender must be prepared in English or Finnish. Documents submitted in other languages must be accompanied by an English translation.
- 7.3. The contracting authority guarantees the confidentiality of tenders. Tenders will be opened and examined only after the tender submission deadline has passed.
- 7.4. The tenderer bears all risks associated with submitting its tender on time. The tenderer is responsible for all costs relating to the preparation and submission of the tender.
- 7.5. Tenders must remain valid for 4 (four) months from the tender submission deadline. By submitting a tender, the tenderer is deemed to confirm that it remains valid for at least that period; the validity period need not be stated separately in the tender.
- 7.6. The tenderer must state the tender price using the form in Annex 1. Prices must be stated in euros to two decimal places. VAT must be stated separately.
- 7.7. The amounts stated in the tender price are final for the contracting authority and include fees and other charges, excluding VAT, which must be stated separately. No additional fees or costs will be added to those amounts. The numerical amounts indicating the tender price must be consistent across the documents submitted as part of the tender. In the event of contradictions or inconsistencies concerning the tender price in those documents, the evaluation will be based on the price submitted using the form in Annex 1.
- 7.8. The tender must meet the conditions specified in the procurement documents, include the required documents and be properly formatted. The information in the tender must be presented in a manner and format that enables the contracting authority to verify compliance with the conditions set out in the procurement documents.
- 7.9. The service provider must ensure that its team includes at least one expert who provides the service throughout the contract period and meets at least the following requirements:
 - 7.9.1. The expert has previous experience in advising SMEs in fields relevant to the subject matter of the procurement and has advised at least two (2) small or medium-sized enterprises.
 - 7.9.2. The expert has previous experience in IT project development and has completed or participated in at least one (1) project qualifying as an IT project, including software implementation, digitalisation, AI development, data analysis, etc.
 - 7.9.3. The expert's knowledge must include IT expertise: an understanding of machine learning model training, data processing and management, generative AI and automation solutions, operating software and the integration of IT with other systems, including knowledge of hardware and its use cases.
 - 7.9.4. The expert has English language proficiency at level B2.
 - 7.9.5. The tenderer must submit the expert's CV with the tender using the form in Annex 2, signed by the expert.
- 7.10. The tenderer must provide information on team members in the tender using the form in Annex 2. The form must be signed by the tenderer.
- 7.11. The tenderer must provide a free-form description of its working methods. The methodology description must be in machine-readable Word or PDF format.
- 7.12. The tenderer must identify in the tender any information constituting its trade secrets and justify that designation. The tenderer may not designate as trade secrets: 1) the tender price or component costs; 2) in service procurement contracts, in addition to the information referred to in item 1, other numerical indicators describing the tender that correspond to the tender evaluation criteria.
- 7.13. If the person submitting the tender is not the tenderer's legal representative, a power of attorney signed by the tenderer's legal representative must be provided to demonstrate that person's authority to submit the tender.
- 7.14. If tenderers submit a joint tender (hereinafter joint tenderers), they must comply with the requirements and submit, together with the tender, a power of attorney issued to their representative in the form provided in the annexes. If a joint tenderer relies on the resources of other joint tenderers to demonstrate its economic and financial standing or technical and professional qualifications, the tender must include information on the size and nature of the part of the framework agreement to be performed by each joint tenderer.
- 7.15. The contracting authority will reject a tender if a framework agreement concluded on its basis would be void under international sanctions legislation.

RAISE

7.16. The tenderer shall reject the tender if it does not meet the conditions set out in the procurement document, if the tenderer fails to provide the clarifications requested by the tenderer within the specified period, or if the tenderer's clarifications do not allow compliance with the conditions to be assessed unambiguously. The contracting authority may deem a tender compliant if it contains no material deviations from the conditions of the procurement document.

7.17. If the requirements or deadlines stated by the contracting authority differ between the contract notice and the procurement documents, the contract notice shall prevail.

8. Evaluation of tenders

8.1. Lot I

8.1.1. In Lot I, the contracting authority will procure applications and services based on machine learning models (see Annex 4, section 3.1).

8.1.2. The contracting authority will conclude framework agreements with up to two tenderers on the basis of the most economically advantageous tenders, taking account of the best price-quality ratio. The maximum score is 100 points. The points awarded to each tender under all criteria will be added together and tenders ranked accordingly. Up to two tenders with the highest evaluation scores will be accepted in Lot I. Scores will be calculated to two decimal places. Ties will be resolved by drawing lots. Representatives of all tenderers may attend the draw. As many slips will be prepared as there are tied tenders. One slip will be marked "successful tender"; the others will be left blank. The slips will be placed in an opaque container. Slips will be drawn in the order in which tenders were submitted (the first tenderer to submit its tender draws first). The tenderer whose representative draws the slip marked "successful tender" will be declared successful. Tenderers will be notified of the time and place of the draw using the contact details provided in their tenders.

8.1.3. The tender evaluation criteria and their percentage weightings are as follows:

No.	Evaluation criterion	Weight	Description of the evaluation criterion
8.1.3.1	Price (lower is better)	30% (max. 30 points)	In accordance with section 8.1.4
8.1.3.2	Team expertise, allocation of roles and references	40% (max. 40 points)	In accordance with section 8.1.5 Scale: 1 point – There are significant shortcomings or inconsistencies in the team composition or allocation of work presented in the tender. Team members' previous work experience or expertise is described in general terms. No reference projects are provided. The contracting authority is not convinced that the service provider can deliver a high-quality service. The contracting authority is not confident that the tenderer can fulfil orders given the contract volume. 15 points – The allocation of work among team members presented in the tender is appropriate for the purpose of the procurement. Team members' previous work experience and expertise are described in general terms. There are isolated shortcomings or inconsistencies in the description or breakdown of work. The tenderer has provided 1–4 reference projects, at least one of which will be completed in English. The service provider's team is large enough to ensure timely fulfilment of the maximum volume of orders under the contract. 30 points – The tenderer has based the team on the tenderer's needs, the purpose of the service and the methodology. Each team member's

RAISE

No.	Evaluation criterion	Weight	Description of the evaluation criterion
			previous work experience and expertise are presented in the team description. Roles within the team are clearly allocated. The described allocation of work is optimal and enables all planned activities to be completed to a high standard by the deadline. The tenderer has submitted 5–9 reference projects, at least one of which is in English. The service provider's team is large enough to ensure timely fulfilment of the maximum volume of orders under the contract. 40 points – The tenderer has based the team on the tenderer's needs, the purpose of the service and the methodology. The team description contains a detailed and substantiated account of each team member's previous work experience and expertise. Roles within the team are clearly allocated. The service provider has considered options for replacing team members. The team members' previous experience and qualifications in a field corresponding to the subject of the procurement (AI or machine learning applications) give the contracting authority confidence that the tenderer can complete the planned activities on time and to a high standard. The tenderer has submitted at least 10 reference projects, at least two of which were carried out in English. The service provider's team is large enough to ensure timely fulfilment of the maximum volume of orders under the contract. NOTE: At least 15 points are required for acceptance.
8.1.3.3	Service delivery methodology	30% (max. 30 points)	In accordance with section 8.1.6 Scale: 1 point – The description of the methods and procedures to be used to achieve the objective of the work has significant shortcomings: the proposed solutions are unsuitable, the methodology is unclear and important information is missing. 15 points – The methods and procedures used to achieve the objective of the work are generally appropriate, but there are shortcomings in the justification and suitability of the proposed solutions and in the precision of their description. 30 points – The methodology used to achieve the objective of the work is based on generally recognised methodological principles and the subject matter of the procurement. The

RAISE

No.	Evaluation criterion	Weight	Description of the evaluation criterion
			tenderer's proposed approach is described clearly and in detail. The suitability of the proposed solutions is justified, and the solutions are linked to the purpose of the work. The tenderer has described the planned outcome of the work. The tenderer has presented its own additional solutions that enable the objectives to be achieved more efficiently and improve communication about the activities and results of the work. NOTE: At least 15 points are required for acceptance.

8.1.4. The tender price must be stated as an hourly rate (60 minutes) in euros. Tenders with a zero or negative price are not permitted and will be rejected. A maximum of 30 points is available under the price criterion (section 8.1.3.1). The lowest price receives 30 points. Points are awarded using the following formula, comparing prices: $30 \times (\text{lowest tender price} / \text{price being evaluated}) = \text{points}$. The result is rounded to two decimal places.

8.1.5. A maximum of 40 points is available for team expertise, allocation of roles and references (section 8.1.3.2). At least 15 points are required for acceptance. The maximum score for a subcriterion is awarded if the characteristic being assessed meets or exceeds the corresponding score description. If the subcriterion is not met to the extent required by that description, the quality criterion is scored one level lower. Under this criterion, the contracting authority assesses the team's qualifications and allocation of roles. For references, it also assesses previous experience in providing services in English or performing contracts in English.

8.1.6. A maximum of 30 points is available for the service delivery methodology (section 8.1.3.3). At least 15 points are required for acceptance. If a tender receives fewer than 15 points, the methodology is considered not to meet the contracting authority's needs and the tender is excluded from further evaluation. The maximum score for a subcriterion is awarded if the characteristic being assessed meets or exceeds the corresponding score description. If the subcriterion is not met to the extent required by that description, the quality criterion is scored one level lower.

8.1.7. The procurement will result in framework agreements in Lot I with up to two successful tenderers that have received the highest total scores under the criteria set out in section 8.1.3. The terms of the framework agreement are set out in Annex 6.

8.1.8. The framework agreement will be concluded in accordance with the procedure and within the period specified in the procurement document, after the statutory standstill period has elapsed. The tenderer must sign and return the framework agreement sent to it for signature within 5 (five) working days of the contracting authority sending it. If the signed framework agreement is not returned within that period, the contracting authority may re-evaluate the relevant tenders.

8.2. Lot II

8.2.1. In Lot II, the contracting authority will procure generative AI, AI agents, workflow automation, integrations and application development services (see Annex 4, section 3.2).

8.2.2. The contracting authority will conclude framework agreements with up to two tenderers on the basis of the most economically advantageous tenders, taking account of the best price-quality ratio. The maximum score is 100 points. The points awarded to each tender under all criteria will be added together and tenders ranked accordingly. Up to two tenders with the highest evaluation scores will be accepted in Lot II. Scores will be calculated to two decimal places. Ties will be resolved by drawing lots. Representatives of all tenderers may attend the draw. As many slips will be prepared as there are tied tenders. One slip will be marked "successful tender"; the others will be left blank. The slips will be placed in an opaque container. Slips will be drawn in the order in which tenders were submitted (the first tenderer to submit its tender draws first). The tenderer whose representative draws the slip marked "successful tender" will be declared successful. Tenderers will be notified of the time and place of the draw using the contact details provided in their tenders.

8.2.3. The tender evaluation criteria and their percentage weightings are as follows:

RAISE

No.	Evaluation criterion	Weight	Description of the evaluation criterion
8.2.3.1	Price (lower is better)	30% (max. 30 points)	In accordance with section 8.2.4
8.2.3.2	Team expertise, allocation of roles and references	40% (max. 40 points)	In accordance with section 8.2.5 1 point – There are significant shortcomings or inconsistencies in the team composition or allocation of work presented in the tender. Team members' previous work experience or qualifications are described in general terms. No reference projects are provided. The contracting authority is not convinced that the service provider can deliver a high-quality service. The contracting authority is not convinced that the tenderer can fulfil orders given the scope of the contract. 15 points – The allocation of work among team members presented in the tender is appropriate for the purpose of the procurement. Team members' previous work experience and expertise are described in general terms. There are isolated shortcomings or inconsistencies in the description or breakdown of work. The tenderer has provided 1–4 reference projects, at least one of which is in English. The service provider's team is large enough to ensure timely fulfilment of the maximum volume of orders under the contract. 30 points – The tenderer has based the team on the tenderer's needs, the purpose of the service and the methodology. Each team member's previous work experience and expertise are presented in the team description. Roles within the team are clearly allocated. The described allocation of work is optimal and enables all planned activities to be completed to a high standard by the deadline. The tenderer has submitted 5–9 reference projects, at least one of which is in English. The service provider's team is large enough to ensure timely fulfilment of the maximum volume of orders under the contract. 40 points – The tenderer has based the team on the tenderer's needs, the purpose of the service and the methodology. The team description contains a detailed and substantiated account of each team member's previous work experience and expertise. Roles within the team are clearly allocated. The service provider has considered options for replacing team members. The team members' previous experience and qualifications in a field corresponding to the subject of the procurement (AI or machine learning applications) give the contracting authority confidence that the tenderer can

RAISE

No.	Evaluation criterion	Weight	Description of the evaluation criterion
			complete the planned activities on time and to a high standard. The tenderer has submitted at least 10 reference projects, at least two of which were carried out in English. The service provider's team is large enough to ensure timely fulfilment of the maximum volume of orders under the contract. NOTE: At least 15 points are required for acceptance.
8.2.3.1	Service delivery methodology	30% (max. 30 points)	In accordance with section 8.2.6 Scale: 1 point – The description of the methods and procedures to be used to achieve the objective of the work has significant shortcomings: the proposed solutions are unsuitable, the methodology is unclear and important information is missing. 15 points – The methods and procedures used to achieve the objective of the work are generally appropriate, but there are shortcomings in the justification and suitability of the proposed solutions and in the precision of their description. 30 points – The methodology used to achieve the objective of the work is based on generally recognised methodological principles and the subject matter of the procurement. The tenderer's ideas are described in detail and clearly. The suitability of the proposed solutions is justified, and the solutions are linked to the purpose of the work. The tenderer has described the planned outcome of the work. The service provider has presented its own additional solutions. NOTE: At least 15 points are required for acceptance.

8.2.4. The tender price must be stated as an hourly rate (60 minutes) in euros. Tenders with a zero or negative price are not permitted and will be rejected. A maximum of 30 points is available under the price criterion (section 8.2.3.1). The lowest price receives 30 points. Points are awarded using the following formula, comparing prices: $30 \times (\text{lowest tender price} / \text{tenderer's price}) = \text{points}$. The result is rounded to two decimal places.

8.2.5. A maximum of 40 points is available for team expertise, allocation of roles and references (section 8.2.3.2). At least 15 points are required for acceptance. The maximum score for a subcriterion is awarded if the characteristic being assessed meets or exceeds the corresponding score description. If the subcriterion is not met to the extent required by that description, the quality criterion is scored one level lower. Under this criterion, the contracting authority assesses the team's expertise and allocation of roles. For references, it assesses previous experience in providing services in English or performing contracts in English.

8.2.6. A maximum of 30 points is available for the service delivery methodology (section 8.2.3.1). At least 15 points are required for acceptance. If a tender receives fewer than 15 points, the methodology is considered not to meet the contracting authority's needs and the tender is excluded from further evaluation. The maximum score for a subcriterion is awarded if the characteristic being

RAISE

assessed meets or exceeds the corresponding score description. If the subcriterion is not met to the extent required by that description, the quality criterion is scored one level lower.

8.2.7. The procurement will result in framework agreements in Lot II with up to two successful tenderers that have received the highest total scores under the criteria set out in section 8.2.3. The terms of the framework agreement are set out in Annex 6.

8.2.8. The framework agreement will be concluded in accordance with the procedure and within the period specified in the procurement document, after the statutory standstill period has elapsed. The tenderer must sign and return the framework agreement sent to it for signature within 5 (five) working days of the contracting authority sending it. If the signed framework agreement is not returned within that period, the contracting authority may re-evaluate the relevant tenders.

9. Rejection of all tenders or discontinuation of the procurement procedure

9.1. The contracting authority may reject all submitted tenders or all tenders deemed compliant at any time before the procurement contract is concluded. If it rejects all tenders, the contracting authority will issue a reasoned decision.

9.2. Where there is a justified need, the contracting authority may declare the procurement procedure invalid on its own initiative. Such a need may arise in particular, but not exclusively:

9.2.1. If the subject matter of the framework agreement needs to be changed substantially;

9.2.2. If the conditions underlying the procurement have changed substantially, making conclusion of the framework agreement unnecessary or impossible;

9.2.3. If inconsistencies identified in the procurement procedure cannot be remedied and the procedure therefore cannot be lawfully completed;

9.2.4. If the contracting authority lacks the financial resources required to perform the framework agreement.

10. Annexes

10.1. ANNEX 1 – Tender Pricing Form;

10.2. ANNEX 2 – Expert CV Form; Team Description

10.3. ANNEX 3 – Power of Attorney for Joint Tenderers;

10.4. ANNEX 4 – Technical Description;

10.5. ANNEX 5 – Model Agreement for Granting State Aid to a Company;

10.6. ANNEX 6 – Framework Agreement and Procurement Contract