



REPORT ON THE EVALUATION OF THE SUBMITTED DELIVERABLES AND PCP CONTRACT AWARDING PHASE 3 CALL-OFF (D.5.2)

Project Acronym: ***SELECT***
Standardized, opEn, data-driven, service-oriented & user-centric pLatform Enabling large-scale Co-creation,

Project Title: *Testing & validation of IoE services for Cities*

GA Number: ***688196***

Version: *Final*
Dissemination level: **Public**

Table of Contents

Executive Summary	4
Submission of call-off Phase 3 Tender Forms	5
Eligible Tenders	5
Non-eligible Tenders	5
Exclusion Criteria	6
Selection Criteria	6
Compliance Criteria	6
Award Criteria	7
Scoring Model	7
Project management - Evaluation	8
Impact on challenge – Evaluation	9
Technical quality of the platform	10
Commercial feasibility - Evaluation	11
Living labs approach	11
Price	12
Criteria	12
Evaluation	12
Contract Awarding	13

Document revision history

Revision				
No	Author	Organization	Date	Work effectuated
1	Katrien Lenaert	Digipolis	17/09/2018	Initial draft
2	Tech Team	All	08/10/2018	Final report for approval

Approvals for final version

Contributor	Author	Organization	Date
S4C Tech Team	All	Digipolis, Forum Virium Helsinki	09/10/2018
Procurers Steering Committee	All	Buyers Group	10/10/2018

Distribution list

Name	Ways to distribute	Comments
Consortium partners	Mail	Draft and finalized versions
European Commission	Mail	Finalized versions for validation

Abbreviations

Abbreviation	Explanation
OMC	Open Market Consultation
S4C	SELECT For Cities
IoT	Internet of Things
IoE	Internet of Everything

Executive Summary

This report is a summarized version of the full confidential report on the assessment and scoring of the SELECT for Cities Phase 3 Call-off intended for public dissemination.

The evaluation was carried out on the basis of the Phase 3 Call-off Tender forms submitted by the Contractor's Project teams. The report serves as an overview of the evaluation and as a deliverable for the European Commission. In addition, it will be used as a means to clarify the results to the Tenderers. This document is intended to be made publicly available. A concise version without any company-specific confidential information will be published on the website.

Based on the full evaluation procedure executed by the members of the Select for Cities Buyers Group, 3 Contractors were invited to proceed to Phase 3 of the Select for Cities PCP project:

- Engineering Ingegneria Informatica S.p.A.
- Indra Sistemas S.A.
- University of Florence

5 Contractors submitted a Phase 3 Tender before the deadline of 17 September 2018 10:00 AM:

- Bosonit S.L.
- Engineering Ingegneria Informatica S.p.A.
- Indra Sistemas S.A.
- Martel GmbH
- University of Florence

The submitted Tenders were verified on administrative compliance and compliance criteria during the desk evaluation by the Buyers Group. All 5 Tenders were found eligible for continuing to the technical and financial evaluation which consisted of a desk evaluation by the Buyers Group's technical experts and several group iterations.

Contractors were selected for the next Phase based on the following requirements:

- Threshold reached on all items (Project Management, Impact on Challenge, Technical quality of the platform, Commercial feasibility, Living labs)
- Budget limit respected

A final Go/NoGo session and a confirmation by the Select for Cities Procurers Steering Committee finalized the Call-off Phase 3 evaluation round and resulted in this report.

Based on the full evaluation procedure executed by the members of the Select for Cities Consortium and on the available Phase 3 budget, 3 Tenderers were selected to proceed to Phase 3 of the Select for Cities PCP project:

- Engineering Ingegneria Informatica S.p.A.
- Indra Sistemas S.A.
- University of Florence

1 Submission of call-off Phase 3 Tender Forms

5 Contractors submitted a SELECT for Cities Call-off Phase 3 Offer with all relevant and required Templates before the deadline of September 17th 2018:

- Bosonit S.L.
- Engineering Ingegneria Informatica S.p.A.
- Indra Sistemas S.A.
- Martel GmbH
- University of Florence

1.1 Eligible Tenders

In order to be eligible Tenders were to be submitted electronically, signed and by means of the predefined Annexes A, E, F and G:

- Annex A - General Tender Submission Form
- Annex E - Technical Offer Phase 3, including Templates A-I
- Annex F - Financial Offer and Cost Breakdown
- Annex G - Financial Offer Phase 3

All 5 Contractors submitted a complete, correct and signed Contract. Their Tender Forms were submitted to the subsequent Administrative Evaluation Committee.

1.2 Non-eligible Tenders

No Contractors submitted an incomplete and therefore irregular Phase 3 Tender.

2 Exclusion Criteria

The exclusion, selection and compliance criteria listed in the Request for Tenders (TD1) were equally applicable in Phase 3. Tenderers were to be excluded if they were no longer non-compliant with one of those criteria.

None of the Phase 3 Tenderers were non compliant to the Exclusion Criteria. Their Tenders were submitted to the Technical and Financial evaluation committees for the assessment and scoring of the Award criteria.

3 Selection Criteria

The exclusion, selection and compliance criteria listed in the Request for Tenders (TD1) were equally applicable in Phase 3. Tenderers were to be excluded if they were no longer compliant with one of those criteria.

None of the Phase 3 Tenderers were non compliant to the Selection Criteria. Their Tenders were submitted to the Technical and Financial evaluation committees for the assessment and scoring of the Award criteria.

4 Compliance Criteria

The exclusion, selection and compliance criteria listed in the Request for Tenders (TD1) were equally applicable in Phase 3. Tenderers were to be excluded if they were no longer compliant with one of those criteria.

None of the Phase 3 Tenderers were non compliant to the Compliance Criteria. Their Tenders were submitted to the Technical and Financial evaluation committees for the assessment and scoring of the Award criteria.

5 Award Criteria

The Award criteria were used to assess the capacity of the Contractor and the quality of their proposal in terms of Project management, Impact on challenge, Technical quality of the platform, Commercial feasibility, Living labs and Price.

For that purpose Contractors had to complete and submit the templates of Annex E. The were used to assess and score the extent to which a Contractor meets the award criteria.

The Award criteria evaluation was assessed based on the following Annexes:

- Annex E'' - Technical offer Phase 3 - template A
- Annex E'' - Technical offer Phase 3 - template B
- Annex E'' - Technical offer Phase 3 - template C
- Annex E'' - Technical offer Phase 3 - template D
- Annex E'' - Technical offer Phase 3 - template E
- Annex E'' - Technical offer Phase 3 - template F
- Annex E'' - Technical offer Phase 3 - template G
- Annex E'' - Technical offer Phase 3 - template H
- Annex E'' - Technical offer Phase 3 - template I

Only Contractors with the following minimum scores (threshold) were eligible for consideration for a contract:

60% of the maximum number of points for each of the criteria, excluding Price:

- Project Management - 10%
- Impact on Challenge - 20%
- Technical quality of the platform - 15%
- Commercial feasibility - 5%
- Living Labs Approach - 20%

60% of the maximum number of points for the combined scores, including Price.

Failure to achieve the minimum score for any of the components resulted in the Contractor being excluded from further participation in the PCP.

5.1 Scoring Model

The scoring model that was used by the evaluators to assess and score the extent to which a Tender is meeting the award criteria was the same as in TD1, Appendix 4 - Scoring Model for the Award Criteria:

0	Nonexistent	None of the aspects of the requirement are met.
1	Very weak	Multiple important aspects of the requirement are missing.
2	Weak	Multiple aspects of the requirement are present, but the provided explanation may not convince.
3	Good	All important aspects are present.
4	Very good	All important aspects are present and the provided explanation is very convincing.
5	Excellent	There is significant added value to the required feature, which is described very convincingly.

Table1 . Scoring Model

The Tenderers scores are clarified in the following subsections of the report.

5.2 Project management - Evaluation

The Project management evaluation was assessed based on the following Award criteria:

<i>Award criteria</i>	<i>Maximum points</i>	<i>Total Weighting</i>
1. Project Management		10%
Feasibility of the Project plan and schedule	10	
Methodology of the project, including risk management and quality assurance	10	

Table 2 . Project management - Award Criteria

5.3 Impact on challenge – Evaluation

The Impact evaluation was assessed based on the following Award criteria:

<i>Award criteria</i>	<i>Maximum points</i>	<i>Total Weighting</i>
2. Impact on challenge		20%
F1: Serve as a City Dashboard F1.1: Demonstrate how the prototype implements a dashboard that fits the basic requirements F1.2: Demonstrate how the prototype is innovative in this domain	10	
F2: Serve as an Open City Platform F2.1: Demonstrate how the prototype implements an Open City Platform that fits the basic requirements F2.2: Demonstrate how the prototype is innovative in this domain	10	
F3: Real Time communication F3.1: Demonstrate how the prototype implements the basic requirements F3.2: Demonstrate how the prototype is innovative in this domain	10	

F4: Data referential		
F4.1: Demonstrate how the prototype implements the basic requirements		
F4.2: Demonstrate how the prototype is innovative in this domain	10	
F5: Platform		
F5.1: Demonstrate how the prototype implements the basic requirements		
F5.2: Demonstrate how the prototype is innovative in this domain	10	

Table 3. Impact on challenge – Award Criteria

5.4 Technical quality of the platform

The Technical quality evaluation was assessed based on the following Award criteria:

<i>Award criteria</i>	<i>Maximum points</i>	<i>Threshold</i>	<i>Total Weighting</i>
3. Technical quality of the platform			15%
Q1: Open Source	10	5	
Q2: Open Standards	10	5	
Q3: Scalable	10	5	
Q4: Robustness	10	5	
Q5: Distributed and Decoupled	10	5	
Q6: Heterogeneous	10	5	
Q7: Interoperability	10	5	
Q8: Communication with things	10	5	

Q9: Security by design	10	5	
Q10: Privacy by design	10	5	

Table 4. Technical quality of the platform - Award Criteria

5.5 Commercial feasibility - Evaluation

The Commercial Feasibility evaluation was assessed based on the following Award criteria:

<i>Award criteria</i>	<i>Maximum points</i>	<i>Total Weighting</i>
4. Commercial feasibility		5%
Completeness, sense of reality and feasibility of the commercialisation plan including the market analysis and risk management Sense of reality and feasibility of the principles for licensing, pricing, packaging, distribution	10	

Table 5. Commercial Feasibility - Award Criteria

5.6 Living labs approach

The Living Lab approach evaluation was assessed based on the following Award criteria:

<i>Award criteria</i>	<i>Maximum points</i>	<i>Total Weighting</i>
5. Living Labs		20%
LL1: Running in real-life setting		
LL1.1: Approach to test the platform with users in the three cities	10	
LL1.2: Business case	10	
LL2: Iterative testing		

LL2.1: Plan to meet intermediate milestones	10	
LL2.2: Expected evolution after iterations	10	
LL3: Validation with local stakeholders		
LL3.1: Local stakeholders involved in validation	10	
LL3.2: Predefined use cases	10	
LL3.3: Ability to demonstrate scaling	10	
LL4: Innovation trajectory		
LL4.1: Advancement over state-of-the-art	10	
LL4.2: Potential for procurement	10	

Table 6. Living labs - Award Criteria

6 Price

6.1 Criteria

<i>Award criteria</i>	<i>Maximum points</i>	<i>Total Weighting</i>
6. Price		30%
Binding contract price for carrying out the work in the present phase	10	

Table 7. Price criteria - Award Criteria

6.2 Evaluation

The Tenderers' Actual Price for Phase 3 (present phase) was evaluated according to the formula:

Weight awarded to Price * (Price lowest tender/Price Tender)

7 Contract Awarding

The overall Contract awarding was done based on the best quality price ratio or the Most Economically Advantageous Tender (MEAT).

The final Total Scores per Contractor and per Phase 3 Award Criterion are listed below:

- I. Project Management (weight 10%)
- II. Impact on Challenge (weight 20%)
- III. Technical quality of the platform (weight 15%)
- IV. Commercial feasibility (weight 5%)
- V. Living Lab (weight 20%)
- VI. Price (weight 30%)

Failure to achieve the minimum score for the respective components and/or its threshold (marked in red) resulted in the Contractors Bosonit S.L. and Martel GmbH to be excluded from further participation in the PCP.

As a consequence the following Contractors passing the administrative and evaluation criteria and all thresholds are considered eligible for funding and will be invited to sign the SELECT for Cities Specific Contract for Phase 3.

- Engineering Ingegneria Informatica S.P.A.
- Indra Sistemas S.A.
- University of Florence

Since the Phase 3 budget is sufficient to fund all Contractors passing the evaluation, all the 3 (three) Contractors passing the evaluation have been invited to sign a SELECT for Cities Phase 3 Specific Contract.