



# REPORT ON THE EVALUATION OF THE SUBMITTED TENDERS AND PCP CONTRACT AWARDING

Project Acronym: **SELECT**  
Project Title: *Standardized, opEn, data-driven, service-oriented & user-centric pLatform Enabling large-scale Co-creation, Testing & validation of IoE services for Cities*  
GA Number: **688196**

Authors: *Katrien Lenaert (Digipolis)  
Ann Fournier (Digipolis)  
Karin Goedheid (Digipolis)*

Version: **1.0**  
Dissemination level: **Public**



## Table of Contents

REPORT ON THE EVALUATION OF THE SUBMITTED TENDERS AND PCP CONTRACT AWARDING.....	1
Table of Tables .....	3
Executive Summary .....	5
Abbreviations .....	6
1 Submitted Tenders .....	7
1.1 Eligible Tenders .....	7
1.2 Non-eligible Tenders .....	7
2 Exclusion Criteria .....	8
2.1 Criteria .....	8
2.2 Evaluation .....	10
3 Selection Criteria .....	10
3.1 Criteria .....	10
3.2 Evaluation .....	11
4 Compliance Criteria .....	12
4.1 Criteria .....	12
4.2 Evaluation .....	14
5 Award Criteria .....	15
6 Price .....	17
6.1 Criteria .....	17
6.2 Evaluation .....	17
7 Overall Conclusion .....	17
Appendix A - Scoring Model for the Award Criteria .....	19



## Table of Tables

Table 1. Part A1 - Exclusion Criteria .....	8
Table 2. Part A2 - Exclusion Criteria .....	9
Table 3. Part B - Conflict of Interest .....	10
Table 4. Selection criteria .....	11
Table 5. Compliance criteria - with R&D definition .....	12
Table 6. Compliance criteria - compatibility with other public financing.....	13
Table 7. Compliance criteria - place of performance of the contract .....	13
Table 8. Compliance criteria - with ethics and research integrity requirements .....	13
Table 9. Compliance criteria - with security requirements .....	14
Table 10. Award criteria evaluation points .....	16
Table 11. Price criteria.....	17

## Document revision history

Revision No	Author	Organization	Date	Work effectuated
1	Katrien Lenaert, Ann Fournier, Karin Goedheid	Digipolis	06/06/2017	Overall evaluation report - confidential
2	Karin Goedheid	Digipolis	17/08/2017	Evaluation report - public

## Approvals for final version

Contributor	Author	Organization	Date
Consortium partners	All	Antwerp, Copenhagen, FV-Helsinki, imec, 21C, Digipolis	

## Distribution list

Name	Ways to distribute	Comments
SELECT for Cities partners	Mail/Google docs	
European Commission	Deliverable	Will be distributed after approval by the S4C Procurers Steering Committee
SELECT for Cities website	Publication on website	

## Executive Summary

This report summarizes the results of the first evaluation period within the Select for Cities PCP project: the evaluation of the tenders for the initial phase.

During the SELECT for Cities PCP Request for Tenders evaluation 28 offers were received, evaluated and scored by the Select for Cities Buyers Group. As described in TD1 Request for Tenders, Section 4.1 Evaluation process, the Tender evaluation was conducted in a variety of steps and checks on compliance with the:

- conditions of the Tenders
- exclusion criteria
- selection criteria
- compliance criteria
- award criteria

28 Tenders were verified on administrative compliance, exclusion criteria, conflicts of interests, and selection and compliance criteria during the desk evaluation by the Buyers Group, combined with GoToMeeting iterations to align with the evaluation team.

23 Tenderers were found eligible for continuing to the technical evaluation which consists of a desk evaluation by the Buyers Group's technical experts, several group iterations and a webinar with all eligible Tenderers. During a webinar, the Tenderers were able to present their technical solution very briefly. The Buyers Group used the allotted time during the webinar to check unclarities in the offers.

Based on the full evaluation procedure executed by the members of the Select for Cities Consortium and on the available Phase 1 budget, 10 Tenderers (Lead Tenderer in alphabetical order) were selected to proceed to Phase 1 of the Select for Cities PCP project:

- Bosonit S.L. - Spain
- etventure Corporate Innovation GmbH - Germany
- HOP Ubiquitous S.L. - Spain
- Indra sistemas S.A. - Spain
- Engineering Ingegneria Informatica S.p.A – Italy
- Magenta srl -Italy
- Martel GmbH - Switzerland
- University of Florence (DISIT Lab) - Italy
- Urban Software Institute GmbH- Germany
- WINGS ICT Solutions - Greece



## Abbreviations

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

# 1 Submitted Tenders

## 1.1 Eligible Tenders

28 Tenderers submitted a Tender before the deadline of 14 April 2017 – 10:00 AM CET. In order to be eligible Tenders were to be submitted electronically, signed and by means of the predefined Annexes A through G:

- Annex A - General Tender Submission Form
- Annex B - Exclusion Criteria
- Annex C - Selection Criteria
- Annex D - Compliance Criteria
- Annex E - Technical Offer Annex
- Annex F - Financial Offer and Cost Breakdown
- Annex G - Financial Offer Phase 1

Tenders that did not comply with these conditions were regarded as irregular. 24 Tenderers submitted a complete, correct and signed Tender. Their Tenders were submitted to the subsequent Administrative Evaluation Committee.

## 1.2 Non-eligible Tenders

Three Tenderers submitted an incomplete and therefore irregular Tender. One Tenderer submitted its Tender twice. The double submission was excluded.

Non-eligible Tenderers were not conveyed to the subsequent Administrative Evaluation Committees.

## 2 Exclusion Criteria

All eligible Tenders were then assessed in accordance with the exclusion criteria.

### 2.1 Criteria

#### Part A1 - Exclusion Criteria

<b>A1</b>	<b>Has your organisation or any of its directors or any other person with power of representation, decision or control of the organisation been convicted of any of the following offences?</b>	
A1.1	Criminal offences referred to in Article 2 of Council Framework Decision 2008/841/JHA of 24 October 2008 on combating organized crime.	Yes / No
A1.2	Corruption as defined in Article 3 of Council Act of 26 May 1997 preparation on the basis of Article K.3.2 c Treaty on European Union, the Convention on the fight against corruption involving officials of the European Communities or officials of Member States of, and Article 3.1 Council Joint Action 98/742/JHA of 22 December 1998 adopted by the Council on the basis of Article K.3 of the Treaty on European Union, on corruption in the private sector.	Yes / No
A1.3	Money laundering as defined in Article 1 of Council Directive 91/308/EEC of 10 June 1991 on measures to prevent the financial system for money laundering, amended by European Parliament and Council Directive 2001/97/EC.	Yes / No
A1.4	Fraud within the meaning of Article 1 of the Convention drawn up on the basis of Article K.3 of the Treaty on European Union for the Protection of the Communities' financial interests.	Yes / No
A1.5	Terrorist offences or offences linked to terrorist activities as defined in Articles 1 and 3 of Council Framework Decision of 13 June 2002 on combating terrorism.	Yes / No
A1.6	Child labour and other forms of trafficking in human beings as defined in Article 2 of Directive 2011/36/EU of the European Parliament and of the Council of 5 April 2011 on preventing and combating trafficking in human beings and protecting its victims, and replacing Council Framework Decision 2002/629/JHA.	Yes / No
A1.7	Is guilty of serious misrepresentation in supplying the information required under this section or has not supplied such information.	Yes / No

Table 1. Part A1 - Exclusion Criteria



## Part A2 - Exclusion Criteria

A2	<b>Does any of the following apply to your organisation, or to (any of) the director(s) / partners /consortium partners/ proprietor(s)?</b>	
A2.1	Bankruptcy, insolvency, compulsory winding up, receivership, composition with creditors, or subject to relevant proceedings	Yes / No
A2.2	A conviction (or convictions) for a criminal offence related to business or professional conduct	Yes / No
A2.3	Legal or administrative finding of a commission of an act of grave misconduct in the course of business	Yes / No
A2.4	Failure to fulfil obligations related to payment of social security contributions	Yes / No
A2.5	Failure to fulfil obligations related to the payment of taxes	Yes / No
A2.6	Failure to provide information required or providing inaccurate / misleading information when participating in a procurement exercise	Yes / No
A2.7	Failure to obtain and maintain relevant licensing or membership of an appropriate trading or professional organisation where required by law	Yes / No
A2.8	If the answer to any of these is <b>“Yes”</b> please give brief details below, including what has been done to put things right.	

Table 2. Part A2 - Exclusion Criteria

## Part B - Conflict of Interest

<b>A3</b>	<p>Tenderers submitting a Tender in respect to this PCP confirm:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>● That they do not have any conflict of interest in connection to the contract. A conflict of interest may arise in particular as a result of economic interests, political or national affinities, family or emotional ties, or any other relevant connection or shared interest;</li> <li>● That they will inform the Lead Procurer, without delay, of any situation constituting a conflict of interest or which could give rise to a conflict of interest;</li> <li>● That they have not made, and will not make, any offer of any type whatsoever from which an advantage can be derived under the contract;</li> <li>● That they have not granted, sought, attempted to obtain or accepted and will not grant, seek, attempt to obtain, or accept any advantage, financial or in kind, to or from any party whatsoever, constituting an illegal or corrupt practice, either directly or indirectly, as an incentive or reward relating to the award of the</li> </ul>	
-----------	---	--

- contract;
- That they understand that the Lead Procurer reserves the right to verify this information and that they are aware of the consequences which may derive from any false declaration in respect of the information required by the awarding body as a condition of participation in the contract procedure.

Table 3. Part B - Conflict of Interest

## 2.2 Evaluation

The situation of the Tenderers and their Subcontractors was assessed based on the responses to the questions in Annex B.

All eligible Tenderers passed the exclusion criteria, and therefore all 24 Tenders were considered eligible to further participate in the SELECT for Cities PCP evaluation process.

## 3 Selection Criteria

The selection criteria were used to assess Tenderers' professional capacity, work experience and appropriate structures to fulfill the contract. The criteria used was as follows.

### 3.1 Criteria

Demonstrate the ability to perform R&D up to original development of the first products or services and to commercially exploit the results of the PCP, including intangible results in particular IPRs.

Provide a description of relevant reference and/or previous projects which reflect the competences and capacity of the Tenderer in the different phases and domains of the SELECT for Cities project.

Provide a list of current/previous services performed/developed which are similar in scope and complexity to this Tender. These references can be provided based on previous projects of the Tenderer or one or several of the consortium partners and/or Subcontractors who will be working on the project.

The references should be recent and should have been finalized during the last five years. Examples of areas in which references can be provided: large scale data projects, integration projects with sensors and other devices, experience with privacy and security in a network context ...

If you cannot provide at least one reference, please explain briefly why.

Demonstrate the Tenderers expertise and working experience required to undertake an innovative R&D project that entails software development, integration and commercialisation.

Provide the CVs of key personnel with competences and skills necessary to complete the project. Non-exhaustive list of possible competences: developers, integration specialists, project leaders, data-visualisation specialists, data analysts, data scientists, security and privacy experts, enterprise architects, commercial specialists, etc. ...

Identify who the subcontractor(s) is/are and what they will deliver.

Does your organisation have a Business Continuity / Disaster Recovery / Risk Management plan that ensures the described services are delivered in the event of a disruption affecting your business and ensures continuity of supply / service from your critical suppliers?

YES/NO

Insurance

Provide details of your current insurance cover:

- Employer's Liability
- Public Liability
- Professional Indemnity (if applicable)
- Product Liability (if applicable)
- Other

Please confirm whether you will take the appropriate level of insurance cover if you are successful in winning the contract?

YES/NO

Table 4. Selection criteria

### 3.2 Evaluation

The financial, economic, technical and professional capacity of the Tenderers and Subcontractors was assessed based on the responses to the questions in Annex C. All eligible Tenderers passed the exclusion criteria, and therefore all 24 Tenderers were considered to to further participate in the SELECT for Cities PCP evaluation.

## 4 Compliance Criteria

The compliance criteria were used to ensure that the Tenderers are in compliance with H2020 directives and PCP specific rules. The criteria used were as follows.

### 4.1 Criteria

#### A - Compliance with the R&D definition

A1	<p>The Tenderer declares that the submitted offer contains a min. of 50% R&amp;D-services and that the total value of products offered in each Phase will be less than 50 % of the total value of the framework agreement.</p> <p>The offers for all three Phases must propose services matching the R&amp;D definition; See Article XV(1)(e) <u>WTO GPA 1994</u> and the Article XIII (1)(f) of the <u>revised WTO GPA 2014</u>).</p> <p>Answer Yes / No</p>
A2	<p>The Tenderer declares that the provided unit prices for each category of R&amp;D-resources (e.g. junior, senior researchers, developers, ...) in the submitted offer for Phase 1 are binding for Phases 2 and 3.</p> <p>Answer Yes / No</p>
A3	<p>The Tenderer declares that the financial part of the offer for the Framework Agreement must provide binding unit prices for all foreseeable items for the whole duration of the Framework Agreement.</p> <p>The financial part of the offer for each phase must provide a breakdown of the price for that Phase in terms of units and unit prices for every type of items in the contract, distinguishing clearly the units and unit prices for product related items.</p> <p>The offers for all three Phases will include only items (products) needed to address the challenge in question and to deliver the R&amp;D services described in the Request for Tenders.</p> <p>Answer Yes / No</p>

Table 5. Compliance criteria - with R&D definition

#### B - Compatibility with other public financing

B	<p>The tenderer declares that he does not receive public funding from other sources that may lead to double public funding or an accumulation of different types of public financing not permitted by EU legislation, including EU state aid rules.</p>
---	---

Answer Yes / No

Table 6. Compliance criteria - compatibility with other public financing

C - Place of performance of the contract

C	<p>The Tenderer declares that:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>· At least 50 % of the total value of activities covered by the framework agreement will be performed in the EU Member States or H2020 associated countries. The principal R&amp;D staff working on the PCP will be located in the EU Member States or H2020 associated countries;</li> <li>· At least 50% of the total value of activities covered by each specific contract for each PCP phase must be performed in the EU Member States or in H2020 associated countries. The principal R&amp;D staff working on each specific contract will be located in the EU Member States or H2020 associated countries.</li> </ul>
	Answer Yes / No

Table 7. Compliance criteria - place of performance of the contract

D - Compliance with ethics and research integrity requirements

D1	The research involves Human Embryonic Stem Cells (HESCs), human participants, human cells or tissues?	Yes / No
D2	Does this research involve personal data collection and/or processing?	Yes / No
D3	If yes - Does it involve the collection and/or processing of sensitive personal data (e.g. health, sexual lifestyle, ethnicity, political opinion, religious or philosophical conviction)?	Yes / No
D4	Does it involve processing of genetic information?	Yes / No
	Does it involve tracking or observation of participants?	Yes / No
D5	<p>The tenderer commits to execute the tasks assigned under the Framework Agreement and the Specific Contracts in compliance with the provisions set out in the Framework Agreement, and compliant with the rules of:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>a) Ethical principles (including the highest standards of research integrity); and</li> <li>b) Applicable international, EU and national law</li> </ul>	Yes / No

Table 8. Compliance criteria - with ethics and research integrity requirements

#### E - Compliance with security requirements

E	The submitted bids comply with the EU, national and international law on dual-use goods or dangerous materials and substances.
Answer Yes / No	

Table 9. Compliance criteria - with security requirements

### 4.2 Evaluation

In order to be regular and administratively compliant Tenders were to meet the following Compliance Criteria, see Section 3.5 Compliance criteria in TD1 – Request for Tenders:

- Criterion A - Compliance with the definition of R&D services
- Criterion B - Compatibility with other public financing
- Criterion C - Compliance with requirements relating to the contract place of performance
- Criterion D - Ethics and research integrity
- Criterion E - Security

Tenders that did not comply with these Compliance Criteria were rejected.

All 24 Tenderers declared to be compliant. However, in one case the evidence given in Annex F - 'Financial Offer and Cost Breakdown' to prove the compliance with the '50% or more of the requested funding must go to R&D activities' rule, was deemed incorrect. The evaluators concluded that the proposed budget showed a value per Phase and an overall value of more than 50 % of non-R&D activities. Therefore this Tender was considered non-compliant and was excluded from further Tender evaluation.

Consequently, 23 Tenderers were considered to be eligible to further participate in the SELECT for Cities PCP evaluation. 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 Tenderer 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 Tenderers had to complete and submit Request for Tenders Annex E and F. Both annexes were used to assess and score the extent to which a Tender meets the award criteria, see TD1 Request for Tenders, section 3.6 and TD2 - Functional Specification.

In addition to the Award criteria evaluation, a webinar was organized during which all the 23 eligible Tenderers shortly present their technical solution and were afterwards subjected to questions from the Buyers Group. This was done to clarify those parts of their tenders which needed more information. Based on the responses of the webinar, slight changes were made to the Tenderers scores.

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

<i>Award criteria</i>	<i>Maximum points</i>	<i>Threshold</i>	<i>Total Weighting</i>
<b>Award Criteria Phase 1 and Framework Agreement</b>			
<b>1. Project Management</b>			<b>10%</b>
Feasibility of the Project plan and schedule	10		
Methodology of the project, including risk management and quality assurance	10		
<b>2. Impact on Challenge</b>			<b>30%</b>
<b>F1: Serve as a City Dashboard</b>			
F1.1: Describe how you will implement a dashboard that fits the basic requirements	10		
F1.2: Describe how your solution will be innovative in this domain			
<b>F2: Serve as an Open City Platform</b>			
F2.1: Describe how you will implement an Open City Platform that fits the basic requirements	10		
F2.2: Describe how your solution will be innovative in this domain			
<b>F3: Real Time communication</b>			
F3.1: Describe how your solution implements the basic requirements	10		
F3.2: Describe how your solution is innovative in this domain			
<b>F4: Data referential</b>			
F4.1: Describe how your solution implements the basic requirements	10		
F4.2: Describe how your solution is innovative in this domain			
<b>F5: Platform</b>			
F5.1: Describe how your solution implements the basic requirements	10		
F5.2: Describe how your solution is innovative in this domain			
<b>3. Technical Quality of the platform</b>			<b>20%</b>
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	
<b>4. Commercial Feasibility</b>			<b>5%</b>
Completeness, sense of reality and feasibility of the commercialisation plan including the market analysis and risk management	10		
Sense of reality and feasibility of the principles for licensing, pricing, packaging, distribution			
<b>5. Living Labs</b>			<b>5%</b>
Vision and plan for executing a Living Lab trial in the context of this PCP	10		
<b>6. Price</b>			<b>30%</b>
Binding contract price for carrying out the work in the present phase	10		
Indicative price for the work in all three PCP Phases, incl. the present phase (total price)	10		

Table 10. Award criteria evaluation points

Only Tenderers 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
- Impact on Challenge
- Technical quality of the platform
- Commercial feasibility
- Living Lab

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

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

The scoring model used by the evaluators to assess and score the extent to which a Tender was meeting the award criteria is included in Appendix A

Note: the information provided by the Tenderers concerning the Commercial feasibility varied too much to allow for a correct and useful evaluation. The information provided was too heterogeneous which made it impossible to objectively assess all Tenders equally at this stage. As a result, the Buyers Group has decided to award the maximum score of 5% to all Tenderers.

The Select for Cities consortium will adapt the Commercial feasibility part of the Tender to allow for an improved and correct evaluation in Phase 2.



## 6 Price

### 6.1 Criteria

6. Price			30%
Binding contract price for carrying out the work in the present phase	10		
Indicative price for the work in all three PCP Phases, incl. the present phase (total price)	10		

Table 11. Price criteria

### 6.2 Evaluation

The Tenderers' Actual Price for Phase 1 (present phase) and the Indicative price for the work in all three phases was evaluated according to the formula:

$$\text{Weight awarded to Price} * (\text{Price lowest tender} / \text{Price Tender})$$

## 7 Overall Conclusion

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

1. Project Management (weight 10%)
2. Impact on Challenge (weight 30%)
3. Technical quality of the platform (weight 20%)
4. Commercial feasibility (weight 5%)
5. Living Lab (weight 5%)
6. Price (weight 30%)

Failure to achieve the minimum score for the respective Tender components and/or its threshold resulted in the Tender to be excluded from further participation in the PCP.

The exact number of Contracts to be awarded depended on the number of Tenders passing the evaluation and on the prices offered. Contracts were funded until the remaining budget is insufficient to fund the next best Tender.

Each Tenderer was sent an individual evaluation report with feedback and their place in the final ranking.



The 10 highest ranked Tenderers passing the administrative and evaluation criteria and all thresholds were considered eligible for funding and were invited to sign the SELECT for Cities Framework Agreement and the Specific Contract for Phase 1, in accordance with the model contracts provided in TD3 and TD4 (Lead Tenderer in alphabetical order):

- Bosonit S.L. - Spain
- etventure Corporate Innovation GmbH - Germany
- HOP Ubiquitous S.L. - Spain
- Indra sistemas S.A. - Spain
- Engineering Ingegneria Informatica S.p.A – Italy
- Magenta srl -Italy
- Martel GmbH - Switzerland
- University of Florence (DISIT Lab) - Italy
- Urban Software Institute GmbH- Germany
- WINGS ICT Solutions - Greece

On 4 July 2017 the Contract Award Notice was published on the eNotices portal for European public procurement under the publication number 2017/S 125-255529.

## Appendix A - Scoring Model for the Award Criteria

### Overall scoring model

This Appendix contains the scoring model that will be used by the evaluators to assess and score the extent to which a Tender is meeting the award criteria.

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