



REPORT ON THE EVALUATION OF THE SUBMITTED DELIVERABLES AND PCP CONTRACT AWARDING (D4.2)

PHASE 2 CALL-OFF

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.....	5
Abbreviations.....	6
1 Submission of call-off Phase 2 Tender Forms.....	7
1.1 Eligible Tenders.....	7
1.2 Non-eligible Tenders.....	7
2 Exclusion Criteria.....	7
3 Selection Criteria.....	8
4 Compliance Criteria.....	8
5 Award Criteria.....	8
5.1 Scoring Model.....	9
5.2 Project management - Evaluation.....	10
5.3 Impact on challenge - Evaluation.....	10
5.4 Technical quality of the platform.....	11
5.5 Commercial feasibility - Evaluation.....	12
5.6 Living labs approach.....	12
6 Price.....	12
6.1 Criteria.....	12
6.2 Evaluation.....	12
7 Overall Conclusion.....	13

Table of Figures

Figure 1. Project management - Scores	Error! Bookmark not defined.
Figure 2. Impact on challenge – Scores.....	Error! Bookmark not defined.
Figure 3. Technical quality of the platform - Scores	Error! Bookmark not defined.
Figure 4. Commercial Feasibility - Scores.....	Error! Bookmark not defined.
Figure 5. Living labs - Scores	Error! Bookmark not defined.
Figure 6. Price criteria – Scores Overall Conclusion.....	Error! Bookmark not defined.
Figure 7. Final total scores per Contractor and per Phase 2 Award Criterion	Error! Bookmark not defined.
Figure 8. Contractors eligible for funding	Error! Bookmark not defined.
Figure 9. Contractors eligible for funding	Error! Bookmark not defined.

Table of Tables

Table 1. Scoring Model	9
Table 2. Project management - Award Criteria	10
Table 3. Impact on challenge – Award Criteria.....	11
Table 4. Technical quality of the platform - Award Criteria	11
Table 5. Commercial Feasibility - Award Criteria.....	12
Table 6. Living labs - Award Criteria	12
Table 7. Price criteria - Award Criteria.....	12

Document revision history

Revision				
No	Author	Organization	Date	Work effectuated
1	Katrien Lenaert	Digipolis	13/10/2017	Initial draft
2	Katrien Lenaert	Digipolis	25/10/2017	Finalized template
3	Susie McAleer, Katrien Lenaert	21C, Digipolis	30/10/2017	Draft motivations Project Mgt, Commercialization, Living Lab
4	Katrien Lenaert	Digipolis	03/11/2017	Draft motivations Functional and Qualitative topics
5	Select for Cities Tech team	All	07/11/2017	Agreement and finalizing the motivation
6	Katrien Lenaert, Karin Goedheid	Digipolis	08/11/2017	Financial motivation and final report

Approvals for final version

Contributor	Author	Organization	Date
Consortium partners	Katrien Lenaert	Digipolis	

Distribution list

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

Executive Summary

This report summarizes the assessment and scoring of the SELECT for Cities Phase 2 Call-off. The evaluation was carried out on the basis of Phase 2 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 members of the Select for Cities Buyers Group, 6 Contractors were invited to proceed to Phase 2 of the Select for Cities PCP project, and all 6 Contractors submitted a Phase 2 Tender before the deadline of 27 October 2017 10:00 AM:

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

The submitted Tenders were verified on administrative compliance and compliance criteria during the desk evaluation by the Buyers Group. 6 Tenderers were found eligible for continuing to the technical and financial evaluation which consisted of a desk evaluation by the Buyers Group's technical experts followed by 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 2 evaluation round which 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 2 budget, 5 Tenderers were selected to proceed to Phase 2 of the Select for Cities PCP project:

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

Abbreviations

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

1 Submission of call-off Phase 2 Tender Forms

6 Contractors submitted a SELECT for Cities Call-off Phase 2 Report, comprising all relevant Deliverables and Results, before the deadline of October 27th 2017:

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

1.1 Eligible Tenders

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

- Annex A - General Tender Submission Form
- Annex E - Technical Offer Phase 2 Annex
- Annex F - Financial Offer and Cost Breakdown
- Annex G - Financial Offer Phase 2

Deliverables that did not comply with these conditions were regarded as irregular. 6 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 2 Tender.

2 Exclusion Criteria

The exclusion, selection and compliance criteria listed in the Request for Tenders (TD1) were equally applicable in Phase 2. Tenderers were to be excluded if they were no longer compliant with one of those criteria.

None of the Phase 2 Tenderers were incompliant 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 2. Tenderers were to be excluded if they were no longer non-compliant with one of those criteria.

None of the Phase 2 Tenderers were incompliant 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 2. Tenderers were to be excluded if they were no longer non-compliant with one of those criteria.

None of the Phase 2 Tenderers were incompliant 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

Pre-defined 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. These 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 template A - Project Management & Project Team (P)
- Annex E template B - Detailed Project Plan for Phases 2 and 3 (P)
- Annex E template C - Methodology of the Project (P)
- Annex E template D - Adapted Risk Plan (P)
- Annex E template E - Adapted Quality Assurance Plan (P)
- Annex E template F - Impact on Challenge (F)
- Annex E template G - Expected Functionalities (F)
- Annex E template H - Technical Quality of the Platform (Q)
- Annex E template I - Quality Assurance and Testing (Q)
- Annex E template J - GDPR Compliancy (Q)
- Annex E template K - Diagrams of Prototype (Q)
- Annex E template L - Architecture Integration (Q)

- Annex E template M - Commercial Feasibility (C)
- Annex E template N - Industry Analysis (C)
- Annex E template O - Customer Analysis (C)
- Annex E template P - Business Model (C)
- Annex E template Q - Competitor Analysis (C)
- Annex E template R - Marketing Plan (C)
- Annex E template S - Vision and Plan on Living Lab trial (L)
- Annex E template T - Living Labs Questions (L)
- Annex E template U - Ethics & Privacy Checklist (L)
- Annex E template V - Privacy Policy Phase 2
- Annex E template W - Intellectual Property

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 - 30%
- Technical Quality of the Platform - 20%
- Commercial Feasibility - 5%
- Living Labs Approach - 5%

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 used by the evaluators to assess and score the extent to which a Tender meets 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.

Table 1. 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:

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:

2. Impact on challenge			30%
F1: Serve as a City Dashboard			
F1.1: Show how the prototype will implement a dashboard that fits the basic requirements			
F1.2: Show how the prototype will be innovative in this domain	10		
F2: Serve as an Open City Platform			
F2.1: Show how the prototype will implement an Open City Platform that fits the basic requirements			
F2.2: Show how the prototype will be innovative in this domain	10		
F3: Real Time communication			
F3.1: Show how the prototype will implement the basic requirements			
F3.2: Show how the prototype will be innovative in this domain	10		

F4: Data referential			
F4.1: Show how the prototype will implement the basic requirements			
F4.2: Show how the prototype will be innovative in this domain	10		
F5: Platform			
F5.1: Show how the prototype will implement the basic requirements			
F5.2: Show how the prototype will be 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:

3. Technical Quality of the platform			20%
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:

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:

5. Living Labs			5%
Vision and plan on executing a Living Lab trial in the context of this PCP	10		

Table 6. Living labs - Award Criteria

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 the remaining phase (Phase 3)	10		

Table 7. Price criteria - Award Criteria

6.2 Evaluation

The Tenderers' Actual Price for Phase 2 (present phase) and the Indicative price for the work in the remaining phase (Phase 3) was evaluated according 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).

The final Total Scores per Contractor and per Phase 2 Award Criterion are listed below:

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

Failure to achieve the minimum score for the respective components and/or its threshold resulted in the Contractor Urban Software Institute 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 2.

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

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

Since the Phase 2 budget is sufficient to fund all Contractors passing the evaluation, all 5 Tenders have been invited to sign a Phase 2 Specific Contract.