



EUROPEAN COMMISSION

Directorate-General for Internal Market, Industry, Entrepreneurship and SMEs

Industrial Transformation and Advanced Value Chains
Director

28. 11. 2018

Brussels,
grow.ddg1.c.dir(2018)5940820




Subject: Reopening of competition under framework contract 575/PP/2016/FC - 714/PP/GRO/IMA/18/1133/10704 - Impact Assessment on Common Charges of Portable Devices

Dear Sir,

We regret to inform you that your specific tender has not been successful in the above reopening of competition, for the following reason:

Following its evaluation, your tender was not the most economically advantageous tender.


These are all the details that we can provide on the grounds for our decision:

The person in charge of the evaluation has given the tender submitted by **tenderer**  the following points:

3 out of 5 for award criterion No 1:

Sufficient. The proposal is correctly structured. Sections are displayed in a way that main tasks are logically organised, therefore facilitating an easy reading. The proposed methodology for the study, structured in a number of relevant 'work packages', indicates clear steps and expected outputs, therefore providing a coherent path on how the study will be performed.

10 out of 15 for award criterion No 2:

More than sufficient. Quality aspects are given good importance, and proposed quality control procedures are well detailed. More in particular, the tender specifies procedures explaining how to ensure quality of collected data and their analysis, quality of the deliverables, and the involved actors. Concerning risk management aspects, a standard table reporting main risks with their level and proposed safeguard measures is provided, however not sufficiently well developed. Mechanisms for project management are not adequately explained, as it is just claimed that 'management will be reliable as  has extensive experience with previous projects'.

13 out of 20 for award criterion No 3:


More than sufficient. The composition of the team appears slightly unbalanced towards management activities as, other than project director and project and assistant-project managers (4 people in total), just 1 electrical safety expert is part of the team, only supported by 1 consultation co-ordinator. Although economics and data analysis aspects are covered by the remaining two people, the presence of profiles having more direct experience in standardisation activities, potentially very relevant for such a specific market sector, would be of utmost relevance. All proposed team members, 8 people in total, come from [REDACTED]. Roles are well defined, though unbalanced as 50% of team devoted to project's management activities.

16 out of 25 for award criterion No 4:

More than sufficient. The tender is correctly and clearly indicating that the exercise will comprehend two tasks, (1) literature review and (2) stakeholders consultation. The literature review phase is well addressed and detailed. Main needed information is listed and main potential sources are correctly indicated. Rightly, it is also mentioned that academic research articles could be easily outdated and that there is need for fresh information coming from alternative sources such as blog posts and other technology websites. A number of technology websites and blogs are listed. The suggestion of extending the scope of the study to tablets/laptops, portable DACs, GPS, e-books, cameras toothbrush is interesting and relevant. The inclusion of wireless (e.g. via a specific power cord) and of UPB PD (p.53) is really a plus. Market analysis aspects are rather weak, as not proposing innovative collecting strategies, and instead reporting on difficulties had during similar exercise. The way consultations should be setup are rather well detailed, with well prepared lists of stakeholders, ranged by type of companies, industry associations and other actors. . In conclusion, the proposed methodologies are adequate, but not proposing new a possibly interesting strategies.

22 out of 35 for award criterion No 5:

More than sufficient. The part related to the evaluation of the Memorandum of Understanding is correctly structured and addressed by 10 assessments points. Many cited points and data provided up to 2013 are based on outcomes already present in a previous study, therefore not being of particular benefit. Again, the modelling methods of the previous study are proposed in the offer, covering the missing 2015-2018 period, and just updating with technologies not present up to 2014. In this respect, both fast and wireless charging technologies are mentioned, and basic data are reported already. The part addressing to the impact assessment of policy option is sufficiently well developed. The intervention logic is displayed in a table, together with main indicators linked to policy aspects. The methodology used for the development of policy options is correctly addressed, and a clear identification of methods useful to assess the most significant impacts is provided.

Bid No	Crit. No 1 Out of 5	Crit. No 2 Out of 15	Crit. No 3 Out of 20	Crit. No 4 Out of 25	Crit. No 4 Out of 35	Total points Out of 100	Price	Ratio
	3	10	13	16	22	64	218.510	72,2587

If you so request in writing, you may be informed of the name of the contractor to whom the specific contract has been awarded.

The contract can be signed only after a period of 10 calendar days starting from the day following the date on which this letter was sent. During this period you may submit any observations concerning the procurement procedure to the contracting authority. If it is not possible to conclude the contract as envisaged, we reserve the right to review our decision and to award the contract to another tenderer or to cancel the procedure.

If you believe that there was maladministration, you may lodge a complaint to the European Ombudsman within two years of the date when you became aware of the facts on which the complaint is based (see <http://www.ombudsman.europa.eu>).

Any request you may make and any reply from us, or any complaint for maladministration, will have neither the purpose nor the effect of suspending the time-limit for lodging an action for annulment of the present decision, which must be done within two months of notification of this letter. The court responsible for hearing annulment procedures is the General Court of the European Union:

General Court
Rue du Fort Niedergrünwald
L-2925 Luxembourg
tel.: (+352) 4303 1 fax: (+352) 4303 2100
URL: <http://curia.europa.eu>

Thank you for your interest in the work of the European Commission. We trust that it will be renewed in future procurement procedures.

Yours sincerely,


Gwenole Cozigou

