Tender Evaluation

PDC WAMS

Contract Notice TED ref. 170936-2025

Summary	Description of the tender evaluation of the above procedure.
Filename	PDC_WAMS_Tender_Evaluation.docx
Date	02/06/2025

Document creation and distribution

Author	Ignaas De Valkenaere
Function	Group Purchase IT

Previous versions

Version	Author	Summary of changes
20250513	Ignaas De Valkenaere	First version
20250602	Ignaas De Valkenaere	Final version

Table of contents

1. Introduction & Overview

This document describes the evaluation of the Bids and the contract award mechanisms for the Tender as EU Contract Notice **170936-2025**, published by **ELIA Transmission Belgium** (hereinafter called "Elia").

The purpose of this document is to allow the Tenderers to submit a focussed and high-quality Bid and to ensure an objective, comprehensive and transparent award procedure and award decision.

In line with the abovementioned Contract Notice, the Contract will be awarded to the most advantageous Bid. The criteria, their scoring and weighting and the respective calculation mechanisms are described in this document.

2. Definitions

	Definition
Award Criteria	include the criteria as described in section 3 of this document which will be assessed by the Contracting Entity, each with a specifically attributed weight as indicated in this document.
Award Matrix	means the Excel sheet with the defined calculation scheme for the Award Criteria.
Contract Deviation List	means document **PDC_WAMS_DeviationList.xls**
Form of Proposal	means document add reference (=document with the reply of the bidders that will be used for the technical evaluation)
ITT	means the invitation to tender as sent to the Tenderers with document reference **PDC_WAMS_ITT.pdf**
Price Sheet	means document **PDU_WAMS_Pricing_Sheet.xlsx**

Other capitalised terms shall have the meaning assigned to them in the ITT or, to the extent specifically indicated, in other documents of this Tender.

3. Tender Evaluation Overview

The evaluation of the submitted bids will be performed using the Award Criteria, on the basis of the following weighting:

Weight	Award Criteria	Information	Min score
50%	Price Evaluation	Based on oLump Sum Contract Price	0%
10%	Terms & Conditions	Acceptance of key clauses of the Contract	0,50%
15%	Business & Interfacing Requirements	Validation of the offered solution against the business & interfacing requirements	0%
10%	IT Requirements	Validation of the offered solution against the IT requirements	0%
10%	Demo	Validation of the offered soltuion	0%
5%	SLA Requirements	Validation of the offered solution against the SLA requirements	0%

A system of 'Total Points' will be used for the Award Matrix. The maximum Total Points that can be achieved by a Tenderer is 100 points.

Based on this system, each Award Criterion is converted from percentage to points.

Example:

ID	Award Matrix	Weight	Tenderer 1	Tenderer 2	Tenderer 3
1	Monetary Evaluation	50	48,53	41,38	41,39
2	Legal and Commercial Evaluation	10	8,50	9,00	7,00
3	Technical Evaluation	40	35,80	33,30	30,64
	Total Points	**100**	**92,83**	**83,68**	**79,03**

The 'Total Points' (i.e. not the intermediary points) will be rounded up with 2 numbers after the coma using the standard decimal function in Excel. This means that any decimal number in the "total points" score strictly smaller than 0.005 will be rounded down and any decimal number bigger or equal to 0.005 will be rounded up. Example: a total score of 8.74**5** will be rounded up to 8.7**5** while a total score of 8.74**4** will be rounded down to 8.7**4**. Note that the standard Excel functions will not apply this rounding principle to intermediate results used in the calculation to obtain the "total points".

The given points will be the result of the evaluation by The Contracting Entity of the Bid as received (initial or revised).

The detailed criteria of the respective sections are described in the upcoming chapters.

4. Mandatory Criteria

Bidders must pass all mandatory criteria to have their other sections evaluated.

One "Fail" in any of the criteria in this section will result to an exclusion of the Bidder from the tender.

PASS/FAIL

Bidders must pass ALL the mandatory Pass/Fail questions (minimum requirements) listed in the documents

- **Response Template Business Requirements.xlsx**
- **Response Template Interfacing requirements.xlsx**
- **Response Template IT requirements.xlsx**
- **Response Template SLA requirements.xlsx**

Bidders must have a score > 0 for ALL demonstrations. A score "0" for 1 or more demonstration(s) will result to an exclusion of the Bidder from the tender.

5. Monetary Evaluation

The monetary evaluation will be assessed on a quantitative basis and comprises all those criteria that can be evaluated using a monetary value. This includes:

- Lump Sum Contract Price
- MVP Price

The total of all monetary criteria is the Total Price.

The Bidder with the lowest Total Price will achieve the maximum of 50 points, which is equivalent to a share of 50% of the applicable total. The lower-ranking bids will be proportionally scored applying the following formula:

$$\text{Score} = (P_{min} / P_n) * 50$$

whereas

- P_{min} is the value of the Bidder with the lowest Total Price
- P_n is the Total Price for the Bidder being evaluated.

Example

Bidder	Total Price	Score
Bidder A	€ 100,00	50,00
Bidder B	€ 120,00	41,67
Bidder C	€ 150,00	33,33
Bidder D	€ 110,00	45,45
Bidder E	€ 140,00	35,71

The individual dimension of the monetary evaluation is described hereafter.

5.1 Lump Sum Contract Price

The Lump Sum Contract Price offered by the Bidder will be evaluated as the total of all required goods and services covered in the Bidder's offer.

For the calculation of this Lump Sum Contract Price, we will use the EXCEL file with ref. : **PDU_WAMS_PricingSheet.xls**

6. Legal / Commercial Evaluation

The legal and commercial aspects of the Contract Proposal (General – Specific – SLA) will be evaluated on a qualitative basis following a predefined scoring model which is outlined in this section. The Legal and Commercial Evaluation represents a share of 10% of the overall score. The maximum score for this Award Criterion is therefore 10 points.

The Tenderers are required to accept the Contract. Tenderers may however suggest a limited amount of deviations. The Tenderer must indicate each requested change to the Contract separately (a "**Deviation**") in the Contract Deviation List : **PDC_WAMS_DeviationList.xlsx**

The Legal Evaluation will assess the degree of acceptance of the Deviations based on their impact on the project as a whole. The Deviations will be evaluated on a qualitative basis.

Each Tenderer starts with an initial score of 10 points.

For each Contract clause for which the Tenderer request one or more Deviation(s), points will be subtracted from the Tenderer's score using the 'Legal Scoring Model'.

Legal scoring Model		
Level	**Score**	**Definition**
Minor Deviation	**-0,5**	Changes, comments or terms which have <u>**an adverse effect**</u> upon the Project, directly or indirectly, but which is not regarded as a material adverse effect, including without limitation the transfer of risk or increased cost to the Project.
Major Deviation	**-3**	Complete rejection of the clause or subject matter or Changes, comments or terms which have <u>**a material adverse effect**</u> upon the Project, directly or indirectly, including without limitation the transfer of risk or increased cost to the Project. Several and combined adverse effects will be considered as a material adverse effect.
Unacceptable Deviation	**-10**	Complete rejection of the clause or subject matter or changes, comments or terms which have <u>**an unacceptable material adverse effect**</u> upon the Project, directly or indirectly, including without limitation the transfer of risk or increased cost to the Project.Several and combined adverse effects will be considered as a material adverse effect. and/or Non compliant response including without limitation comments which state 'to be discussed further' without full substantiation of the concern or comment.

If a Bid on which The Contracting Entity bases itself for the award decision or any prior shortlisting decision (the first Bid or any other revised and/or modified Bid) receives a score lower than **0.5/10** for the Legal/Commercial Evaluation, this Bid will be considered to be non-compliant with the Tender specifications and will be rejected.

7. Technical Evaluation

The technical aspects of the Contract will be evaluated on a qualitative basis following a predefined scoring model which is outlined in this section. The Technical Evaluation represents a share of 40% of the overall score. The maximum score for this Award Criterion is therefore 40 points.

The evaluation for this Award Criterion is further divided into several subcriteria that are linked to the Form of Proposal. The different sections of the Form of Proposal are defined below with a weighting depending on their importance.

The subweighting is equivalent / equal to the maximum achievable points per subcriterion as displayed in the following excerpt of the Award Matrix:

Nr.	Technical Criteria	Weight
1	Business & Interfacing Requirements	15
2	IT Requirements	10
3	Demo's	10
4	SLA Requirements and Tender Competences	5
		40

Each Technical Criteria will receive a score in accordance with the following technical scoring model:

Price	50%			Weight			Weight	Score
					Business - Basic Requirements		1	0
					Business - Data Validation		1	0
					Business - Data Acquisition and Forwarding		1	0
					Business - Conversion and Manipulation		1	0
					Business - Data Storing		1	0
		Business & Interfacing Requirements	15		Business - Functional Requirements		3	0
					Business - Visualization		3	0
					Business - PMU stream simulator		3	0
					Interfacing - Standards		1	0
					Interfacing - Networks		1	0
					Interfacing - Interfaces		3	0
					Interfacing - Database		1	0
					Interfacing - (Micro) Services		3	0
					IT specifications		1	0
					IT Architecture		3	0
					IT software		1	0
Technical	40%	IT Requirements	10		IT Support & documentation		1	0
					IT Software Testing		1	0
					Cyber Security		3	0
					Servers Standards		3	0
					Demo 1 - connection to Elia PMU		1	0
					Demo 2 - Visualization of data - historical		1	0
					Demo 3 - Visualization of data - real time		1	0
		Demo	10		Demo 4 - export of PMU data		1	0
					Demo 5 - WAMS - Power Oscillation Detection		3	0
					Demo 6 - WAMS - Power Oscillation Locator		3	0
					Demo 7 - WAMS - Benchmark measurement		3	0
					SLA requirements - Service Levels		5	0
		SLA Requiremens - Tender Competences	5		SLA requirements - Reliability/Availibility		5	0
					SLA requirements - Technical Support		1	0
					Tender Competences		5	0
T&C's	10%							

7.1 Scoring model "Business Requirements", "Interfacing Requirements" and "IT Requirements"

Scoring "Business Requirements", "Interfacing Requirements" and "IT Requirements" (except "cyber security" requirements):

10	The requirements are in accordance and above expectations, the requirements are already actually available in the solution, deployed and in operation in a TSO and the filled in "response template" by the Tenderer is of good quality
5	Basic requirements are met, the basic requirements are already actually available in the solution, deployed and in operation in a TSO and the filled in "response template" by the Tenderer is of good quality
2	Basic requirements are available in the solution or are available in the solution with minor deviation(s). Or the filled in "response template" by the Tenderer is of poor quality
0	Minimal requirement(s) are not met (exclusion)

"cyber security" scoring: the entire final percentage score will be taken over (translated to 10 points, so 10 points = 100% scoring)

7.2 Scoring model "demo's"

10	Demo 1: "pass" Demo 2, 3, 4, 5, 6 and 7: all requested functionalities are demonstrated in accordance and above the scope and the demonstration is of good quality
5	Demo 2, 3, 4, 5, 6 and 7: basic scope of the demonstration has been met and the demonstration is of good quality
2	Demo 2, 3, 4, 5, 6 and 7: basic scope of the demonstration has been met with minor deviation or the demonstration is of poor quality
0	Demo 1: "fail" Demo 2, 3, 4, 5, 6 and 7: none of the requested functionalities has been demonstrated or the functionality is not present in the demonstrated software

7.3 Scoring model "SLA requirements" and "Tender Competences"

10	- "service levels": the tenderer has proposed a good "service levels" plan for the 3 requested scenario's in production. The corresponding price is reflected in the pricing grid and the "service levels" for production are covered by a more than expected proposed penalty system showing confidence by the Tenderer in the proposed service levels by the Tenderer and a good reversibility clause has been proposed. Good "service levels" are as well proposed for the acceptance and test environment. The delivered information is clear and usable. - "Reliability/availibility" numbers are available and 99,9% availability can be offered in production. The Tenderer can prove this availibility based on other deployed projects within TSO's part of ENTSOE region (or regions with simular specificities). The delivered information is clear and usable. - "Technical support": the tenderer can prove the requirements can be met - "Tender Competences": the tenderer can prove it can handle the project with a project plan, detailed workout out project timeline, good training strategy, supported by an experience project team and organization. The tenderer can prove it has a long term vision with Elia, supporting Elia with a constant improving and evoluating product. The delivered information is clear and usable.
8	- "service levels": the tenderer has proposed a good "service levels" plan for the 3 requested scenario's in production. The corresponding price is reflected in the pricing grid and the "service levels" for production are covered by a more than expected proposed penalty system showing confidence by the Tenderer in the proposed service levels by the Tenderer. The delivered information is clear and usable. - "Reliability/availibility" numbers are available and 99,8% availability can be offered in production. The Tenderer can prove this availibility based on other deployed projects within TSO's part of ENTSOE region (or regions with simular specificities). The delivered information is clear and usable. - "Technical support": NA - "Tender Competences": NA
5	- "service levels": the tenderer has proposed a good "service levels" plan for the 3 requested scenario's in production. The corresponding price is reflected in the pricing grid and the "service levels" for production are covered by a good proposed penalty system. The delivered information is clear and usable. - "Reliability/availibility" numbers are available and 99,6% availability can be offered in production. The Tenderer can prove this availibility based on other deployed projects within TSO's part of ENTSOE region (or regions with simular specificities). The delivered information is clear and usable. - "Technical support": NA - "Tender Competences": NA
2	- "service levels": the tenderer has proposed a poor "service levels" plan for the 3 requested scenario's in production or the "service levels" for production are covered by a poor proposed penalty system or the corresponding price is not well reflected in the pricing grid. The delivered information is clear. - "Reliability/availibility" numbers are available. The Tenderer can prove this availibility based on other deployed projects within TSO's part of ENTSOE region (or regions with simular specificities). The delivered information is clear. - "Technical support": NA - "Tender Competences": the tenderer has delivered information about tender competences. The information is of poor quality or not convincing the Tenderer can handle the project, or the Tenderer is not convincing having a long term strategy with its product or with Elia.
0	- "service levels": the tenderer has delivered no or incomplete information concerning a proposed "service levels" plan for the 1 or more requested scenario's in production, no or the "service levels" for production are covered by a poor proposed penalty system or the corresponding price is not well reflected in the pricing grid. The delivered information is clear. - "Reliability/availibility" numbers are not available, or the availity can not be proven with information from other TSO's part of ENTSOE region (or regions with simular specificities), or the delivered information is not clear or not usable. - "Technical support": the tenderer can not prove the requirements can be met - "Tender Competences": the Tenderer has not provided any information about Tender Competences, or incomplete (missing or not answered sections), or irrelevant information, or unusable information