

## Award criteria

The contract will be awarded in accordance with the UVgO<sup>1</sup> guidelines. The contract will be awarded to the most economical bid.

The following award criteria and their weighting will be used to assess the economic viability:

Criterion	No.	Explanation of the award criteria	Evaluation scheme
<b>Price</b>			
Offer price	1	The net amount of all costs for the items required in the specifications inclusive the daily rate net * 50 will be assessed.	The most affordable offer will be awarded the full number of points (20 points). An offer that is twice as expensive receives 0 points. In between, linear interpolation is carried out and rounded to 2 places. So, for example, if your offer is 50% more expensive, you will receive 10 points.
<b>Quality</b>			
<b>Concept for project implementation</b>			
Comprehension of Project Scope, Complexity, and Key Priorities	2.1	<p>The bidder shall provide written responses to the guiding questions 1-3 (max. 300 words for <b>each</b> answer):</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>1. Based on your understanding of the tender documents, which core complexities and challenges do you identify in this project, and how do they influence your proposed approach?</li> <li>2. Which aspects of the required services do you consider most critical for achieving the project objectives, and how does your approach ensure that these focus areas are addressed effectively?</li> <li>3. What are the most important technical design or architectural considerations, and how do they influence your implementation plan?</li> </ol>	<p><b>5 points:</b> Deep and precise understanding; answers demonstrate strong alignment with project needs and a well-thought-out approach to the identified complexities.</p> <p><b>4 points:</b> Clear, well-structured understanding; complexities are addressed with reasonable insight.</p> <p><b>3 points:</b> Adequate understanding; most important aspects are recognized but not explored in depth.</p> <p><b>2 points:</b> Partial understanding; key complexities or focus areas are only superficially addressed.</p> <p><b>1 point:</b> Minimal understanding; essential elements of the project are misunderstood or overlooked.</p>

<sup>1</sup> Regulation on sub-threshold procurement

		Please note that only the first 300 words of each question/answer will be considered in the evaluation, and any text beyond that will not be included in the evaluation.	<b>0 points:</b> No relevant understanding demonstrated; answers are missing or entirely off-topic.
Organisational concept	2.2	<p>The bidder's organisational concept for the project will be evaluated to ensure proper planning and implementation of the project.</p> <p>The information provided by the bidder regarding the project organisation and implementation, as well as the tools used to clarify the planned process with regard to the specific project, shall be taken into account. The bidder must explain how the cooperation/working method in its project team is carried out (project structure, hierarchies, communication and reporting). They must also describe the decision-making management in case of conflicts (reaction and escalation management).</p> <p>The bidder must also state how coordination with the client and other persons/institutions involved in the project will take place.</p>	<p><b>5 points:</b> The description of the organisational concept is very good and very coherent. The information provided suggests that the project success will be fully achieved in terms of quality.</p> <p><b>4 points:</b> The description of the organisational concept is good and mostly conclusive. The information provided suggests that the project success will be almost entirely achieved in terms of quality.</p> <p><b>3 points:</b> The description of the organisational concept has some gaps, but is still comprehensible. The information provided suggests that the project success will be largely achieved in terms of quality.</p> <p><b>2 points:</b> The description of the organisational concept is rather superficial and is not consistently plausible in several places. The information provided suggests that the project success will not be predominantly achieved in terms of quality.</p> <p><b>1 point:</b> The description of the organisational concept is insufficient and has numerous gaps; many aspects are not presented in a plausible way. The information provided suggests that the project success will not be achieved in terms of quality for the most part.</p>

			<p><b>0 points:</b> The bidder or the bidding consortium does not make any useful statements, or any at all, regarding this criterion.</p>
Project plan	2.3	<p>The plausibility of the bidder's project plan for the implementation of the project will be evaluated.</p> <p>In particular, the following aspects will be assessed:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• <b>Scheduling and Milestone Planning:</b> The bidder shall provide a detailed schedule including all relevant milestones. The bidder must explain which milestones are planned at which point in time within the project and indicate the earliest possible date on which the implementation can commence.</li> <li>• <b>Resource and Work Package Planning:</b> The bidder shall provide a comprehensive resource plan. This must include a breakdown of all sub-packages/work packages, each with the corresponding Full-Time Equivalent (FTE) allocation, the required skill levels, and the team members (roles/profiles) assigned. For each sub-package, the bidder must also indicate the planned timeline and dependencies.</li> <li>• If synergy effects or external tools are intended to be used, please provide a brief description where applicable.</li> </ul>	<p><b>5 points:</b> The project plan is very plausible and includes the essential aspects. The details lead us to expect that the success of the project will be safely achieved within the given time frame.</p> <p><b>4 points:</b> The project plan is plausible and contains almost all essential aspects. The information provided suggests that the success of the project will almost certainly be achieved within the given time frame.</p> <p><b>3 points:</b> The project plan is largely plausible and contains most of the essential aspects. The information suggests that the success of the project will be achieved within the given time frame with a certain degree of certainty.</p> <p><b>2 points:</b> The project plan is only plausible in parts and the essential aspects are included only rudimentarily. The information provided suggests that the success of the project is unlikely to be achieved within the given time frame.</p> <p><b>1 point:</b> The project plan is largely implausible and does not even include a rudimentary overview of the essential aspects. The information provided suggests that the success of the project will hardly be achieved within the given time frame.</p>

			<b>0 points:</b> The bidder or the bidding consortium does not make any useful statements, or any at all, regarding this criterion.
<b>Contract-related experience and qualification</b>			
Experience of project management and deputising	3.1a	The designated project manager has at least 5 years of professional experience with IT project management.	For each additional full professional year 0.2 points (max. 20 years = max. 4 points)
	3.1b	The designated project manager has a relevant qualification/certification such as PRINCE 2 or equivalent.	1 point extra
	3.1c	The designated project leader has implemented at least one project in a community setting (multi-stakeholder approach).	1 point extra
	3.2a	The designated deputy project manager has at least 5 years of professional experience with IT project management.	For each additional full professional year 0.2 points (max. 20 years = max. 4 points)
	3.2b	The designated Deputy Project Manager has a relevant qualification/certification such as PRINCE 2 or equivalent.	1 point extra
	3.2c	The designated deputy project manager has implemented at least one project in a community setting (multi-stakeholder approach).	1 point extra
Contract-related experience and project team qualifications – key personnel only	4	<p>The technical qualification and contract-related experience of the key personnel disclosed by the bidder (not including project management deputies) will be evaluated.</p> <p>The bidder must name 3 employees as key personnel in the Forms who it will actually use to provide the services if the contract is awarded and</p>	<p><b>5 points:</b> Very experienced and highly qualified key personnel.</p> <p><b>4 points:</b> Well qualified and experienced key personnel.</p> <p><b>3 points:</b> Mainly well-qualified and experienced key personnel.</p> <p><b>2 points:</b> Sufficiently qualified and experienced key personnel.</p>

		<p>who are available to them for this purpose. In addition, the bidder must submit a self-declaration on the technical training and professional experience of the key personnel (<b>CVs with details of training and professional experience (in full years)</b>) in accordance with Forms.</p> <p>Furthermore, information on OSS platform knowledge such as GitHub, GitLab, Eclipse Foundation, Linus Foundation, etc. will be positively assessed in addition to subject-specific qualifications and years of employment.</p>	<p><b>1 point:</b> No sufficiently qualified and experienced key personnel.</p> <p><b>0 points:</b> The bidder does not make any useful statements regarding this criterion, or provides statements that are obviously false.</p>
<b>Quality management</b>			
Quality assurance	5	<p>The bidder's presentation will be evaluated to ensure effective quality assurance during the implementation. This includes measures that are suitable for increasing the objective probability that the software to be developed will achieve a high level of quality. However, it is necessary that the concrete quality assurance measures refer to the service and not to the company in general.</p> <p>e.g.:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• The provider works within a secure software development process that is clearly defined and established. Functionality and effectiveness are regularly tested.</li> <li>• Quality Assurance Certifications (CMSQ, ITSQB, etc.)</li> </ul>	<p><b>5 points:</b> The information on quality assurance is very practical and suggests that the software to be developed will have a very high level of quality with a very low error rate.</p> <p><b>4 points:</b> The information on quality assurance is practical and suggests that the software to be developed will have a high level of quality with a low error rate.</p> <p><b>3 points:</b> The information on quality assurance is largely practical and suggests that the software to be developed will have a good level of quality with a medium error rate.</p> <p><b>2 points:</b> The information on quality assurance is rather theoretical and suggests that the software to be developed will have a less than good quality level with a rather high error rate.</p>

			<p><b>1 point:</b> The information on quality assurance is theoretical or superficial and suggests that the software to be developed will have an insufficient level of quality with an unacceptable error rate.</p> <p><b>0 points:</b> The bidder or the bidding consortium does not make any useful statements, or any at all, regarding this criterion.</p>
--	--	--	---