Q&A

Subject: Consultancy for the development of urban mobility indicators

Ref no: Invitation to Tender n° MOVE/C1/2015-66

Q1: Would a partnership with specialists in mobility assessment be appreciated in the application process or would it be better pitched by an organisation specialised in transport?

A1: As for the composition of tenderers: it is up to the tenderers whether to submit the tender as a sole tender, a joint tender by a consortium, and whether or not to additionally engage subcontractors (which can be done by a sole tenderer or by a consortium). No preference cannot and must not be given based on the composition of the tenderer.

As for the minimum expertise and experience required from the tenderer under the selection criteria (in combination, including consortium members and subcontractors, if any), please refer to paragraph 2.3.2 (a) of the Tender Specifications.

As for the minimum number and profiles of the team members: please refer to paragraph 2.3.2 (b) of the Tender Specifications.

The selection criteria listed in the tender specifications must be respected and the supporting evidence will be checked.

Q2: Is there a benefit in the selection process in having an international partnership?

A2: The composition of the consortium is up to the tenderers, please refer to the answer 1, and, as such, will not be given any preference.

The tender(er) is exclusively assessed based on exclusion, selection and award criteria as foreseen in the Tender Specifications.

Q3: Between the indicators and the on-line tool, is there a priority of one over the other? Is the main outcome to have a solid group of indicators or a versatile tool?

A3: The objectives and deliverables of the consultancy are developed in the tender specifications. All required tasks are expected to be carried out, without one having priority on the other.
In the methodology, the tenderer must address all tasks as described in the Tender Specifications. Please refer to award criterion 2, *Quality of the proposed methodologies to carry out the tasks*.

**Q4:** What is the language of the on-line tool? Is it expected to be in more than one language? If so, is it to be translated by the Commission or within the budget?

A4: All deliveries are expected to be in English. Please refer to paragraph 3.2.4 of the Tender Specifications, *Outputs and Deliverables*.

**Q5** Once the on-line tool is created, should it be changeable by the EC / others?

Q5: It is likely that, over time, the tool will be subject to evolutions. However, it is premature to confirm that there would indeed be evolutions, when and of which nature.

**Q6:** Are there any expectations of what the on-line tool should do? For example link directly to the Eltis + Civitas knowledge bases? Create a PDF report? Save profiles for each city? Have public / private profiles?

Q6: The on-line tool should achieve what is described in the technical specifications under 3.2.4. The on-line tool is expected to be the means through which cities input their data, view their results and benchmark them with other cities and with themselves over time.

**Q7:** The tool may be championed by stakeholders, particularly those from representation organisations noted in the document: UITP, ECF. Would the Commission want the tool to be shared by such organisations? If so, would it be useful to host a workshop event that brings representatives from this group together to help them disseminate the tool?

A7: As explained in the tender specifications, it is expected that the work involves consultation of relevant stakeholders.

The tenderers must, among other tasks, in their methodology, address the way(s) to carry out stakeholder consultations, which might also include a workshop or workshops. The tenderer must target sufficiently representative and balanced stakeholder consultation. As for any choice of the methodology, the tender should justify the chosen approach.

**Q8:** Testing events - is it expected that the consultant travels to the test cities to have one on one feedback? Should these cities be noted in the tender?

A8: How the dry-run will be conducted (with travel or not etc.) is up to the tenderers to propose. The tenderers should develop in their offer the methodology that they will apply for the different tasks, including the dry-run.

**Q9:** How will the tool be communicated and used by the cities?
A9: The Commission will leverage its various communication channels such as website, forums, expert groups, conferences etc. It is premature at this stage to indicate exactly which channels will be used and how.

Q10: Payments: there are only two payments in the draft contract, the first after 38 weeks and the second at the completion of the work. Is this correct? Can it be negotiated?

A10: Your understanding is correct.

The payment arrangements cannot be negotiated, please refer to point 7 of the invitation to tender. Please refer also to draft contract: all rights and obligations of the parties, including the payment arrangements, are obligatory to follow, once the tenderer submits the tender and the contract with the winning tenderer would be signed.

Q11: Would it be worth providing a variety of options with different prices?

A11: The tenderers cannot offer differing prices. The financial offers must correspond to paragraph 2.6 in the Tender Specifications, i.e. each tenderer must propose one fixed amount as a total price, not exceeding 250,000 euros, etc. These prices, proposed by the tenderers, will be taken into account by the evaluation committee for the ranking of tenders in accordance with paragraph 2.4 of the Tender Specifications (please see the formula).

As for the content of the tender, the tender must be clear and unambiguous enough to cover all tasks indicated in the Tender Specifications. The tenderer can allow flexibility depending on the future developments he foresees, but all possible scenarios and choice between them must be described with the necessary detail, justified, and have no impact on the obligation to propose one single fixed price as a financial offer.

Q12: When do you expect the project to be awarded and for it to begin?

A12: We will open the proposals on 10 Dec and evaluate them in January. We expect the award decision to go out in February/March 2016 and the contract in March/April 2016. However these are indicative timings, as the procedure can take less or more time.

Q13: Could you please specify in which format would you like to receive the Financial Offer?

A13: There is no format, model or template for the financial offers. Content wise, the financial offer must correspond to paragraph 2.6 in the Tender Specifications: please also refer to the answer 11 above.

Q14: Concerning the Economic and financial capacity criteria and the Technical and professional capacity criteria, is it necessary for all partners to comply with the criteria or rather it is sufficient that the consortium as a whole meets the requirements?

A14: It is sufficient that the consortium as a whole (including taking into account also the capacity and experience of sub-contractors, if any) complies with the criteria.
Q15: The tenderer must prove experience in the field of consultancy work with at least five projects delivered in these fields in the last three years with a minimum value for each project of € 30.000. Which are the specific fields that we should address?

A15: "These fields" refers to urban mobility and/or statistics and/or indicators.

A15 (revised as at 17/11/2015): Please refer to answers 19, 38 and 47 below, as well as to the corrigendum to the Tender Specifications published at MOVE Europa:


Q16: The contractor is asked to develop an IT tool that will be hosted on Europa. Which is the hosting platform of Europa? Which database engine can we use? (MS SQL, MySQL, etc.) Does the online tool/site have to meet the web accessibility guidelines of the European Union (http://ec.europa.eu/ipg/standards/accessibility/index_en.htm)?

A16: For database engines, we have Oracle, MySQL and SQL. The hosting infrastructure is described here: http://ec.europa.eu/ipg/build/infrastructure/index_en.htm. And, yes, the web accessibility standards need to be respected.

Q17: We noticed that a joined document EC/OECD has been published: CITIES IN EUROPE: THE NEW OECD-EC DEFINITION in which a specific segmentation of urban areas is proposed based on population size: S between 50 000 and 100 000, M between 100 000 and 250 000, L between 250 000 and 500 000, XL between 500 000 and 1 000 000, XXL between 1 000 000 and 5 000 000, Global city of more than 5 000 000. Why is it asked in the tender to segment in three groups from 20,000 to 50,000, from 100,000 to 200,000 and above 300,000? Are these mandatories in the collection of indicators?

A17: This is not relevant to the collection of indicators and is solely for the purpose of testing/validating the indicators as explained under 3.2.2. The indicators of the complete tool, if the Scoreboard and of the Scoreboard Mini must be the same for all cities, irrespective of the size of their population.

Q18: In both tasks 3.2.2 and 3.2.3 a validation of the Urban Mobility Scoreboards (the selections of indicators) should be done via a dry-run with “at least 3 cities of different size”: Should both Scoreboards be tested in the same 3 cities? Or should the Scoreboard-Mini (cf. section 3.2.3) be validated via a dry-run with another selection of cities than those of the Scoreboard (cf. section 3.2.2)?

A18: This is left to the choice of the tenderers.

Q19: Could you clarify what the definition of ‘consultancy work’ is in the following Technical and professional capacity criterion? ‘The tenderer must prove experience in the field of consultancy work with at least five projects delivered in these fields in the last three years with a minimum value for each project of € 30.000’. Would research projects funded by FP7 or other research funding organisations be accepted for this criterion?
A19: Consultancy work is the practice of giving expert advice within a particular field. Research projects may qualify if the work meets this definition, i.e. they include an element of advising other parties on a particular issue.

Q20: In terms of the evidence to be provided the call text says: ‘The following evidence should be provided to fulfil the above criteria: List of relevant services provided in the past five years, with summaries, dates and recipients. The most important services shall be accompanied by certificates of satisfactory execution, specifying that they have been carried out in a professional manner and have been fully completed.’ How do you define the ‘most important services’ for which certificates of execution have to be provided? Is there a minimum number of services for which such certificates have to be provided?

Q20: The minimum number of certificates required is the number corresponding to the minimum number of projects required in order to comply with a selection criterion.

For example, in order to comply with the selection criterion referred to in question 19, it is required to have at least five projects carried out in consultancy services. Therefore, the tenderers must present, as a minimum, five certificates to prove that they are compliant with this selection criterion.

The certificate must prove, most importantly, the period when the project was implemented, the content of the work, the / price value of the project, and the assessment that it was carried out as expected.

Q21: It is noted that “cities can fill in the values of their performances on each indicator”? Does this mean that there will be two types of user access: public access for viewing data and restricted access for data input by cities? If so, how will those users (representing cities) be managed? Will the user login credentials be validated against some existing database/service, or using single sign-on or in some other way?

A21: Cities will be able to choose whether their data is shown anonymously for benchmarking purposes or whether they can be identified with the name of the city. There must indeed be a login foreseen for cities who wish to use the tool by entering data.

Q22: How does the commission see the “handover process” of the tool? To which party/organ will the contractor be asked to handover the tool?

A22: The tool is to be delivered to the European Commission. There is no third party involved.

In terms of intellectual property rights, please refer to article I.8 of the service contract, as published. The tool is considered as a deliverable under the contract, ownership rights of which are to be transferred to the European Union.

Q23: Will the member cities be required to submit their numbers once per year or on multiple dates? Is a city required to submit the number directly into the website or by uploading a form?
A23: The cities will not be required to do anything. They will use the tool on a voluntary basis and will be able to choose the updating frequency they see fit.

Q24: How does the Commission see the tool development process? Does the commission requires multiple client facing meetings with the development team and regular updates from the team?

A24: Please refer to the "Output and Deliverables" part of the Technical Specifications. Obviously, regular interactions will the Commission's Project Officer will help ensure a smooth and successful project.

Q25: Will the ‘Mobility Indicators tool’ be used during the dry runs with the cities?

A25: The on-line tool does not need to be part of the dry-run. But the indicators selection yes, as detailed under sections 3.2.2 and 3.2.3 of the technical specifications.

Q26: Is it required to finish the development of the tool before the dry runs start?

A26: No, the on-line tool does not need to be ready, timing-wise, for the dry-runs as they do not involve the on-line tool.

Q27: Does the EU have a development environment for this on-line tool? Could the Commission provide us with more details on this environment or in case that we need to provide such an environment, what are the requirements?

Please refer to Q16&A16.

Q28: How will access be/need to be organised for this development environment?

A28: The Commission does not need to have access to the development phase.

Q29: Do we need to provide an environment for user acceptance testing?

A29: It is up to the tenderer to decide to foresee user acceptance testing or not but foreseeing it is likely to make the proposed methodology stronger.

Q30: According to what described into the “Infrastructure” page (http://ec.europa.eu/ipg/build/infrastructure/index_en.htm) quoted by the Answer A16 of the FAQs (Version: 27/10/2015), the hosting Infrastructure for Dynamic Sites should be based either on Coldfusion or Java technologies. Due to the fact that the next generation of the “Corporate Web Content Management” will use Drupal7 (http://ec.europa.eu/ipg/tools/wcm/index_en.htm), we would like to know if the online tool described in task 3.2.4 of the TORs could be based on this technology (i.e. Drupal7)?

A30: Drupal 7 is available as a technology for Dynamic websites. It should be used for dissemination of information only.
Q31: The Terms of Reference do not specify whether the contractor should be in charge of the graphical design of the tool described in task 3.2.4, however, we assume that this task encompasses as well the graphical layout of the tool. Could you confirm the correctness of our assumption?

A31: This assumption is correct. Developing the tool does include its graphical design.

Q32: In case the graphical layout had to be developed by the contractor, could you specify whether specific visual identity requirements should be addressed (we think for instance of the guidelines described in the European Commission's Visual Identity Manual).

A32: The graphical design should be consistent with that of Europa transport: http://ec.europa.eu/transport/index_en.htm.

Q33: Concerning the Login function (A. 21 of the FAQs): should this function be integrated with ECAS authentication system?

A33: No, cities do not have ECAS.

Q34: Please confirm or clarify, if the online tool must be implemented as a software solution and forms a separate deliverable to be submitted together with the draft final report (70 weeks after contract award) and that the technical specifications to successfully implement this tool constitute an internal work step to be performed by the consultant or the consultant is only responsible for drawing up the technical specifications for later technical implementation by a third party. In connection with the further use of the online tool by EC we would like to learn, how the tool is intended to be maintained and updated in future (as the contract ends with submitting the deliverables).

A34: Of course the online tool must be fully developed and implemented. Future maintenance and update is not yet decided upon.

Q35: Is it correct to understand the dry-runs as exercises aiming at identifying existing relevant data available at local authorities and at analyzing their consistency with the proposed sub-set of indicators.

A35: No, this is not correct. The dry-runs is to validate that the indicators work in practice and that their definition and data collection methodology are clear and unambiguous enough for the cities to know how to use them. The data will not always be available or will not always be directly in the hands of the cities. This forms part of a longer-term process for cities to build partnerships for gathering available data and falls outside the scope of this tender.

Q36: Should the dry-run exercises include a first test of the proposed post-harmonization algorithms.

A36: The proposed algorithms should be valid and robust. Those qualities can be ensured through different means, up to the choice of the tenderers.
Q37: Could you please confirm if a legal person registered in Switzerland is eligible to submit a proposal?

A37: Yes, a legal person registered in Switzerland is entitled to submit an offer.

Q38: Do internal research projects (without an external client) qualify as a relevant credential to meet the selection criteria: “tenderer must prove experience in the field of consultancy work with at least five projects delivered in these fields in the last three years with a minimum value for each project of € 30,000.”?

It would imply that the recipient providing a certificate of satisfactory execution is an internal sponsor of the research project. Would this still qualify as a relevant credential?

A38: The Tender Specifications do not specify the content of the consultancy services, therefore the consultancy services on research can be considered as acceptable.

As for the second part of the question, we understand that the party issuing the certificate would be the same legal entity as the tenderer, or there are two closely linked entities.

If this is the case, general obligation to avoid the conflict of interests will apply. This implies that there must be a clear and reasonable separation of functions between the tenderer and the party issuing the certificate, and this separation must also be credibly explained in the certificate.

The consultancy services provided by the tenderer must comply with the following requirements: at least 5 projects, each with a minimum value of 30 000 euros, provided (or completed in the case of long-term projects) during the last 3 years.

Q39: Does the infrastructure EUROPA admit a website developed in ASP.NET technology. If the answer is yes, what .NET Framework is installed on EUROPA?

A39: ASP.NET is not admitted.

Q40: The tool has to serve dynamic content, so we have the options of either Coldfusion or Weblogic (or maybe Drupal7). For the sake of simplicity and cost savings we would prefer Coldfusion. What are the prerequisites and requirements to host a Coldfusion site together with a database (Oracle preferred) on EUROPA? The publicly available information at http://ec.europa.eu/ipg/build/infrastructure/index_en.htm does not provide enough information on how much effort it will take to get it up and running. The links to further details are protected and lead to an ECAS login page.

A40: Please see attached Service Catalogue of European Commission (DG DIGIT) for Coldfusion.
Q41: Based on your experience, how many hours does it normally take to integrate and publish a new Coldfusion site on EUROPA (together with a database backend)?

A41: The IPG says "At minimum you will have to wait for 3-4 months before having access to your application in production.". Please see [http://www.cc.cec/home/europa-info/procedures/dynamic_site/index_en.htm](http://www.cc.cec/home/europa-info/procedures/dynamic_site/index_en.htm).

Q42: For the tool to work properly users must have the possibility to gain authorized access in order to provide data for the system. Is it possible to use EUROPA’s user management and authentication system for this purpose? If yes, where do we find further information on how to integrate this user management API to retrieve user information in the Coldfusion pages?

A42: As the website will be under the Europa domain ECAS is the required authentication service. An ECAS account can be created for external users as well.

Q43: Further inquiries to Q21, IT Tool user: is the website with the IT tool restricted to participating cities via log in? Or is it also part of the tender for the tool to be open for everyone to use and compare different city data?

A43: Yes, the pool should be open to everyone. But only cities using the Scoreboard who need to fill in data should be able to login and come back to (change) their data via that login.

Q44: IT Tool set of indicators: in case of open access: has it always to be the scoreboard (or the scoreboard mini) en bloc or is it in the interest of the EC to let the interested user choose between single indicators from the scoreboard?

A44: The pool indicators should be available to all but the indicators of the Scoreboard and Scoreboard mini with possibility to fill in data on-line should be the ones defined for those Scoreboards and not be picked and chosen by the cities from the pool.

Q45: Results of the IT-Tool: is it in the interest of the EC for the IT Tool user to be able to save the benchmark results as data file (e.g. MS Excel)?

A45: Yes, that could be a good solution.

Q46: Would delivering research projects such as SHATI-COST and Ecomobility shirt and others listed in Section 3.2.1 be acceptable examples?

A46: First of all, the project must offer adequate solutions in accordance with the requirements of the Technical Specifications.

Q47: Do consultancy projects submitted as evidence need to be commercial consultancy services?

A47: Not necessarily. Please also refer to answers 15, 19 and 38 above.
Q48: In reference to Q30 in the FAQs, we would like to know in reference if the online tool
described in task 3.2.4 of the TORs could be based on any other dynamic PHP based
Corporate Web Content Management System (not being Drupal)?

A48: No.

Q49: could you please clarify what do you mean for “indicator”? Should it necessarily be a KPI
(so, a single number) or could it be also, for example, a chart? For example: modal split for
urban travels. In that case we could represent the event in two options: a) with a simple KPI
/incidence % of sustainable transport mode: 70%) or b) with a chart (i.e.: 30% car, 30% public
transportation, 30% bicycle, 10% walk). Could also option “b” be right for you?

A49: Yes, both options can be considered.

Q50: Would it be possible to include in the staff to be proposed for contract implementation
also CVs of experts that are not currently employed by Consortium partners? In this case will
these experts be considered as staff or as natural persons acting as individual Consortium
partners or subcontractors?

A50: Yes, it is possible: it is entirely up to the tenderer to compose the team, bearing in mind
the minimum (selection) criteria of Tender Specifications.

In the case referred to in the question, the experts can be sub-contractors.

Q51: regarding 2.3.2. In terms of the evidence to be provided the call text says: ‘The following
evidence should be provided to fulfil the above criteria: List of relevant services provided in
the past five years, with summaries, dates and recipients. The most important services shall
be accompanied by certificates of satisfactory execution, specifying that they have been
carried out in a professional manner and have been fully completed.’
Q 51 (a): Should the certificates be addressed to DG MOVE or to the tenderer?
Q 51 (b): Is it sufficient to have the (at least 5) certificates as evidence for the consultancy
work and just list (in a detailed way) the experience for project management, English
language, Expertise in Urban Mobility, Expertise in statistics and/or indicators - or are
separate certificates for this needed for this as well?

A51 (a): It is not crucial to whom the certificate is addressed, as long as it is clearly proven that
the services were provided and completed by the tenderer, and the certificate will cover other
relevant aspects as explained above, in answer 20.
A51 (b): The certificates concerning the tenderer are addressed in the first bullet point of
section 2.3.2 (c) of the Tender Specifications:
"List of relevant services provided in the past five years, with summaries, dates and recipients. The
most important services shall be accompanied by certificates of satisfactory execution, specifying that
they have been carried out in a professional manner and have been fully completed."
These certificates are to prove that the tenderer complies with section 2.3.2 (a):
• "The tenderer must prove experience in the field of consultancy work with at least five projects
delivered in these fields in the last three years with a minimum value for each project of €
30.000."
- The tenderer must prove experience of working in the English language with at least three projects delivered in English in the last five years.

The certificates for the consultancy services and for the English language can be combined – i.e. if the tenderer has successfully carried out a consultancy project in English, it is sufficient to have one certificate, clearly covering both requirements.

- Concerning the **team members**, CVs must be provided in accordance with the second bullet point of section 2.3.2 (c), in order to prove their compliance with the requirements stated in section 2.3.2 (b) of the Tender Specifications.

**Q52**: We checked http://ec.europa.eu/ipg/build/infrastructure/index_en.htm for available hosting infrastructure at EUROPA which you referred to in A16. Since some links at this page are broken and some information seems outdated we ask for clarification: Is PHP/MySQL available at EUROPA hosting?

**A52**: PHP and MySQL are offered on a LAMP, but cannot be used for external communication.

**Q53**: The inner envelope must include two sealed envelopes. One with three copies of the Administrative and Technical Parts + a digital copy and other with three copies of the Financial Offer + digital copy?

or

The inner envelope must include two sealed envelopes (one with 3 copies of Administrative and Technical Part and other with 3 copies of Financial offer) and only one digital copy that contains both?

**A53**: Please follow section 3 of the Invitation to Tender: "Tenders must be placed inside **two sealed envelopes**. The inner envelope, addressed as indicated above, should be marked as follows: "CALL FOR TENDERS - NOT TO BE OPENED BY THE INTERNAL MAIL DEPARTMENT ". If self-adhesive envelopes are used, they must be sealed with adhesive tape and the sender must sign across this tape. The inner envelope must also contain two sealed envelopes, one containing the technical tender and the other the financial tender. Each of these envelopes must clearly indicate the content ("Administrative and technical parts" and "Financial offer")."

**Q54**: Is it possible and legal that an economic operator participates as partner in two consortia, in both cases NOT as lead partner? Is it possible and legal that an economic operator participates as partner in two consortia, in one case as lead partner?

**A54**: Both options, as indicated in the question, are possible.

**Q55**: Regarding the expected functionality of the IT tool, does the EC expect that the cities enter already aggregated indicators into the Scoreboard (e.g. yearly CO2 emission) whereby the cities calculate the aggregated values themselves based on the methodology defined in the database of the pool of the indicators; or should the IT tool offer the functionality to enter low-level (sub-)indicators for a particular aggregated indicator (e.g. noise by time of day) and the IT tool should include the algorithm to calculate the aggregated value?
A55: The tool should be as user-friendly as possible, so if there are aggregated indicators then it is better to allow the entry of the corresponding sub-indicators and the aggregation done by the tool.

Q56: As for the certificates of satisfactory execution for the technical and professional capacity criteria and evidence, for projects funded by the European Commission through the framework programmes (FP7), is it sufficient to provide the letter of approval of final reports and final payment issued by the European Commission?

A56: Please refer to the (last sections) of the answers 19 and 38 above.