

Evaluation Manual phase 0

Example THALEA

Preface

Dear Evaluator,

In order to provide reliable results and assessment, please use the following tables and follow the evaluation accordingly. Additional to this evaluation manual are the evaluation forms which have to be used for scoring.

The evaluation of phase 0 comprehends the evaluation of the Tender Form (send to us per email and paper version) and the evaluation of the face-to-face presentations.

First, the evaluation of the Tender Form will be described. Thereafter, the evaluation of the face-to-face presentations will be described.

Please note that these documents are strictly confidential. Please keep them within the THALEA consortium and advisory board.

Kind regards,

Team Aachen

Example THALEA

For the evaluation of the Tender Form and the face-to-face presentations, a verbal rating system will be used. Table 1 shows an explanation of the verbal rating system. Points can be given by rating on a numerical scale from 1 to 6, with 1 referring to insufficient and 6 referring to excellent.

TABLE 1, EXPLANATION OF THE VERBAL RATING SYSTEM

Assessment	Description
1 point	Insufficient (even basic criteria were only met fragmentary)
2 points	Poor (criteria were met inadequately)
3 points	Adequate (criteria were just met)
4 points	Satisfactory (criteria were met in essence)
5 points	Good (correspond fully to the defined criteria)
6 points	Excellent (criteria were met above expectations)

Example

PHASE 0

Evaluation of incoming tenders – Tender Form

Please read the following scoring method, the scoring description and criteria. By using the scoring description and criteria, you can assess each criterion for evaluating the Tender Form. Please use the “*Evaluation Form – Phase 0 Tender Form*” for your assessment.

Category	Scoring method						
CRITERIA FOR EVALUATION OF TENDER FORM							
1	<p>Please assess <i>how well the provision of a sustainable financing plan and description of commercialization plan for the duration of the project is secured</i>, in order to demonstrate that companies are able to build up - gradually throughout the PCP process - sufficient financial capacity¹. (YES or NO)</p> <table border="1" data-bbox="400 987 1390 1290"> <thead> <tr> <th data-bbox="400 987 715 1037">Assessment</th> <th data-bbox="719 987 1390 1037">Description</th> </tr> </thead> <tbody> <tr> <td data-bbox="400 1043 715 1160">YES</td> <td data-bbox="719 1043 1390 1160">A “YES” is given, if financing seems secured for the whole project duration.</td> </tr> <tr> <td data-bbox="400 1167 715 1283">NO</td> <td data-bbox="719 1167 1390 1283">A “NO” is given, if financing seems not secured for the whole project duration.</td> </tr> </tbody> </table>	Assessment	Description	YES	A “YES” is given, if financing seems secured for the whole project duration.	NO	A “NO” is given, if financing seems not secured for the whole project duration.
Assessment	Description						
YES	A “YES” is given, if financing seems secured for the whole project duration.						
NO	A “NO” is given, if financing seems not secured for the whole project duration.						

¹ e.g. by requiring in the later PCP phases proof of support of an external financial investor such as a Venture Capitalist, or the commitment of a first buyer –e.g. a public procurer – to make a follow-up investment in the solutions developed during the PCP (e.g. to further scale up the production chain to large scale production and/or deploy a first batch of commercial end-solutions once successfully tested at the end of the PCP) (in accordance with *European Commission C(2012)4536 of 09 July 2012, Appendix 6*)

2

Please assess *project management*: declaration of project manager and project team with specification of individual training of each team member (**max. 6 points**)

Assessment	Description	Criteria
1 point	Insufficient (even basic criteria were only met fragmentary)	Declaration of project management: e.g. <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Team size - Individual training of each team member
2 points	Poor (criteria were met inadequately)	
3 points	Adequate (criteria were just met)	
4 points	Satisfactory (criteria were met in essence)	
5 points	Good (correspond fully to the defined criteria)	
6 points	Excellent (criteria were met above expectations)	

Example

3 Please assess *proven experience of the project management* (max. 6 points)

Assessment	Description	Criteria
1 point	Insufficient (even basic criteria were only met fragmentary)	Proven experience: e.g. <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Project manager has been in the role of deputy or not - Realized R&D projects (national – EU level) - Experience due to university education
2 points	Poor (criteria were met inadequately)	
3 points	Adequate (criteria were just met)	
4 points	Satisfactory (criteria were met in essence)	
5 points	Good (correspond fully to the defined criteria)	
6 points	Excellent (criteria were met above expectations)	

Example

4 Please assess *availability of project team* during phases 1-3 (**max. 6 points**)

The points will be given by the following scheme:

Less points will be given for availability in final project phase (last month of the phase) and evaluation phase, whereas more points will be given for availability in complete project phase incl. the evaluation phase.

Assessment	Description
1 point	Availability in final project phase (last month of the phase) and evaluation phase from: Monday-Friday 08:00 a.m. to 02:00 p.m.
2 points	Availability in final project phase (last month of the phase) and evaluation phase from: Monday-Friday 08:00 a.m. to 04:00 p.m.
3 points	Availability in final project phase (last month of the phase) and evaluation phase from: Monday-Friday 08:00 a.m. to 08:00 p.m.
4 points	Availability in final project phase (last month of the phase) and evaluation phase from: Monday - Sunday 08:00 a.m. to 08:00 p.m.
5 points	Availability in complete project phase incl. the evaluation phase: Monday - Sunday 08:00 a.m. to 08:00 p.m.
6 points	Availability in complete project phase incl. the evaluation phase: Monday – Sunday 00:00 a.m. to 24:00 p.m.

5 Please assess *value for money*² (max.6 points)

Please judge the value for money based on the cost breakdown structure using “Total costs of ownership” (Tco) and the evaluation points (please see pages before). In order to make offers and market price estimations comparable, the following formula will be used:

$$\frac{\sum \text{Points}}{Tco}$$

Sum of points given (pages above) divided by the total costs of ownership.

Total costs of ownership is based on the following assumptions:

- Price for Hardware based on 2 x 100 monitored ICU-beds
- Connection to 3 different PDMS
- Connection to one different PDMS/ICU
- Licence and service fees (on 5 year contract) f.i. for regular updates
- Power consumption of the System (yearly)

² Please use the formula to determine the value for money. Afterwards, rank the value for money from 1-6, where the highest quotient receives the highest point (6 points) and the lowest quotient the lowest point (1 point).

PHASE 0

Evaluation incoming tenders – Face-to-face presentations

Please read the following scoring method, scoring description and criteria. By using the scoring description and criteria, you can assess each criterion for evaluating the face-to-face presentations. Please use the “*Evaluation Form – Phase 0 face-to-face presentation*” for filling in your assessment scores.

Category	Scoring method			
1. CRITERIA FOR FACE-TO-FACE PRESENTATION				
Scoring	Please give your impression on how well the tenderers are able to present and explain their proposed solution (Max. 24 points)			
	1 Unacceptable	2 Below expectations	3 Meets expectations	4 Exceeds expectations
a) Overall organisation and impression	<input type="checkbox"/> No discernable organisation <input type="checkbox"/> Topics switch back and forth <input type="checkbox"/> No logical flow among the slides <input type="checkbox"/> None or poor introduction and conclusion <input type="checkbox"/> No “lessons learned”	<input type="checkbox"/> Some part(s) of the presentation are out of order <input type="checkbox"/> Hard to follow the flow of slides <input type="checkbox"/> Too much information <input type="checkbox"/> Few or unimportant “lessons learned” discussed	<input type="checkbox"/> Sequence of slides is logical <input type="checkbox"/> Has all the required parts (intro & motivation, problem statement, data, discussion, conclusion) <input type="checkbox"/> Reflects on lessons learned	<input type="checkbox"/> Exceptionally well organized <input type="checkbox"/> No missing parts <input type="checkbox"/> Easy to follow and understand
b) Preparedness	<input type="checkbox"/> Information presented is wrong or out of date <input type="checkbox"/> Does not explain critical information	<input type="checkbox"/> Some topics are not well understood and not well presented <input type="checkbox"/> Underlying theory not fully understood	<input type="checkbox"/> Grasps all important concepts and fundamentals.	<input type="checkbox"/> All fundamentals and many details are fully understood
c) Visual Aids quality and effect	<input type="checkbox"/> No attempt at presenting information in appropriate way	<input type="checkbox"/> Uses several visual aids (graphs, tables, etc) but they are not well done	<input type="checkbox"/> All aids are of high quality (readable, simple, effective)	<input type="checkbox"/> Includes graphics and other (dynamic) visual aids, which are very clear and informative
d) Clarity	<input type="checkbox"/> Does not engage listeners <input type="checkbox"/> Not easy to understand <input type="checkbox"/> Not clearly and fluently spoken <input type="checkbox"/> Ambiguous and indistinct	<input type="checkbox"/> Lacking in one or two of the elements, but OK in others.	<input type="checkbox"/> All elements are satisfied; <input type="checkbox"/> Easily able to convey the point <input type="checkbox"/> Free from indistinctness or ambiguity <input type="checkbox"/> Maintains listeners interest	<input type="checkbox"/> Exceptional in all respects; <input type="checkbox"/> No need for clarification <input type="checkbox"/> Intellectual responsibility <input type="checkbox"/> Makes you want to find out more about this topic
e) Handling of questions	<input type="checkbox"/> Gives inaccurate or confusing answers to simple questions about the material	<input type="checkbox"/> Gets confused by some follow-up questions; does not answer the question directly	<input type="checkbox"/> Gives accurate and concise answers to most questions	<input type="checkbox"/> Has no problems in answering and engages the audience
f) Use of references	<input type="checkbox"/> No or not sufficient amount of references used	<input type="checkbox"/> Some references used	<input type="checkbox"/> Has the required use of references	<input type="checkbox"/> Exceptionally well use of references

2. IMPACT	
2.1	<p data-bbox="438 304 1476 383">Please assess how well the proposed idea/solution/ technology <i>meets the challenge</i> as detailed in the brief (max. 5 points)</p> <p data-bbox="438 405 1406 521">1 point: it is judged that necessary modification efforts will exceed project duration or it is judged that proposed idea, solution or technology does not sufficiently meet challenge.</p> <p data-bbox="438 546 1155 580">2 points: Most demands met, adaptations are necessary</p> <p data-bbox="438 604 1257 638">3 points: Meets expectation in general, needs minor adaptation</p> <p data-bbox="438 663 1436 741">4 points: Meets expectation and function as detailed in the brief, offers some additional knowledge to the field</p> <p data-bbox="438 766 1430 844">5 points: Exceeds expectations and adds new methods and knowledge to the proposal or telemedicine research agenda</p>
2.2	<p data-bbox="438 1099 1458 1216">Please assess to what extent the approach demonstrates commercial feasibility. Is there a <i>realistic commercialization plan/route to market?</i> (max. 5 points)</p> <p data-bbox="438 1240 1410 1319">1 point: no realistic commercialization plan, commercialization plan needs fundamental refinement</p> <p data-bbox="438 1344 1453 1422">2 points: Assumptions and models in the commercialization plan are vague or have an high level of uncertainty</p> <p data-bbox="438 1447 1257 1480">3 points: Meets expectation in general, needs minor adaptation</p> <p data-bbox="438 1505 1426 1583">4 points: Offers some benefit for EU-Citizens, demonstrates a sound plan to economic success, ROI ~ 5 years</p> <p data-bbox="438 1608 1444 1724">5 points: Clear socio-economic benefit for EU-Citizens, detailed and realistic commercialization plan, clear route to market, will be probably highly successful, ROI < 2,5 years</p>

- 2.3 Please assess to what extent the tender has the *potential to address future/wider challenges in the area* (**max. 4 points**)
- 1 point:** Proposal offers the possibility to operate a telemedicine centre, adaptations for future demands are possible but interoperability in the field of telemedicine and/or PDMS have not been taken into account
- 2 points:** The proposal identified future and actual needs for telemedicine and offers an interoperability concept for telemedicine. Standardization of semantic concept seems feasible, in addition some solutions for interoperability of PDMS are drafted.
- 3 points:** Proposal meets the requirement and in addition references on the actual need for a telemedicine software for Intensive care medicine. It offers a clear concept of technical and semantic interoperability in the field of telemedicine and telemedicine research
- 4 points:** The challenges in Telemedicine as well as in electronic documentation in Intensive Care medicine are met in the widest extent. The wider challenges like demographic change, growing relevance of innovative solutions in e-Health, and demand for research in medical big data are identified. The proposal addresses in excellent manner or exceeds substantially the topics of the telemedicine research agenda. The proposal shows the ability of the tenderer to cope with the challenges in technical and semantic interoperability in PDMS and Telemedicine together with standardization institutions and Research societies.

Example

3.QUALITY																							
3.1	<p><i>Company references in R&D</i> (consortia give accumulated references about the complete consortium) (max. 6 points)</p> <p>Please assess the company's references in R&D according to the 6 points description:</p> <table border="1"> <thead> <tr> <th>Assessment</th> <th>Description</th> <th>Criteria</th> </tr> </thead> <tbody> <tr> <td>1 point</td> <td>Insufficient (even basic criteria were only met fragmentary)</td> <td>Proven experience in successful solving of the problem which means: e.g.</td> </tr> <tr> <td>2 points</td> <td>Poor (criteria were met inadequately)</td> <td>- target achievement of the project</td> </tr> <tr> <td>3 points</td> <td>Adequate (criteria were just met)</td> <td>- adherence to schedules</td> </tr> <tr> <td>4 points</td> <td>Satisfactory (criteria were met in essence)</td> <td>- adherence of budgets</td> </tr> <tr> <td>5 points</td> <td>Good (correspond fully to the defined criteria)</td> <td>- service/customer satisfaction.</td> </tr> <tr> <td>6 points</td> <td>Excellent (criteria were met above expectations)</td> <td></td> </tr> </tbody> </table>		Assessment	Description	Criteria	1 point	Insufficient (even basic criteria were only met fragmentary)	Proven experience in successful solving of the problem which means: e.g.	2 points	Poor (criteria were met inadequately)	- target achievement of the project	3 points	Adequate (criteria were just met)	- adherence to schedules	4 points	Satisfactory (criteria were met in essence)	- adherence of budgets	5 points	Good (correspond fully to the defined criteria)	- service/customer satisfaction.	6 points	Excellent (criteria were met above expectations)	
Assessment	Description	Criteria																					
1 point	Insufficient (even basic criteria were only met fragmentary)	Proven experience in successful solving of the problem which means: e.g.																					
2 points	Poor (criteria were met inadequately)	- target achievement of the project																					
3 points	Adequate (criteria were just met)	- adherence to schedules																					
4 points	Satisfactory (criteria were met in essence)	- adherence of budgets																					
5 points	Good (correspond fully to the defined criteria)	- service/customer satisfaction.																					
6 points	Excellent (criteria were met above expectations)																						

Example

3.2 *Presentation and financial concept (max. 6 points)*

Please assess the presentation and financial concept according to the 6 points description:

Assessment	Description	Criteria
1 point	Insufficient (inadequate and shortage of capacity to meet criterion 1. Financial concept for the project phase is uncertain and highly unsatisfactory.)	<p>The weighting of the criteria is divided in two parts. A minimum required criterion (1), and an additional provision (2) for which additional points can be given. The criteria for the presentation and financial concept is as follows:</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. Provision of financial concept for the project phase <p>Additionally provision:</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 2. Cognizable will to create sustainability to the project development further then phase one (1) and the cognizable will to develop the solution after the PCP-phases.
2 points	Poor (inadequate capacity to meet criterion 1. Financial concept for the project phase is unsatisfactory)	
3 points	Adequate (satisfactory capacity to just meet criterion 1. Presents an adequate financial concepts for the project phase.)	
4 points	Satisfactory (good capacity to meet criterion 1. Presents a clear financial concept for the project phase.)	
5 points	Good (strong capacity to meet criteria 1 and 2. Presents a clear financial and sustainable concept and offers a clear environmental and sustainability plan for commercialisation.)	
6 points	Excellent (very strong capacity to meet criteria 1 and 2. Presents a clear financial and sustainable concept and offers a clear environmental and sustainability plan for commercialisation beyond expectations.)	

3.3 Description of the *workflow to extract data out of the PDMS* (max. 6 points)

Please assess the description of workflow to extract data out of the PDMS according to the 6 point description:

Assessment	Description	Criteria
1 point	Insufficient (even basic criteria were only met fragmentary)	Description of technical feasibility of the following: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - data integration - clear concept and code Europe wide - concerning drug therapies - vital signs - laboratory - microbiology - radiographic studies - number of PDMS
2 points	Poor (criteria were met inadequately)	
3 points	Adequate (criteria were just met)	
4 points	Satisfactory (criteria were met in essence)	
5 points	Good (correspond fully to the defined criteria)	
6 points	Excellent (criteria were met above expectations)	

Example

3.4 Presentation of *first solution statement* (max. 6 points)

Please assess the presentation of first solution statement according to the 6 point description:

Assessment	Description	Criteria
1 point	Insufficient (even basic criteria were only met fragmentary)	Presentation of technical feasibility of: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - data presentation (e.g. design allows identification of leading cause of deterioration) - data analysis (e.g. diagnostic algorithms) - Data export (e.g. interfaces /communication to subsystems) - Technical aspects of solution (e.g. anonymisation, resource planning) - Interoperability; with different PDMS systems and Semantic interoperability (internal coding)
2 points	Poor (criteria were met inadequately)	
3 points	Adequate (criteria were just met)	
4 points	Satisfactory (criteria were met in essence)	
5 points	Good (correspond fully to the defined criteria)	
6 points	Excellent (criteria were met above expectations)	

Example