European Commission

SELECT
for Cities

SELECT FOR CITIES END OF PHASE 2 DELIVERABLES & LAB TESTING REPORT (D4.3)

Project
Acronym: **SELECT**

                   ***S**tandardized, op**E**n, data-driven, service-oriented &
                   user-centric p**L**atform **E**nabling large-scale **C**o-creation,*
Project Title: ***T**esting & validation of IoE services for Cities*
GA Number: **688196**

Authors: Buyers Group
Version: *V.2.0*
Dissemination level: *PUBLIC*

Document revision history

Revision No	Author	Organization	Date	Work effectuated
1	Hugo Gonçalves	Forum Virium Helsinki	26/06/2018	Initial template
2	Jonas Breuer, Katrien Lenaert	Imec, Digipolis	28/06/2018	Initial draft
3	Gert de Tant, Hanna Niemi-Hugaerts, Hugo Gonçalves, Jonas Breuer, Katrien Lenaert, Susie McAleer & others.	Consortium	09/07/2018	Finalized draft
4	Final adjustments and scores-text correction	Consortium	15/08/2018	Final & approved document

Approvals for final version

Contributor	Author	Organization	Date
Consortium	Consortium	Select for Cities Consortium	

Distribution list

Name	Ways to distribute	Comments
Select Consortium	e-mail + Google drive	
European Commission	e-mail + Participants portal	

Table of Contents

Executive Summary

This report presents an overview of the assessment and scoring of the SELECT for Cities end of Phase 2 Results. It is intended for public view, and therefore it is a heavily redacted version of the full end of phase and lab testing report, which is confidential.

The evaluation was carried out on the basis of:

- the 12 End-of-Phase Deliverables submitted by the Contractor's Project teams, the lab testing conducted by the Buyers group tech team on the prototype and the final live demonstrations carried out by the Contractors in Helsinki on the 25 and 26th of June 2018
- the previous prototype testing iterations and interim evaluation. Consequently, those reports are to be consider as part of the final evaluation report and can be found in attachment.

The report serves as an overview of the evaluation, lab testing and as a deliverable for the European Commission (D4.3). In addition, it will be used as a means to clarify the results to the Contractors.

Phase 2 of the Select for Cities PCP project had five Contractors:

1. Bosonit S.L.
2. Engineering, Ingegneria Informatica S.P.A.
3. Indra Sistemas S.A.
4. Martel GmbH
5. University of Florence

During Phase 2, starting on December 15th, 2017 and ending on June 28th, 2018, all the Contractors' interim and final deliverables and support documentation were received, evaluated and scored by the Technical Evaluation Committee. Phase 2 encompassed five testing iterations, an interim monitoring and final evaluation. This included two live demonstrations.

1. Iteration 1: Prototype testing and feedback report;
2. Iteration 2: Prototype testing and feedback report;
3. Iteration 3: Prototype testing, Live demonstration with Interim Project Monitoring and feedback report;
4. Iteration 4: Prototype testing and feedback report;
5. Iteration 5 (Final): the End-of-Phase evaluation consisted of three parts:
   a. A functioning prototype to be tested under lab conditions - provided by June 1st 2018.
   b. End-of-phase deliverables outlining the phase performance, prototype's scalability and commercialization plans, and prototypes' potential approach for a living lab implementation.

c. A live session with all Contractors

A final Go/NoGo session and a confirmation by the Select for Cities Procurers Steering Committee finalized the Phase 2 evaluation round and resulted in this report.

1   Submission Phase 2 Deliverables

During Phase 2, Contractors were required to submit initial and interim deliverables in order to allow for communication, follow-up of Contractors activities, and assessment of Contractors progress, including the performance evaluation of prototype finished components, by the Technical Evaluation Committee.

List of Contractors initial and interim deliverables:

- Initial
  - Deliverable D2.1 Template A: Testing Iteration Overview and B: Revised Project Plan
  - Deliverable D2.2 Project Abstract and List of Pre-existing IPR

- Interim
  - Deliverable D2.3. Input for prototype testing during first iteration
  - Deliverable D2.4. Input for prototype testing before second iteration
  - Deliverable D2.5. Input for prototype testing before third iteration
  - Deliverable D2.6. Input for prototype testing before fourth iteration

- Final

  As part of the end of phase deliverables, all 5 Contractors submitted a SELECT for Cities Phase 2 prototype (D2.12) by the 1st of June 2018, and consequently an end of Phase Report composed of all the listed Deliverables and Results (D2.7 to D2.10) by the 15th of June 2018 as predefined in the 'Phase 2 guideline for Contractors' (Annex 1). Detailed list of deliverables:
  - Deliverable D2.7. End-of-Phase Report
  - Deliverable D2.8. Description of the state-of-the-art versus innovation gap
  - Deliverable D2.9. Measures taken to protect Results (IPR)
  - Deliverable D2.10. List of names & location of personnel that carried out the R&D activities and budget consumption overview
  - Deliverable D2.11. 'Abstract of the main Results achieved' – EU Format
  - Deliverable D2.12 Final Prototype testing (Input for prototype testing before fifth and final iteration)

Most of the Contractors deliverables are classified and therefore managed under restricted access conditions.

2 Evaluation of Phase 2

2.1 Evaluation Process

The Technical Evaluation Committee and consequently the Procurers Steering Committee assessed and scored the deliverables and results of each Contractor in order to determine whether the respective Contractors have unsatisfactorily or, satisfactorily completed Phase 2.

The Technical Evaluation Committee also evaluated if the Contractors have successfully completed the Phase, and consequently, if they are eligible to participate in the call-off for Phase 3: the Living Lab phase.

The evaluation of the Phase 2 Prototyping addresses the prototype's performance and innovation in a test environment. This is evaluated according to:

- The completeness of addressing the requirements;
- The appropriateness of the solutions in terms of technical and operational considerations;
- The overall risks associated with the solution.

The assessment considered the efforts made by Contractors to take into account the feedback received during the technical iterations and the Interim Project Monitoring and Briefing.

For that purpose Contractors had to complete and submit the Deliverables D1.1 to D1.10. The deliverables were used to assess and score the extent to which a Contractor met the Phase 2 requirements. After the live demonstrations on June 25 and 26th 2018 slight changes were made to the Contractor's scores.

2.2 Satisfactory completion

The satisfactory/unsatisfactory completion determines whether the Contractor shall be paid or not. Satisfactory completion is assessed according to the following requirements:

- If the work corresponding to that milestone / deliverable has been carried out;
- If a reasonable minimum quality has been delivered (see clarification below);
- If the reports have been submitted on time;
- If the monies/resources have been allocated to the planned objectives;
- If the monies/resources have been allocated and the work has been carried out according to the compliance criteria (place of performance, public funding and R&D definition criteria);

And

- If the work has been carried out in compliance with the provisions of the contract (including in particular verification if the Contractor has duly protected and managed IPRs generated in

the respective Phase).

'Reasonable minimum quality' of a report means that:

- The report can be read by somebody who is familiar with the topic, but not an expert;
- The report gives insight in the tasks performed in and the Results;
- The report is made using the end of Phase report form.

2.3 Successful completion

The <u>successful</u> completion of Phase 2 is a prerequisite to be invited to the Phase 3 call-off. The Procurers Steering Committee decides on the final ranking of the results, and Contractors will be informed about the outcome. Successful completion of a Phase is assessed by the assessment committee against the following requirements:

- If all milestones have been successfully completed;
- If the R&D results meet the minimum functionality/performance requirements of the challenge description (i.e. the minimum quality/efficiency improvements which the procurers set forward for the innovative solutions to achieve);
- If the results of the R&D are considered to be promising.

2.4 Evaluation Criteria, Weights and Thresholds

The Phase 2 award and evaluation criteria were used to assess the capacity of the Contractor and the quality of their Deliverables in terms of project management, functional requirements, non-functional requirements, commercial feasibility and Living Labs approach. It was assessed based on the following points:

#	Scoring criteria/Questions	Score Weight
SECTION 1. Project Management & Project Team		**14% (10/70)**
P1	**Feasibility of the Project plan and schedule**	
P2	**Methodology of the project**	
SECTION 2. Functional Requirements		**43% (30/70)**
F1	**Serve as a City Dashboard**	
F1.1	Describe how you will implement a dashboard that fits the basic requirements	
F1.2	Describe how your solution will be innovative in this domain	
F2	**Serve as an Open City Platform**	
F2.1	Describe how you will implement an Open City Platform that fits the basic requirements	
F2.2	Describe how your solution will be innovative in this domain	
F3	**Real-time communication**	

F3.1	Describe how your solution implements the basic requirements	
F3.2	Describe how your solutions is innovative is this domain	
F4	**Data Referential**	
F4.1	Describe how your solution implements the basic requirements	
F4.2	Describe how your solutions is innovative is this domain	
F5	**General Platform requirements**	
F5.1	Describe how your solution implements the basic requirements	
F5.2	Describe how your solutions is innovative is this domain	
SECTION 3. Non-functional requirements		**29% (20/70)**
Q1	**Open Source**	
Q2	**Open Standards**	
Q3	**Scalable**	
Q4	**Robustness**	
Q5	**Distributed & Decoupled**	
Q6	**Heterogeneous**	
Q7	**Interoperability**	
Q8	**Communication with things**	
Q9	**Security**	
Q10	**Privacy**	
SECTION 4. Commercial Feasibility[1]		**7% (5/70)**
C1	**Business and Commercialisation plan**	
C2	**Market analysis & risk management**	
C3	**feasibility regarding principles for licensing, business models, pricing and distribution**	
C4	**Estimated time to market**	
C5	**Innovation aspects**	
SECTION 5. Living labs Approach		**7% (5/70)**
L1	**Describe the Living Labs**	

At the end of Phase 2 a Contractor is considered 'satisfactory' when reasonable quality has been achieved, i.e. a minimum overall score of 35/70 (50%) is achieved. And it is considered 'successful' when the offered solution looks promising, i.e. a minimum overall score of 42/70 (60%) is achieved. Contractors with a successful score are eligible for consideration for Phase 3.

2.5 Scoring Model

The scoring model that was used by the evaluators to assess the completion of Phase 2:

0	Nonexistent	None of the aspects of the requirement are met.
1	Very weak	Multiple important aspects of the requirement are missing.
2	Weak	Multiple aspects of the requirement are present, but the provided explanation may not convince.
3	Good	All important aspects are present.
4	Very good	All important aspects are present and the provided explanation is very convincing.
5	Excellent	There is significant added value to the required feature, which is described very convincingly.

For the End of Phase report, each of the following areas is assessed:

1. There is evidence that the work has been carried out completely and diligently;
2. The results are good and consistent with the original Tender;
3. There is a clear potential for further development;
4. The report is well written with the appropriate level of detail

The Contractor scores are clarified in the following subsections of the report. The scores provided comprise firstly the Deliverables evaluation, and secondly the live prototype demonstrations.

Final ranking

Based on the evaluation, scoring and the criteria for being satisfactory and or successful, all Contractors' final scores correspond to a successful completion of Phase 2, and all qualify to take part in the Phase 3 Call-off.

The Buyers Group considers all Contractors' performances as successful and will invite them for Phase 3 call-off.