

FP7 – 288028
Framework Programme (FP) 7
ICT -2011.5.3
Patient Guidance Service (PGS), safety and healthcare record information reuse
Combination of CP & CSA



DECIPHER PCP

Guidelines for Assessors



Table of Contents

GUIDELINES FOR ASSESSORS 3

Guidelines for Assessors

These guidelines have been developed to give assessors the information required to assess bidders' proposals. Assessors should carefully read this document when appointed as members of the DECIPHER Experts Board and refer to this document during all the assessment process.

As a first step DECIPHER Experts Board members are invited to carefully read all the documents distributed when issuing the tender, as the:

- Invitation To Tender (ITT) and all its Annexes
- Challenge Brief: draft of Functional and Technical Specifications
- Feedback from Market Consultation
- Frequent Asked Questions
- EHR-PHR Interfaces and PHR Platforms State Of The Art Report

The DECIPHER- ITT contains information on the assessment of tenders that does not make part of this document and this document should be considered complementary to the ITT.

The following sections of the ITT are especially relevant for the assessment:

- ANNEX III.- Framework Agreement
- ANNEX IV.- Assessment and Scoring Model

Assessors will be provided with a score sheet system to be used when assessing each of the assigned proposals.

1.1 Guiding principles

The assessors are invited to respect the following guiding principles when assess the different bids:

Independence

There is to be no interference with the appointed member performance of his/her monitoring function

Impartiality

Treat all bids equally and evaluate them impartially on their merits, irrespective of their origin or the identity of the applicants

Objectivity

Evaluate each bid submitted; meaning on its own merit, not its potential if certain changes were to be made

Accuracy

Make a judgment making use of the evaluation criteria defined in the ITT and nothing else

Consistency

Apply the same standard of judgment to all proposals

1.2 Confidentiality and conflict of interest

Please note that to participate as a member of DECIPHER PCP Tendering Board each Assessor has signed a declaration of confidentiality and conflict of interest. If at any moment during the DECIPHER tender programme any of the Assessors perceives a possible conflict of interest, he/she is requested to contact with the Procuring Entity sending an e-mail to decipher.aquas@gencat.cat.

1.3 Minimum requirements

While submitting bidders are requested to sign a declaration in which they confirm that they meet with all minimum requirements, including the provision of R&D services.

In case the Assessors identify contradictory data in the proposals and believe that one of these requirements is not met, they are requested to score the minimum, 1.

At the same time they are requested to continue assessing the proposals since other assessors may have a different view.

Proposals that do not fulfil one or more of the minimum requirements will be excluded from DECIPHER-PCP tender process. The decision to exclude a proposal will be made by the DECIPHER Tendering Board based on the advice from the DECIPHER Board of Experts.

It is fundamental to have clear that through DECIPHER PCP tender process DECIPHER Procuring Authorities are contracting R&D services, consequently the proposals should offer R&D services.

For more information on what is considered R&D services, please refer to the ITT.

Additionally DECIPHER consortium suggests to refer to the standard definition of R&D that comes with the OECD Frascati Manual¹:

“The term R&D covers three activities; basic research, applied research and experimental development [...] Basic research is experimental or theoretical work undertaken primarily to acquire new knowledge of the underlying foundation of phenomena and observable facts, without any particular application or use in view. Applied research is also original investigation undertaken in order to acquire new knowledge. It is, however, directed primarily towards a specific practical aim or objective. Experimental development is systematic work, drawing on the existing knowledge gained from research and/or practical experience, which is directed to produce new materials, products or devices, to installing new processes, systems and services, or to improving substantially those already produces or installed. R&D covers both formal R&D in R&D units and informal or occasional R&D in other units. (...)”

1.4 Scoring of the tenders and feedback

Each of the proposals is expected to be submitted using the templates defined in the ITT.

The usage of acronyms should be kept to a minimum and bidders should not assume that readers know what they do mean.

¹ Frascati Manual, Proposed Standard Practice for Surveys on research and Experimental Development (OECD, latest edition 2002).

Please be mindful of the limits placed on bidders proposals regarding the amount of information allowed to submit. Assessors should not assess any more than the number of pages allowed as this could potentially give an unfair advantage over bidders that have complied with the given rules

The overall proposals assessment process will take place over 2 stages:

Stage 1: Functionality, innovation, quality, technical and financial feasibility submissions

Appendix IV of the ITT is a scoring guide that details how points should be awarded. The Scoring Table of Annex IV of the ITT shows the maximum score and the maximum point that will be applied against each of the criteria. Assessors are asked to assess the proposals taking into account the scoring guide and provide an explanation justifying the given scores.

It is possible to make use of the full range of available scores.

If bidders' responses to specific questions are really good and the proposals fully meet the assessment criteria, Assessors should not be afraid to award maximum points.

Like-wise if the bidders' responses to specific questions do not fulfil any of the assessment criteria, Assessors should not be afraid to award the minimum of the points.

Assessors may use scores not specifically listed as long as they are between the minimum and maximum scores (e.g. 10 points).

When determining a score against a criterion, Assessors should use as starting point „1" and mark up to „10".

The scoring will be made according to an absolute scale, meaning that several proposals can receive the same score and that the overall score that a particular proposal receive is not affected by the scores other proposals have received.

All scores are weighted and depending on the criteria and subcriteria the maximum score can correspond to for instance 1 point, 5 points or 20 points. Essentially, assessors need to get familiar with the scoring table and be conscious that scoring „10 does not necessarily mean that the proposal gets 10 point in a given criterion or sub-criterion.

Assessors are kindly invited to:

- Keep the Challenge Brief in mind when assessing the proposals against all the criteria.
- Provide constructive feedback in the comments areas of the Assessment platform. Comments should reflect the score Assessors are giving to each of the question.
- Refrain from asking questions in the comments.
- Do not refer to a specific company or people, or projects, or anything which may identify you to others. You are reminded that your comments will be provided as feedback to successful and unsuccessful Bidders once the assessment process has been completed.
- Remember that under the Spanish Law 19/2013, of December on transparency and access to public information, all comments recorded on the score sheet, may also be disclosed to other parties.

Stage 2: Price

Assessors are not requested to score the price. This score will be automatically calculated once envelope C is opened.

Please note that DECIPHER PCP Tendering Board may need to refer back to the DECIPHER Experts Board to clarify comments made against a particular bid.

1.4.1 Assessment of the Technical Feasibility

When assessing the Technical Feasibility, the Assessors should first refer the Technical Specifications described in the corresponding section of the Challenge Brief (CB) document and at the same time they could take into

Public

consideration different aspects. Several of them have been documented in the non-exhaustive list below to be of support to the Assessors to easily identify which ones could be relevant to DECIPHER across the different phases:

Quality of the technology

- Functionality coverage. Level of coverage of the functionality as defined in the use cases and usage scenarios defined in the brief, for both mandatory and optional functionalities
- End-users centered design
- Scalability. Level of difficulty of scaling up the solution, including technical requirements, increase in resources, processes changes, and any other requirement that may limit the increase of the user base
- Reference to interoperability standards
- Reference to development standards
- Maintenance. Cost of keeping the system in production when commercialized, including technical amortization, human resources, licensing, system backup and upgrade, security monitoring and administration, and any other maintenance element that may be required
- Internationalization. Feasibility and cost of localizing the system to countries other than the Procuring Authorities' countries, including technical requirements, certifications, local regulations, and any other localization adjustment that may be required.
- Adaptability. Capability of the system to tackle future challenges in the scope of the remote access to patient data, such as including new services or adopting new standards. Level of modularity and abstraction of the proposed architecture.
- Integration into existing systems. Adaptation of the system to the current health information systems available in the Procuring Authorities' countries.
- Feasibility. Evaluation of the feasibility of the solution
- Type of licensing required by the system modules
- Third party dependencies (OS, hardware, components, patents, licenses)

Technical validity

- Architecture design
- Process flow (registration, authentication, use cases)
- Data flow
- Risk analysis of the solution (compromised data, lost phone, reauthentication, omission of service, data corruption, etc.)
- Regulatory compliance
- Reliability level
- Quality processes proposed for development, deployment, and maintenance
- Validation strategy and readiness for the proof of concept (unit testing, integration testing, stress test, security test, etc.)

Security:

- Level of security of the solution based on the methods and apparatus used to ensure compliancy with the information governance

Technological risk

- security of the solution in terms of regulatory compliance
- reliability of the information to access
- architecture
- selection of the development platform

1.5 Timeliness

According to DECIPHER schedule the proposals assessment should be completed within 30 days of receipt. All assessors share the responsibility in contributing to the assessment in a timely manner. If there is likely to be a delay, the assessor should communicate it in a promptly manner at the Procuring Entity sending an e-mail to decipher.aquas@gencat.cat.

1.6 Evaluation process

The overall bids evaluation process of DECIPHER competitive programme can be represented by the diagram below:

