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**Follow-up Meeting Minutes**

**Publications Office – FwC10649 – 33874 – Maintenance of the ESPD EDM**

|  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- |
| **Project:** | FwC10649 – 33874 – Maintenance of the ESPD EDM | **Meeting Date/Time:** | **2019-09-10**  **10:00 – 11:30** |
| **Meeting Type:** | ESPD 3rd Meeting OP-GROW with MS | **Meeting Location:** | <https://ecwacs.webex.com/join/sromeu> |
| **Meeting Coordinator:** | Sofia BERENGUER | **Issue Date:** | 2019-09-10 |

|  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- |
| **Attendee Name** *(present)* | **Initials** | **Organisation / Email** |
| Sofia BERENGUER | SB | OP |
| Maria FONT | MF | everis, Spain |
| Enric STAROMIEJSKI | ES | everis, Spain |
| Guifré GUSTA | GG | everis, Spain |
| Mireia BEAS-MOIX | MBM | everis, Spain |
| Ákos ZÁMBÓ | AZ | Hungary |
| Aleksandra | AL | Slovenia |
| Andra GHITULESCU | AG |  |
| Claudia COJMAN | CL | Romania |
| Francesco SCATTARETICO | FS | Af Soluzioni (Italy) |
| Giampaolo SELLITTO | GS | Italy |
| Jennifer GUTSCHE | JG |  |
| Laima PUJĂTE | LP |  |
| Marius GOGESCU | MG | Romania |
| Mitja MEDVESCEK | MI | Slovenia |
| Olegs FILIPOVICS | OL | Latvia |
| Robin ANDERSON BOSTROM | RAB | Sweden |
| Vibeke ENGESAETH | VI | Norway |

|  |
| --- |
| **Summary of Meeting Objectives** |
| * Discussion of the ESPD-EDM GitHub issues that have not been discussed in the previous meeting. |

|  |
| --- |
| **Meeting Agenda** |
| * Discussion of GitHub issues – Enric Staromiejski, everis; Guifré Gusta, everis; Maria Font, everis. |
| **Discussion of GitHub issues:**   |  |  | | --- | --- | | **Github Issue** | **Decision** | | [#225](https://github.com/ESPD/ESPD-EDM/issues/225) | The data about the criterion weight in criteria #40 and #50 is needed by the GUI for the contracting authority to be asked about the specific weight of one criterion.  This means that the data structure is correct. However, this should be well explained in the documentation for version 2.1.1. | | [#239](https://github.com/ESPD/ESPD-EDM/issues/239) | Decision is made that there will be a new criteria in the Procurement Documents named “SUPPLEMENTARY.SELECTION.CRITERIA”. This new criteria must be checked from a legal perspective with DG GROW.  To be implemented in version 2.1.1. | | [#250](https://github.com/ESPD/ESPD-EDM/issues/250) | Check that this rule about the naming is well explained in the documentation. To be implemented in version 2.1.1.  In addition, Robin Anderson (ROB) will create a new issue if the law from Sweden related to CRITERION.OTHER.EO\_DATA.RELIES\_ON\_OTHER\_CAPACITIES differs from ESPD data structure. | | [#199](https://github.com/ESPD/ESPD-EDM/issues/199) | Answer the issue and check with Ansgar Mondorf if the current model does solve the problem once explained which the solution is.  If it is already solved, the issue will be closed and labelled as solved in version 2.1.0; otherwise, the issue will be solved in version 3.0.0. | | [#202](https://github.com/ESPD/ESPD-EDM/issues/202) | This issue requires a change of structure: remove the criterion and put it in as subcriterion of specific and generic turnover.  The resolution suggested is approved. To be implemented in version 3.0.0. | | [#220](https://github.com/ESPD/ESPD-EDM/issues/220) | This will aligned to the new eForms, and therefore needs to go to version 3.0.0. | | [#222](https://github.com/ESPD/ESPD-EDM/issues/222) | The data structure is correct and fits the purpose expressed in the mock-up. In any case, the contracting authority will ask for a ratio without providing a threshold.  Decision is made to close this issue. | | [#223](https://github.com/ESPD/ESPD-EDM/issues/223) | Propose to UBL to include a new class "EOSubcontractedProportion".  To be implemented in version 3.0.0 and only for the extended model. | | [#235](https://github.com/ESPD/ESPD-EDM/issues/235) | For version 2.1.1 we could try and add QUAL\_IDENTIFIER as in the code list ReponseDataType (check it with OP).  For version 3.0.0 we need to rethink whether these prefixes can be avoided at all. Then, we would need strong rules as making compulsory schemeID (identifiers). | | [#242](https://github.com/ESPD/ESPD-EDM/issues/242) | First point is already solved in 2.1.0.  The other two questions need to be discussed in the next meeting. |   **General questions:**   * Robin Anderson (RA) asks how the modifications in the ESPD data model would affect the ESPD Regulation. * Enric Staromiejski (ES) explains that this question should be responded during the face-to-face meeting. |

|  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- |
| **Action Points:** | | | |
| **AP#** | **Name**  **Description** | **Due Date** | **Who** |
| **1** | Legal check with March-Christopher (DG GROW) and DG GROW about issue [#239](https://github.com/ESPD/ESPD-EDM/issues/239). | 18-09-2019 | everis |
| **2** | Propose to UBL Technical Committee a new class “EOSubcontractedProportion” that could be compared with the “AllowedSubcontractedTerms”. | 30-09-2019 | everis |
| **3** | Check with OP the addition of the code QUAL\_IDENTIFIER in the code list ReponseDataType | 30-09-2019 | everis |

|  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- |
| **Proposed Agenda for Next Meeting:** | **Proposed Next Meeting Date:** | End of September (TBD) |
| 1. Discuss open issues. | | |