Follow-up Meeting Minutes

Publications Office – ESPD-EDM

Meeting Date/Time:	2020-05-19 11:00 – 12:30

Attendee Name *(present)*	Initials	Organisation / Email
Sofia BERENGUER	SB	OP
Manuela CRUZ	CM	OP
Natalie MURIC	NM	OP
Ioannis ROUSOCHATZAKIS	IR	OP
Cécile GUASCH	CG	DG GROW
Marc Christopher SCHMIDT	MC	DG GROW
Maria FONT	MF	Everis
Guifré GUSTA	GG	Everis
Héctor RICO	HR	Everis
Robin ANDERSON BOSTROM	RAB	Sweden
Andreea ANGHEL	AA	Romania
Bettina BOZSONYI	BB	Hungary
Simon BUSCH	DB	Denmark
Jason GRECH	JA	Malta
Jennifer GUTSCHE	JG	Austria
Hilde KJOLSET	HN	Norway
Stanislav KOVAC	SK	Slovakia
Marc NOSBUSCH	MN	Luxembourg
Timo RANTANEN	TR	Finland
Francesco SCATTARETICO	FS	Italy
Giampaolo SELLITTO	GS	Italy
Roberto REALE	RR	Italy
Ákos ZÁMBÓ	AZ	Hungary
Jalini	JL	Norway
Sonia	SO	

Summary of Meeting Objectives

- Presentation of work done regarding the code lists (CL) analysis and gather comments if any.
- Presentation of the proposed roadmap for the upcoming months
- Discussion of the Evaluation Method Type within ESPD.
- Discussion of the Lots Management approach.

Meeting Agenda

- Brief introduction to previous work and the current ESPD-EDM 2.1.1
- Roadmap for the new ESPD-EDM release
- Code List – Work Done
- Evaluation Method Type Discussion
- Lots Management discussion

ESPD-EDM 2.1.1
- A brief explanation of the work done and changes implemented in the current version of ESPD was made.
- No comments, questions, or doubts raised related to this topic.

Roadmap next ESPD-EDM release
- The roadmap for the upcoming months, the objective, and the main task to be analysed was presented.
- No comments, questions, or doubts raised regarding this topic.

Code Lists – Work Done
- The analysis done in view of the harmonisation of the current ESPD code lists with both eForms and eProcurement Ontology was presented.
- The following table was presented to illustrate the work done:

Code List ESPD 2.1.1	Identified Replacement Code List	Comments
ProcedureType	Procurement Procedure Type (EU Voc)	Only codes related to current procedure types.
BidType	BidType (EU Voc)	
ConfidentialityLevel	ConfidentialityLevelType (ePO Ontology)	Restricted to use only the codes needed in ESPD.
CriteriaTaxonomy	New table in EU Voc	
EOIndustryClassification Code	Economic Operator Size (EU Voc)	
EORoleType	TBD	ESPD should use Sole Tenderer (ST) code instead of Sole Contractor (SC).
EULanguageCode	Language (EU Voc)	Change from ISO-639-1 (2 digits) to ISO-639-2 (3 digits).
EvaluationMethodType	TBD	
DocRefContentType	New table in EU Voc	
ProjectType	Contract Nature (EU Voc)	Only codes related to procedure types.
ServiceProjectSubType	TBD	
CurrencyCode	Currency (EU Voc)	
CountryCodeIdentifier	Country (EU Voc)	Change from alpha-2 (2 digits) to alpha-3 (3 digits).

- No comments, doubts, or questions raised on this topic.

Evaluation Method Type Discussion
- The approach currently used to deal with the evaluation method is based on two elements (PASSFAIL/WEIGHTED).
- The question is whether weighting could be applied to selection criteria, and if so, if it could apply to all selection criteria or only to technical and professional ability. Weighting would be used for the reduction of participants.

- To clarify the position of the attendants, the participants were invited to reply to a simple question: "Do you want the weighting criteria in the ESPD?"
  - The general opinion was to not keep the weighting in ESPD (. One of the rationales provided was that
    - The need for reduction exits, but it should not be part of the ESPD.
  - Only one participant would prefer to keep the weigthing criteria in ESPD, but only if it is easly implemented into the solution.
- The conclusion on the topic was that there is a need to keep ESPD as simple as possible, therefore, not include weights in ESPD.

Lots Management Discussion

- The approach for lots management is aligned with eForms, and includes 1 ESPD request per procedure but 1 ESPD Response per lot and 1 ESPD Response per group of lots.
  Some participants defended that would be better to have a unique ESPD to fill in, as the multiplicity of lots would create an extra burden on EO side when creating the ESPD.
  Examples were shown to illustrate possible solutions:
  - the Finland ESPD service and how a CA would implement the criteria for the different Lot;
  - how Norway manages lots,: https://vefa.difi.no/ehf-pre/guide/espd/1.2/, and XSD: https://github.com/anskaffelser/ehf-schemas/blob/master/xsd/ehf/Lots-1.0.xsd.
- A "Yes/No" question to summarise the opinion and input from the attendants was proposed: "Would you support the proposal for lots, to have one ESPD request aligned with eForms but an ESPD response per lot or group lots?"
  - The general feedback to the question is positive to the approach presented. This discussion will be finalised in the next meeting.