CHECKLIST - Project manager's qualities and skills and quality of the presented demo of the existing solution [[1]](#footnote-2)

**Basic information**

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
| Contract title: | **Digitisation of the fleet, collection planning system and electronic recording and confirmation of container emptying** |
| Tenderer | *Tenderer´s identification* |
| Project Manager (PM) present | *Name and surname* |
| Interview venue: |  |
| Interview time: |  |

The evaluation interview can be divided into three parts:

* Project manager´s characteristics and quality (orange colour in the table below)
* Key aspects of the presented DEMO version or software (blue colour in the table below)
* Design of the database made available within the presentation of the DEMO version or software (pink colour in the table below)

The table below defines the key individual/personal qualities and abilities of the project manager that will be evaluated by the established committee and that contribute substantially and reasonably to **successful implementation of the subject of the contract and to achievement of the pursued objective - implementation of a software solution for digitalization of the vehicle fleet for OLO, a.s.**

**Below you may find key aspects that will be evaluated on the functionality of the demo version of the solution that were presented during the evaluation interview.**

**Evaluation methodology:**

1. The committee (as a whole, not the committee members individually) shall assign to **each of the below-evaluated qualities or skills of the project manager (parts 1 - 6 of the table below):**
* **5 points** if during the interview the PM **(with his/her demeanour and answers) confirms/demonstrates having it**,
* **2.5 points** if during the interview the PM **(with his/her demeanour and answers) confirms/demonstrates having it** **to a certain extent**,
* **0 points** if during the interview the PM **confirms/demonstrates not having it**.
1. The committee (as a whole, not the committee members individually) shall assign to **each of the below-evaluated feature of the DEMO version or software (parts 7 - 12 of the table below):**
* **10 points** if during the presentation it is **confirmed/demonstrated** that the DEMO or software **has** the feature,
* **5 points** if during the presentation it is **confirmed/demonstrated** that the DEMO or software **has the feature to a certain extent,**
* **0 points** if during the presentation it is **confirmed/demonstrated** that the DEMO or software **does not have the feature.**
1. The committee (as a whole, not the committee members individually) shall assign to **each of the below-evaluated feature of the DEMO version or software when processing the database for the purpose of developing a plan (parts 13 and 14 of the table below):**
* **5 points** if, **when processing the database for the purpose of creating a plan**, the **DEMO version or the software** demonstrates **that it can process the database and create a plan based on it**,
* **2.5 points** if, **when processing the database for the purpose of creating a plan, the DEMO version or the software** demonstrates **that to a certain extent it can process the database and create a plan based on it,**
* **0 points** if, **when processing the database for the purpose of creating a plan, the DEMO version or the software** demonstrates **that it cannot process the database and create a plan based on it.**

In order to obtain points for parts 13 and 14, the Tenderer shall draw up a collection plan based on the documents contained in Annex 15, the output of which shall be:

* Number of (small/big) vehicles needed per collection day
* Number of kilometres required per vehicle and collection day
* Time required for collection with a particular vehicle on a given collection day
* Number of containers emptied by the vehicle on a collection day
* Collection routes map
* Collection ID filled in the *Data.xlsx* table and assigned to a specific container

Fixed parameters for the creation of a collection plan:

* The route is Ivanská Cesta 22 -> Collection -> ZEVO -> Collection -> ZEVO -> Ivanská Cesta 22
* The plan shall be drawn up for a time period of 2 weeks
* Collection plan for individual collection days
* Containers are emptied individually
* The Tenderer has the possibility to optimise the plan by specifying a particular collection day of the week

Sample plan output table

|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| **Collection ID** | **Collection day** | **Vehicle** | **Vehicle type** | **Collection duration** | **Kilometres** | **Number of emptied containers** | **Price** |
| UID | Day 1 | Vehicle A | Small | Hours | 0.00 | 0 | = (Hour \* Price per hour Vehicle type) + (km/100 \* consumption \* fuel price) |
| UID | Day 2 | Vehicle B | Big | Hours | 0.00 | 0 | = (Hour. \* Price per hour Vehicle type) + (km/100 \* consumption \* fuel price) |
|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |

Evaluation:

Total price of all planned collections for 2 weeks = Price of the collection plan

The final number of points for this criterion to be awarded to the Tenderer shall be equal to the sum of the arithmetic averages (rounded to 2 decimal places) of the points awarded for the individual qualities and skills of the PM, for the individual features of the DEMO version or the offered software and for the capabilities of the DEMO version or the offered software, as follows:

**Number of points for the K3 criterion = sum of points awarded for parts 1-6/6 + sum of points awarded for parts 7-12/6 + sum of points awarded for parts 13 and 14/2**

|  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- |
| **Individual quality or skill of the PM and functionality of the presented demo version of the solution (parts)** | The committee shall indicate the number of the question where the PM clearly/substantially demonstrated (with his/her demeanour and answers) that he/she has or does not have the particular quality, or where it was substantially demonstrated based on the evaluated features of the presented demo version that it has/does not have it  | **Evaluation notes**  |
| 1. it is clear from the speech that the PM has sufficient knowledge about the subject of the contract |  |  |
| 2. he/she looks motivated to achieve the goal, treats the project as a professional priority, is clear that he/she will devote a reasonable amount of time to the project |  |  |
| 3. it is clear from the speech that the objective pursued by the PM in the execution of this project is obvious and clearly articulated and in line with the interests of the contracting authority |  |  |
| 4. It is clear from the answers that he/she is aware of the risks of the project and knows mechanisms to eliminate and minimize them, he/she has a clear idea of how to put these mechanisms into practice  |  |  |
| 5. It is clear from the speech that he/she is aware of the importance of the project, of his/her personal responsibility for the project and its progress, is considering ways how to influence the project so that it is implemented in accordance with the agreement |  |  |
| 6. Knowledge of the specificities of the implementation of software solutions in the field of waste collection (waste management)  |  |  |
| 7. The presented software is user-friendly and appropriate to the technical skills of the customer's employees, it contains tools that facilitate its use (e.g. Buil in manual, Tooltips, Regional setting / Language) |  |  |
| 8. The presented software has flexible processes, they can be modified as needed and no significant modification of the customer's current processes is required to put them into practice.  |  |  |
| 9. The presented software uses modern/current technology and procedures. |  |  |
| 10. The presented software is compatible with other software (Demo - Maturity - contains software *APIs, what export formats it has, Premade integrations, contains Product roadmap)* |  |  |
| 11. The presented software has an acceptable Layout (logical, consistent across the software, supports workflow, can be configured and its default settings may be saved) and is easy to use *(High complexity leads to steeper learning curve, Easy to use for manager or needs specialist to operate, Intuitive controls / Naming, Keyboard and mouse interaction (Tabs, Shortcuts, Zoomin, Intuitive use of layers). The software design is modern and user-friendly (color scheme, modern interface layout, Web UI/ responsive / Thic client / Mobile app / Driver navigation app)* |  |  |
| 12. The presented software is adaptive, modular and can be configured according to the needs of the customer *(What configuration options are available to tweak the solution, adjust processes.**Configuration can be done by user or needs programmer)* |  |  |
| 13. The presented software was able to process the provided database fast enough, without technical problems, in a reasonable time. The presented software was able to satisfactorily process the collection plan based on the database. |  |  |
| 14. The collection plan generated by the presented software is cost-effective and usable in practice (the committee will compare the output of the plan produced within the presented solution with the current plan produced by the planning tools currently used by the contracting authority).  |  |  |
|  **Achieved scores for PM characteristics and capabilities, DEMO quality, and quality of plan developed:** |  |

Prepared by: *Name of the member of the committee who has filled in the checklist*

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
| **Members of the evaluation committee (together at least 4 members)** | **Signatures** |
| *Name and surname of the committee member* |  |
| *Name and surname of the committee member* |  |
| *Name and surname of the committee member* |  |
| *Name and surname of the committee member* |  |
| *Name and surname of the committee member* |  |

1. The checklist is annexed to the Tender Documents for tenderers to become familiar with the evaluation procedure for the sub-criterion. The checklist shall not be completed by the Tenderer and shall not be a part of the tender. [↑](#footnote-ref-2)