

JHA SGI
019

**EUROPEAN UNION
THE COUNCIL**

**Brussels, 10 May 1994 (20.05)
(OR. f)**

6858/94

RESTREINT

ASIM 96

REPORT

from : ad hoc Working Party on Eurodac

to : Steering Group I

Subject: Report from the ad hoc Working Party on Eurodac concerning the selection of a consultant

In the light of the Article K.4 Committee's instructions, the ad hoc Working Party on Eurodac considered, at its meeting on 4 May 1994, the possibility of short-listing the three or four best tenders by the consultants competing for selection to study Eurodac users' needs and requirements.

The assessment was made in the light of the selection criteria in 6027/94 ASIM 69 CK4 32. The criteria are as laid down in Belgian law and in particular those applicable under Article 14 of the Law of 14 July 1976 on public works, supply and service contracts.

The Working Party took note of a paper from the Belgian delegation giving a full assessment of all consultants in contention for selection to carry out the study (see Annex II - final findings).

Of the eleven tenders, the Working Party focused on four which, from the objective information available, might be classed as the most attractive.

Those consultants were as follows:

- Andersen Consulting;
- Bossard Consultants, Team Consult and Organotecnia;
- Trasys;
- Cegos, Berenschot.

It emerged from assessment proceedings that all delegations might have the same view of Andersen Consulting. For the other three consultants, the ad hoc Working Party found that individual assessments differed with regard to some of the criteria to be considered. The differences are shown in Annex I.

Faced with this deadlock, the Working Party considered the possibility of setting up a group of experts, open to all delegations, but composed solely of those delegations wishing to participate, in order to look into the reasons for the differing assessments of some consultants.

Against this background, the ad hoc Working Party is referring the matter as it now stands to Steering Group I.

EURODAC

(Outcome of the meeting on 4 May 1994
on the assessment of consultants
which might be classed as the most attractive tenders)

CONSULTANT	TENDER PRICE	TECHNICAL MERIT	PROFESSIONAL AND FINANCIAL GUARANTEES	COMPLETION TIME	SUGGESTIONS PUT FORWARD IN THE TENDER	FINAL GRADE
ANDERSEN CONSULTING	Good (-)	Outstanding (-)	Good (-)	Good	-	
BOSSARD CONSULTANTS TEAM CONSULT ORGANOTECNIA	Good	- Outstanding (F) - Good (+) (B)	- Outstanding (F) - Good (+) (B)	- Outstanding (F) - Good (B)	-	
TRASYS	- Outstanding (B) - Inadequate/ Adequate (NL) - No assessment (D) ⁽¹⁾	- Outstanding (-) (B) - Inadequate (D/NL/F) ⁽²⁾	- Outstanding (-) (B) - Inadequate (F/NL) ⁽³⁾	- Good (B) - Inadequate (F/NL) ⁽⁴⁾	-	
CEGOS BERENSCHOT	Good	- Outstanding (F/NL) - Good (B)	- Outstanding (F/NL/D) ⁽⁵⁾ - Adequate (B)	- Outstanding (F/NL) - Adequate (B)	-	

⁽¹⁾ Thought there was not enough information to check on the tender price.

⁽²⁾ The French delegation felt that there was a lack of technical grasp of the fingerprint-matching system.

The German delegation thought that some aspects had been overlooked, such as the possibility of classifying fingerprints.

⁽³⁾ Misgivings about the type of resources used for the assignment and about professional guarantees (no parallel interviews).

⁽⁴⁾ Tender commitment unrealistic.

⁽⁵⁾ Parallel interviews, as envisaged by this consultant, were an important point to consider.

**OVERALL ASSESSMENT IN RESPECT OF THE CRITERIA
AS PROPOSED BY THE BELGIAN DELEGATION**

Firm	Tender price	Technical merit	Professional and financial guarantees	Completion time	Final assessment
1	Inadequate	Adequate (-)	Inadequate	Inadequate	Inadequate
2	Good (-)	Adequate (-)	Adequate (+)	Inadequate	Adequate
3	Good	Inadequate	Inadequate	Adequate	Adequate
4	Adequate	Adequate (-)	Good	Inadequate	Adequate
5	Adequate (+)	Adequate	Good (-)	Adequate	Adequate (+)
6	Good (-)	Outstanding (-)	Good (-)	Good	Good
7	Good	Good (+)	Good (+)	Good	Good (+)
8	Adequate	Inadequate	Adequate (-)	Good	Adequate
9	Outstanding	Outstanding (-)	Outstanding (-)	Good	Outstanding (-)
10	Good	Good	Adequate (+)	Adequate	Good (-)
11	Adequate (+)	Inadequate	Inadequate	Inadequate	Inadequate

Final ranking

1. TRASYS
 2. BOSSARD, TEAM CONSULT, ORGANOTECNICA
 3. ANDERSEN CONSULTING
 4. CEGOS - BERENSCHOT
 5. FIDES INFORMATIK
 6. STRATORG; LOGICA; C.M.G.
 7. QUALITY R&D LTD.
 8. HURSLEY INTERNATIONAL
 9. TWIJNSTRA GUDDE
-