



Dienst Justitiële Inrichtingen  
*Ministerie van Justitie en Veiligheid*

# Sub-award criteria

Annex 2

## **Prototype Automatic Arabic Dialect Recognition (A-ADR)**

For the State of the Netherlands, Immigration and Naturalisation  
Service (IND)

Reference : T562514  
Date : 12-2-2026  
Version number : 1.0

## Introduction

These are the Sub-award criteria, questions that we would like you to answer. On the one hand, we would like more information on how you would complete the described Assignment. On the other, we offer you the opportunity to stand out and present yourself as a potential partner for the Contracting Authority.

## The award criterion

The award criterion is Economic Most Valuable Bid based on quality/price ratio

Quality	80%
Price	20%

## The ratio

The following weighting will be used in the award process:

#	Sub-award criterion	Points
1	Project governance plan	20
2	Technical development of the prototype	15
3	Validation plan	15
4	EU AI Act compliance plan	15
5	Risk mitigation plan	15
	Price	20
	<b>Total</b>	<b>100</b>

## Assessment and calculation score of sub-award criteria (SAC) with regard to quality

Each SAC will be assessed independently on the basis of the below qualitative descriptors. The contracting authority will award scores reflecting the degree to which the tender meets the requirements set out in the procurement documents. Evaluators will substantiate the scores awarded with concise reasoning as objectively as possible.

<b>Completeness</b>	The extent to which the proposal fully addresses all requirements, questions, and elements set out in the procurement documents, without omissions of relevant information necessary for assessment.
<b>Relevance</b>	The extent to which the proposal directly relates to and supports the objectives, scope, and priorities of the procurement, and responds to the specific challenges and needs described in the procurement documents.
<b>Adequateness</b>	The extent to which the proposal is suitable, feasible, and proportionate in relation to the objectives, scale, complexity, and nature of the contract.
<b>Concreteness</b>	The extent to which the proposal provides clear, specific, and operational descriptions of activities, methods, deliverables, and outputs, as opposed to general, abstract, or non-specific statements.

Rating	Argumentation	Percentage of maximal points
Excellent	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Completeness: All requirements set out in the procurement documents are fully and clearly addressed. No relevant information is missing.</li> <li>Relevance: The proposal fully addresses the objectives, scope, and priorities of the tender and directly responds to the challenges described.</li> <li>Adequateness: The proposed approach is fully suitable, feasible, and proportionate to the objectives, scale, and complexity of the assignment.</li> <li>Concreteness: The proposal contains clear, specific, and operational descriptions of activities, methods, deliverables, and outputs.</li> </ul>	100%
Good	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Completeness: All essential requirements are addressed; minor omissions or lack of detail do not materially affect understanding or feasibility.</li> </ul>	70%

	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Relevance: The proposal is well aligned with the objectives and scope of the procurement, with only limited elements of lesser relevance.</li> <li>• Adequateness: The proposed approach is generally suitable and appropriate, with minor aspects requiring clarification.</li> <li>• Concreteness: Descriptions are largely specific and operational, with limited reliance on general statements.</li> </ul>	
Fair	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Completeness: Several requirements are only partially addressed or insufficiently described.</li> <li>• Relevance: The proposal shows limited alignment with the tender objectives; significant elements are only indirectly related.</li> <li>• Adequateness: The proposed approach raises some doubts regarding suitability, feasibility, or proportionality.</li> <li>• Concreteness: The proposal relies mainly on general or abstract descriptions, with limited detail on implementation.</li> </ul>	30%
Poor	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Completeness: Key requirements of the procurement documents are not addressed or are inadequately described.</li> <li>• Relevance: The proposal does not adequately address the objectives or scope of the tender.</li> <li>• Adequateness: The proposed approach is inappropriate for the intended R&amp;D activities.</li> <li>• Concreteness: The proposal is vague, generic, or non-operational.</li> </ul>	0%

#### Instruction on responding to sub-award criteria

- The elaborations must be completed on the maximum number of A4 pages indicated for the relevant question (including any images, tables, diagrams, figures and appendices, etc.) in arial or verdana font with point size 9, single line spacing. If a maximum number of pages is specified for answering a question, and the maximum number of pages is exceeded, the part affected by that excess will be set aside, and the assessment and resulting score will be based only on the maximum number of A4's specified;
- To ensure equality of assessment, added links are not assessed;
- Under the elaboration, the Tenderer should distinguish any sub-questions from each other by clearly indicating (with headings) to which sub-question the elaboration relates;
- Make sure your description does not contradict the stated requirements in the Requirements (Annex 1);
- The answer to the sub-award criteria will be included in the Agreement, which means that the Contractor will be bound in the performance of the Agreement by what it has stated. This does not apply to elements required as 'proposals', as these will be discussed and agreed upon in more detail during the contracting period.

#### Schedule of Sub-award criteria with regard to quality.

SAC 1 Project governance plan	20 points
<p><i>The question</i> Please provide a project governance plan.</p> <p>Elaborate on at least the following:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>– The composition of your project team and amount of dedicated time</li> <li>– Project management</li> <li>– Preliminary outline (definition and planning) of subdeliverables</li> <li>– <u>Proposal</u> for collaboration with the Contracting party and input needed from IND</li> </ul> <p><i>Format</i> For your elaboration, use a maximum of 3 pages A4 single-sided. You are free to additionally show the planning in a schematic overview. This may be a maximum of 1 A4.</p>	

<b>SAC 2 Technical development of the prototype</b>	<b>15 points</b>
<p><i>The question</i> Please provide a technical development plan.</p> <p>Elaborate on at least the following:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>– The kind of ADR technology, language/data models and/or platforms to be used, recent developments in the field of ADR to be tried out</li> </ul> <p><i>Format</i> For your elaboration, use a maximum of 2 pages A4 single-sided.</p>	
<b>SAC 3 Validation plan</b>	<b>15 points</b>
<p><i>The question</i> Please provide a validation plan</p> <p>Elaborate on at least the following:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>– Validation plan including various performance measures and ways of visualizing the results</li> <li>– Your ideas on how to present the output of the Prototype – including the uncertainty of the outcome – to a potential user of a Final Solution (e.g. an asylum officer)</li> <li>– Your ideas on how to train the human experts in charge of human supervision of the AI and explain the inner workings of the system to them</li> </ul> <p><i>Format</i> For your elaboration, use a maximum of 2 pages A4 single-sided.</p>	
<b>SAC 4 Compliance plan</b>	<b>15 points</b>
<p><i>The question</i> Please provide a Compliance plan.</p> <p>Elaborate on at least the following:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>– The relevant EU AI Act Articles at this stage and how compliance can be ensured</li> <li>– <u>Proposal</u> for division of roles and/or specification of responsibilities as specified in the AI Act</li> </ul> <p><i>Format</i> For your elaboration, use a maximum of 2 pages A4 single-sided.</p>	
<b>SAC 5 Risk Mitigation Plan</b>	<b>15 points</b>
<p><i>The question</i> Please provide a Risk Mitigation Plan. You may include any risks that you see and propose mitigating measures.</p> <p><i>Format</i> For your elaboration, use a maximum of 2 pages A4 single-sided.</p>	

### Sub-award criterion Price

The points to be scored for the submitted price are calculated with the formula

$\text{Points for price} = 20 * (1.200.000 - \text{price}) / 600.000$
---

where the results will be rounded to 1 decimal place.

Instructions regarding Form D Price Sheet

- The submitted price in cell B3 of Form D is fixed for the duration of the Contract and includes all costs for Tenderer to execute the Contract, except data license costs as these are not part of this Tender and will be covered separately by the Contracting authority.
- Tenderer must provide a cost breakdown in at least the required components mentioned in Form D (yellow cells) and is free to provide additional cost breakdown elements (green cells).
- The price is calculated based on the submitted cost breakdown elements.

**Please note:**

**The minimum price to be stated in your bid is € 600.000 excl. VAT and the maximum price to be stated in your Bid is € 1.200.000 excl. VAT. If the price stated in your bid is lower than € 600.000 excl. VAT or higher than € 1.200.000 excl. VAT your bid will be deemed invalid.**