

**EVALUATION REPORT OF THE TECHNICAL REPORT (ENVELOPE / ELECTRONIC FILE
B)****TENDER FOR THE SERVICE CONTRACT OF THE SECOND EDITION OF THE "CATALONIA
SPACE ACCELERATOR" ACCELERATION PROGRAMME**

The purpose of this report is the evaluation, by the Services and Industrial Promotion Office of the IEEC, of the criteria assessed by value judgement (technical report) within the framework of the service contract for the second edition of the "Catalonia Space Accelerator" acceleration programme (File IEEC/263/2025).

In accordance with clause 9 of the Specific Administrative Clauses (hereinafter, SAC), the award criteria assessed by value judgement are the following:

"TECHNICAL REPORT

The bidder shall submit a report of the work to be carried out in which, clearly and concisely, it sets out its proposal for the content and development of the contract, limiting itself to the specific case under analysis, avoiding generic vagueness that does not directly involve them.

A.1 Work Methodology (up to 20 points)

Scoring will take into account the bidder's proposal regarding the content and development of the work subject to this tender. The clarity and presentation of the technical offer, the methodology and work systems proposed by the bidder, and the degree of knowledge of the contract object will be scored.

Evaluation system:

| Description | Score |
|---|------------------|
| <i>Well-developed and correct work methodology</i> | <i>20 points</i> |
| <i>Correct work methodology</i> | <i>15 points</i> |
| <i>Basic process with lack of detail or minor inconsistencies</i> | <i>10 points</i> |
| <i>Does not provide or irrelevant process</i> | <i>0 points</i> |

A.2 Organisation of the Work Team (up to 20 points)

Scoring will take into account the organisation of the work teams in relation to the work structure, dedication to the contract, and the proposed relationships between the bidder and the IEEC.

Evaluation system:

| Description | Score |
|--|------------------|
| <i>Well-defined and effective hierarchy and task allocation</i> | <i>20 points</i> |
| <i>Correct hierarchy and task distribution but poorly developed</i> | <i>15 points</i> |
| <i>Ineffective hierarchy and/or task distribution or with shortcomings</i> | <i>10 points</i> |
| <i>Very scarce, incorrect, or irrelevant proposal</i> | <i>0 points</i> |

A.3 Programme Impact Capacity (up to 10 points)

Scoring will take into account the impact that the contractor can generate at local and international level.

The bidder must include in this section specification of local and international contacts, investors, participation in events, experience in the space sector throughout its value chain (including from upstream to downstream including Earth observation, etc.), relevant examples of companies accelerated in the past, and actions to achieve a high capacity for local and international impact.

Evaluation system:

| Description | Score |
|---|--------------|
| Excellent local and international impact capacity in the space sector | 10 points |
| Good local and/or international impact capacity in the space sector | 5 points |
| Sufficient local and/or international impact capacity in the space sector | 2.5 points |
| Insufficient local and/or international impact capacity in the space sector | 0 points |

The maximum length of the technical report may not exceed 5 DIN-A4 sheets double-sided (10 pages), Arial 10, single line spacing. This page limit does not count the table of contents, covers and/or separators.

IMPORTANT: An increase in the number of pages beyond the stated limit will not imply exclusion of the offer, but only the information contained in the stated pages will be taken into consideration and the rest will not be subject to evaluation or scoring.

A minimum quality threshold of 30 points is established for obtaining the required technical report. Proposals with a score below 30 points will be rejected and therefore excluded from the tender procedure as being technically insufficient.

EVALUATION OF THE TECHNICAL REPORT

Taking into account the criteria evaluable by value judgement established in clause 9 of the Specific Administrative Clauses, the evaluation of the Technical Report submitted by the bidders who have participated in the tender is carried out.

- **Peninsula Corporate Innovation, S.L. with tax ID (NIF) B66585613**

It is noted that, in accordance with clause 9 of the SAC, the maximum length of the Technical Report does not exceed 5 DIN-A4 sheets double-sided (10 pages), Arial 10, single line spacing. This page limit does not count the table of contents, covers and/or separators.

A.1 Work Methodology (up to 20 points).

The evaluation of this criterion with respect to Peninsula Corporate Innovation, S.L. is as follows:

| Description | Score |
|---|--------------|
| Downstream and Dual-Use approach. Methodology is correct. | 15 points |

A.2 Organisation of the Work Team (up to 20 points).

The evaluation of this criterion is as follows:

| Description | Score |
|--|-----------|
| <i>Correct hierarchy and task distribution but poorly developed.</i> | 15 points |

A.3 Programme Impact Capacity (up to 10 points).

The evaluation of this criterion is as follows:

| Description | Score |
|--|------------|
| Lack of justification of experience in European space sector events, or dedicated experience or knowledge of the space sector. The impact is strongly linked to downstream or dual-use only. The bidder does not present relevant examples of companies accelerated in the past in the space sector nor actions to be carried out to achieve a high capacity for local and international impact. | 2.5 points |

- **SARL Starburst Accelerator with VAT NUMBER 805232063**

It is noted that, in accordance with clause 9 of the SAC, the maximum length of the Technical Report does not exceed 5 DIN-A4 sheets double-sided (10 pages), Arial 10, single line spacing. This page limit does not count the table of contents, covers and/or separators.

A.1 Work Methodology (up to 20 points).

The evaluation of this criterion with respect to SARL Starburst Accelerator is as follows:

| Description | Score |
|-----------------------------|-----------|
| The methodology is correct. | 15 points |

A.2 Organisation of the Work Team (up to 20 points).

The evaluation of this criterion is as follows:

| Description | Score |
|--|-----------|
| <i>Correct hierarchy and task distribution but poorly developed.</i> | 15 points |

A.3 Programme Impact Capacity (up to 10 points).

The evaluation of this criterion is as follows:

| Description | Score |
|---|-----------|
| The bidder presents experience in participation in leading European and worldwide space sector programs and events. The bidder includes specification of local and international contacts, investors, participation in events, and experience in the space sector throughout its value chain. It also includes relevant examples of companies accelerated in the past. | 10 points |

- **S2 Xpeed Ventures, S.L. with tax ID (NIF) B09879750, Kim Bcn with tax ID (NIF) G64875941, and INLEA, INTERNATIONAL LEARNING AUTHORITY S.L. with tax ID (NIF) B65745945 (as a joint venture)**

It is noted that, in accordance with clause 9 of the SAC, the maximum length of the Technical Report does not exceed 5 DIN-A4 sheets double-sided (10 pages), Arial 10, single line spacing. This page limit does not count the table of contents, covers and/or separators.

A.1 Work Methodology (up to 20 points).

The evaluation of this criterion with respect to S2 Xpeed Ventures, S.L. is as follows:

| Description | Score |
|--|-----------|
| The bidder emphasises defence and hardware in the technical report. It does not include the entire value chain of the space sector. The needs of downstream entities are presented with little depth; hardware appears to be highlighted more for the strengths of the entities than for alignment with the programme's needs. The methodology has shortcomings regarding how to accelerate considering upstream and downstream needs. | 10 points |

A.2 Organisation of the Work Team (up to 20 points).

The evaluation of this criterion is as follows:

| Description | Score |
|--|-----------|
| The bidders present the role of each one for the execution of the work. However, the work methodology or interconnection between the members of the joint venture is not clear. No interconnection with the IEEC during the contract is specified. | 10 points |

A.3 Programme Impact Capacity (up to 10 points).

The evaluation of this criterion is as follows:

| Description | Score |
|--|------------|
| Lack of specificity regarding experience in international space sector events. This is essential to demonstrate connections at European level. Contact with ESA commercialisation actors is demonstrated. The bidder does not present relevant examples of companies | 2.5 points |

| | |
|--|--|
| accelerated in the past nor actions to achieve a high capacity for local and international impact. | |
|--|--|

- **Acitoflux GmbH with VAT NUMBER DE30564515**

It is noted that the maximum length of the Technical Report for Acitoflux exceeds 5 DIN-A4 sheets double-sided (10 pages), Arial 10, single line spacing.

In accordance with clause 9 of the specific administrative clauses, an increase in the number of pages beyond the stated limit does not imply exclusion of the bid, but only the information contained in the stated pages will be taken into consideration and the rest will not be subject to evaluation or scoring.

A.1 Work Methodology (up to 20 points).

The evaluation of this criterion with respect to Acitoflux GmbH is as follows:

| Description | Score |
|--|-----------|
| The methodology is correct and well developed. | 20 points |

A.2 Organisation of the Work Team (up to 20 points).

The evaluation of this criterion is as follows:

| Description | Score |
|---|----------|
| Section not subject to evaluation, due to exceeding the maximum number of pages established for the technical report. | 0 points |

A.3 Programme Impact Capacity (up to 10 points).

The evaluation of this criterion is as follows:

| Description | Score |
|---|----------|
| Section not subject to evaluation, due to exceeding the maximum number of pages established for the technical report. | 0 points |

- **Arribes Enlightenment, S.L. with tax ID (NIF) B16745994**

It is noted that, in accordance with clause 9 of the SAC, the maximum length of the Technical Report does not exceed 5 DIN-A4 sheets double-sided (10 pages), Arial 10, single line spacing. This page limit does not count the table of contents, covers and/or separators.

A.1 Work Methodology (up to 20 points).

The evaluation of this criterion with respect to Arribes Enlightenment, S.L. is as follows:

| Description | Score |
|---|-----------|
| Correct work methodology. In the presentation of the methodology, there is a lack of application to the space sector. The methodology is coherent and correct, but not sufficiently adjusted to the difficulties of accelerating companies from upstream to downstream. | 15 points |

A.2 Organisation of the Work Team (up to 20 points).

The evaluation of this criterion is as follows:

| Description | Score |
|---|-----------|
| The acceleration programme aims to support companies in their market development, investors, etc. Of the roles described by the bidder, only the "Support in space technologies and markets" acts directly on the programme's need; the rest of the work team has a generic role. | 10 points |

A.3 Programme Impact Capacity (up to 10 points).

The evaluation of this criterion is as follows:

| Description | Score |
|--|----------|
| Lack of specificity regarding leading space sector events but many proposals are made. Good. | 5 points |

The Services and Industrial Promotion Office of the IEEC, in view of the evaluation based on the award criteria evaluable by value judgement established in clause 9 of the Specific Administrative Clauses, proposes to the Procurement Board to award the companies the following score for the proposal evaluable by value judgement – envelope / electronic file B (Technical Report):

| Company | Work Methodology Score (up to 20 points) | Work Team Organisation Score (up to 20 points) | Programme Impact Capacity Score (up to 10 points) | Total Technical Report Score (up to 50 points) |
|---|--|--|---|--|
| Peninsula Corporate Innovation, S.L. | 15 points | 15 points | 2.5 points | 32.5 points |
| SARL Starburst Accelerator | 20 points | 15 points | 10 points | 45 points |
| S2 Xpeed Ventures, S.L, KIMbcn and INLEA, INTERNATIONAL | 10 points | 5 points | 2.5 points | 17.5 points |

| | | | | |
|------------------------------|-----------|-----------|----------|-----------|
| LEARNING AUTHORITY S.L. | | | | |
| Acitoflux GmbH | 20 points | 0 points | 0 points | 20 points |
| Arribes Enlightment, S.L. | 15 points | 10 points | 5 points | 30 points |

In accordance with clause 9 of the SAC, a minimum quality threshold of 30 points is established for obtaining the required technical report. Proposals with a score below 30 points will be rejected and therefore excluded from the tender procedure as being technically insufficient.

Based on the above, we therefore propose to the Procurement Board that the following companies be excluded, as they did not meet the required quality threshold of 30 points:

- S2 Xpeed Ventures, S.L., KIMbcn and INLEA, International Learning Authority S.L.
- Acitoflux GmbH

Castelldefels, February 2026.

Dani Sors
Head of the IEEC Services and Industrial Promotion Office

Lluís Foreman
Technician at the IEEC Services and Industrial Promotion Office.

