Award Evaluation Matrix

"Geophysical and Geotechnical Survey of the Offshore Platform"

Table of Contents

1. Introduction 3
2. Overview of award criteria 3
3. Evaluation 3
   3.1. General 3
   3.2. Total Tender price in EUR (net) 3
   3.3. Methodological approach 5
   3.4. Risk and task management 7
   3.5. Project organisation 8
   3.6. HSE 11

1. Introduction

The contract will be awarded – if there is no cancellation of the procedure – to the most economically advantageous offer among the offers eligible for evaluation.

The economic advantage is determined based on the award criteria listed below, see section 2.

The economic advantage of the offers is measured by the total score achieved during the evaluation process. A maximum of 100 points can be awarded.

Each award criterion is weighted as a percentage. The total weightings of the individual criteria add up to 100%.

Overall, the technical evaluation is considered with a weighting of 70%, the total Tender price with 30%.

The offer with the highest total score will be awarded the contract.

The contracting authority reserves the right to award the contract without negotiations, based solely on the initial offers if it receives one or more offers without any qualifications; in that case the award is made on the basis of the published award criteria (§ 15 (4) SektVO).

2. Overview of award criteria

No	Award Criterion	Weight	Scoring	Max achievable points
1	Total Tender price in EUR (net)	30%	0-30	30
2.1	Methodological approach to data gathering.	30%	0-30	30
2.2	Project organization	20%	0-20	20
2.3	Risk and Task management	10%	0-10	10
2.4	HSE	10%	0-10	10
	Total score	**100%**		**100**

3. Evaluation

3.1. General

The evaluation of offers is based on the award criteria described below. The maximum number of points that can be achieved is 100 (100 %), in accordance with the Introduction and with the overview table in Section 2.

3.2. Total Tender price in EUR (net)

The evaluation of the main award criterion “Total Tender price in EUR (net)” is included in the overall evaluation of the offers with a total of 30%. A maximum of 30 points can be achieved in total.

The award criterion is evaluated as follows:

(1) Relevant Information for Evaluation

Relevant for the evaluation is the "Total Tender Price" in cell E16 in the summary tab of the Excel Pricing Sheet as stated in Attachment B.3 (Pricing Sheet) (= evaluation price). Cell E16 in the summary tab is the sum of the totals and the vessel and personnel day rates multiplied by the evaluation quantities stated in the Pricing Sheet (day rates are not part of the Contract Price and apply to Variations only).

(2) Evaluation Method

If there are several offers with different information on the amount of the evaluation price, the comparative evaluation of this criterion is carried out as follows:

The offer with the lowest amount of the evaluation price will be evaluated with 30 points in relation to this criterion and determines the value between points and Euros. The 30 points will be divided by the evaluation price of the offer with the lowest amount of the evaluation price, which results in the ratio "Points per Euro". The ratio "Points per Euro" will not be rounded. Instead, calculations continue with the computed fraction/rational number. The difference between the valuation price of the offer with the lowest amount of the valuation price and the valuation price of the respective tenderer will be calculated. Such difference will be multiplied with the "Points per Euro" ratio and shall be deducted from the maximum 30 Points to create the final result in Points for the respective tenderer. Note that the minimum score for this criterion is 0 points.

Example 1:
Tenderer 1: 45,000 Euro
Tenderer 2: 60,000 Euro
Tenderer 1 receives 30 Points
Calculation for Tenderer 2:
30 Points divided by 45,000 Euro = 0.00066667 Points/Euro (unrounded: 30/45,000)
Evaluation price difference Tenderer 2 and Tenderer 1: 60,000 Euro minus 45,000 Euro = 15,000 Euro
Value of points to be deducted from maximum:
0.00066667 Points/Euro multiplied by 15,000 Euro = 10 Points
Result tenderer 2: 30 Points – 10 Points = 20 Points

Example 2:
Tenderer 1: 45,000 Euro
Tenderer 2: 100,000 Euro
Tenderer 1 receives 30 Points
Calculation for Tenderer 2:
30 Points divided by 45,000 Euro = 0.00066667 Points/Euro
Evaluation price difference Tenderer 2 and Tenderer 1: 100,000 Euro minus 45,000 Euro = 55,000 Euro
Value of points to be deducted from maximum:
0.00066667 Points/Euro multiplied by 55,000 Euro = 36.67 Points
Result tenderer 2: 30 Points – 36.67 Points = -6.67 Points results in 0 Points

3.3. Methodological approach

The evaluation of the criterion “Methodological approach” is included in the overall evaluation of the offers with a total of 30%. A maximum of 30 points can be achieved in total.

The tenderer shall describe and document the proposed approach for conducting the Geophysical and Geotechnical Survey (Part 1 – Geophysical Survey and Part 2 – Geotechnical Survey). The tenderer shall demonstrate an understanding of the proposed instrumentation, deployment configurations, measurement capabilities, limitations, data quality considerations and associated operational constraints.

Expectation: The tenderer shall submit a method statement addressing the following aspects:

- Completeness of the methods with regard to the requirements specified in the AquaDuctus Scope of Work and the quality of the alignment between the methods and the AquaDuctus Scope of Work.

- Proposed method(s) for the required investigations, including a description of instrumentation, deployment configuration, measurement specifications, expected data quality and measurement accuracy.

- Demonstration of the tenderer's understanding of the limitations, uncertainties and operational constraints associated with the proposed instrumentation and survey methodology. This shall include discussion of expected data gaps, measurement uncertainties, environmental limitations, configuration-specific constraints, and proposed mitigation measures to ensure data quality and fulfilment of the Scope of Work

- Timetable for the complete Geophysical and Geotechnical Survey campaign (both parts), including all preparatory activities, permitting and approvals from relevant authorities, mobilisation, data acquisition (geophysical before geotechnical, see Scope of Work 4.3), demobilisation, laboratory testing, data processing and reporting. The tenderer shall clearly identify key milestones, dependencies and any assumptions regarding permits, vessel availability, weather windows and access constraints.

- Information on the planned vessels and equipment specifications list.

The tenderer must create a separate document (Offer Document B_Tenderer Name: Method statement) for the tender. A detailed, complete and comprehensible documentation in continuous text is required (max. 5 DIN A4 pages, font: Arial, font size 11).

Note: Attachment B.10 (Self-declaration vessel) is a minimum requirement and not an input to the qualitative assessment of this criterion; it is therefore not evaluated here. The vessel and equipment information to be assessed under this criterion is that contained in the tenderer's method statement (Offer Document B).

Evaluation aspects:

- Completeness of scope: Inclusion of all relevant activities, phases, and milestones, ensuring that the entire Scope of Work is covered without omissions and fully understood by the tenderer.

- Logical sequencing and dependencies: Transparent identification of task dependencies and interrelations, ensuring that the project structure reflects a professional and logical

order of execution and the tenderer therefore shows a deep understanding of such interdependencies.

- Resource efficiency: The tenderer shows a sufficient allocation of appropriate resources (not only personnel but also technical devices) to each phase of the project, demonstrating an efficient and balanced use of personnel, equipment, and support functions.
- Risk awareness and mitigation: The tenderer describes potential risks that may impact the schedule (and therefore the tenderer work), alongside preventive measures and shows contingency plans to ensure timely project completion.
- Alignment with contractual framework: Full consistency with the contractual delivery schedule, including any specific deadlines and submission dates stipulated in the tender documents.
- Milestone clarity: Clear and traceable definition of milestones that serve as control and monitoring points for progress evaluation and reporting.
- Technical alignment and suitability: Clear and understandable description of the proposed equipment, instrumentation, deployment configurations and vessels, including justification of their suitability for the project requirements and operating conditions.
- Understanding of instrumentation capabilities and limitations: Demonstration of a clear understanding of the capabilities, limitations, uncertainties and operational constraints associated with the proposed instrumentation, deployment configurations and survey methods.
- Limitations of vessel deployment with regard to weather limitation (wave heights, currents and wind speeds) when using the equipment.

The evaluation for the criterion “Methodological approach” is based on a qualitative evaluation as follows:

Grade	Points	Descriptive explanation
very good	30	The method statement exceeds all requirements and expectations in an outstanding manner. It is very well-founded and very coherent that suggests a very good and very efficient task fulfilment. The descriptions demonstrate largely or completely professional performance in the required quality and streamlined execution of the delivery of services according to the Scope of Work. Well-structured, far above average explanations, that suggest exceptionally good performance.
good	24	The method statement exceeds most requirements and expectations. It is well- founded and coherent, that suggests good and efficient task fulfilment. The descriptions demonstrate highly professional performance in the required quality and streamlined execution of the delivery of services according to the Scope of Work. Structured, above average explanations, that suggest good performance.
satisfactory	18	The method statement meets the requirements and expectations in the upper average range. It is mostly coherent, that suggests efficient task fulfilment. The descriptions indicate only professional performance in the required quality and

		streamlined execution of the delivery of services according to the Scope of Work. Structured, above average explanations, that suggest good performance.
sufficient	12	The method statement meets the requirements and expectations in the average range. It is partially coherent, that suggests at least partially efficient task fulfilment. The descriptions only partially indicate professional performance in the required quality and streamlined execution of the delivery of services according to the Scope of Work. Partially structured, average explanations, that suggest satisfying performance.
poor	6	The method statement is only below average and has severe gaps and/or inconsistencies or suggests weaknesses in performance. The descriptions hardly indicate professional performance in the required quality and streamlined execution of the delivery of services according to the Scope of Work.
insufficient	0	The method statement is inadequate. It does not reveal a concept that will prove itself with minor modifications. The descriptions do not or only very poorly indicate professional performance in the required quality and streamlined execution of the delivery of services according to the Scope of Work. The methods have significant gaps and/or inconsistencies or suggest significant weaknesses in performance.

3.4. Risk and task management

The evaluation of the criterion “Risk and task management” is included in the overall evaluation of the offers with a total of 10%. A maximum of 10 points can be achieved in total.

The tenderer shall identify and describe the principal risks (excluding HSE risks, which are addressed under Item 3.6 HSE) associated with the planning and execution of the scope. For each identified risk, the tenderer shall describe the proposed preventive, control and mitigation measures, as well as any contingency measures intended to minimise impacts on survey execution, data quality, programme and deliverables.

Expectation: A clear and structured description of the identified project-specific risks, their potential impacts, and the proposed measures for prevention, mitigation and contingency, demonstrating a robust approach to minimising execution and planning risks.

- Identification of the key technical, operational, logistical and schedule-related risks associated with the proposed survey methodology and execution plan.
- Assessment of the potential impact of identified risks on survey execution, data quality, programme and deliverables.
- Description of preventive and mitigation measures to minimise the likelihood and consequences of identified risks.
- Approach to mitigating the risk of loss or damage of towed and deployed equipment (streamers, sources, towfish, drilling/CPT tools), including risks associated with UXO.

- Approach to managing access restrictions and operational constraints, including tidal limitations, , weather windows, vessel draft restrictions and potential inability to access planned survey locations.

- Demonstration that the proposed methodology, equipment, vessels and resources are suitable for the anticipated site conditions and identified project risks.

The tenderer must create a separate document (Offer Document C_ Tenderer Name: Risk and task management) for the tender. A detailed, complete and comprehensible documentation in continuous text is required (max. 2 DIN A4 pages, font: Arial, font size 11).

Evaluation aspects:

- Sophisticated overview of the identified risks and uncertainties regarding delays, including specific control measures.

- Sophisticated method descriptions on how to handle (find, evaluate, mitigate) risks.

- Sophisticated method description on how to track tasks and how to implement respective parties into that.

The evaluation for the criterion “Risk and task management” is based on a qualitative evaluation as follows:

Grade	Points	Descriptive explanation
very good	10	The risk and task management outlined in the offer exceeds the specified requirements. Based on the documentation, the tenderer’s performance can be assessed as very good.
good	8	The risk and task management described in the offer document is detailed and demonstrates the ability to perform the work which meets the requirements.
satisfactory	6	The risk and task management described in the offer document is detailed and demonstrates the ability to perform the work which meets the requirements. However, there may be some gaps/deviations which are of a minor nature and acceptable.
sufficient	4	The risk and task management described in the offer document includes limited details (i.e. some aspects are left open or questionable) but the offered solution does meet the requirements.
poor	2	The risk and task management described in the offer document is only below average and has severe gaps and/or inconsistencies or suggests weaknesses in performance.
insufficient	0	The risk and task management described in the offer document is not satisfactory in a number of areas (i.e. has a number of gaps/deviations in the information provided that are not acceptable) and does not therefore fundamentally meet the requirements.

3.5. Project organisation

The evaluation of the criterion “Project organisation” is included in the overall evaluation of the offers with a total of 20%. A maximum of 20 points can be achieved in total.

The tenderer shall submit a comprehensive project organisation plan that outlines in detail how qualified personnel will be assigned and organised for the execution of the contract and how quality management is assured.

Expectation: This project organisation plan must include a clear organisation chart (organigram), providing full transparency on the project's human resource structure and management hierarchy, as well as a short management description on how to provide full quality work and CVs of the personnel.

Tenderer shall provide a list of key personnel for both parts of the scope (as described in the pricing document and below), details of their previous project experience and their CVs, including the legally required offshore training certificates. Personnel not meeting the stated minimum experience reduce the grade for this criterion; they do not lead to exclusion:

Onshore:

- Project manager (minimum 2 years experience)
- Survey manager / Project Surveyor (minimum 5 years experience)
- GIS engineer/Draftsman (minimum 2 years experience)

Offshore:

- Party chief/ Offshore Project manager (minimum 5 years experience of which 2 years offshore)
- Senior geotechnical engineer / geologist (minimum 5 years experience of which 2 years offshore)
- Senior geophysicist (minimum 5 years experience of which 2 years offshore)
- Senior driller (minimum 5 years experience of which 2 years offshore)
- Senior CPT-technician (minimum 5 years experience of which 2 years offshore)
- Survey Engineer / Surveyor (minimum 2 years offshore experience)
- Data processor (minimum 2 years offshsore experience)

The Tenderer must create a separate document (Offer Document D_ Tenderer Name: Project organisation plan) for the tender. A detailed, complete and comprehensible documentation in continuous text is required (max. 15 DIN A4 pages, font: Arial, font size 11 including CVs).

Evaluation aspects:

- Key personnel identification: The tenderer provides a complete list of key project personnel as defined, supplemented by their CVs and documented evidence of relevant project experience.

- Role and responsibility definition: The tenderer shows clear assignment of responsibilities, functions, and reporting lines for all key roles. Each position shall be described in terms of provided qualifications, decision-making authority, and accountability.

- Organisational transparency: The tenderer provides a well-structured organisational chart that illustrates the reporting hierarchy, internal communication lines, and integration of project-related support functions as well as integration of AquaDuctus personnel.

- Resource adequacy: The tenderer demonstrates how a sufficient number of personnel with the required competencies will be provided to ensure streamlined and uninterrupted project execution.

- Competence and experience: The tenderer provides evidence that staff members possess the technical skills, certifications, and project experience necessary for their respective roles (if not already included in the CVs).

- Geographical allocation: The tenderer hands in a specification of the office locations and operational bases relevant for the project, ensuring that resources are positioned where they are most effective.

- Continuity and substitution planning: The tenderer explains explicit arrangements for replacement in the case of illness, leave, or other absence, ensuring continuous availability of critical personnel and maintaining project stability.

- Integration of quality management: The tenderer clearly describes how quality assurance and quality control (QA/QC) will be embedded in the staffing approach. This includes the definition of roles with explicit quality management responsibilities, processes for internal reviews, reporting lines for quality control, and escalation procedures. The tenderer must demonstrate how quality management will be ensured, both at the organisational and operational level, to guarantee compliance with contractual requirements, industry standards, and AquaDuctus expectations.

The evaluation for the criterion “Project organisation” is based on a qualitative evaluation as follows:

Grade	Points	Descriptive explanation
very good	20	The project organization plan demonstrates a very high level of professionalism. Roles, responsibilities, and reporting lines are fully clear. Personnel qualifications and experience exceed the requirements, and substitution arrangements are comprehensive. Quality management is fully integrated with clearly assigned QA/QC responsibilities and robust processes. The structure shows a very good understanding of the project requirements and provides strong evidence that performance will be excellent.
good	16	The project organization plan provides good details on roles, responsibilities, and staff qualifications. Personnel experience meets the requirements, and the organizational chart is coherent. Substitution arrangements are provided. Quality management is included in a clear but not outstanding manner. The explanations allow the tenderer performance to be inferred as reliably good.

satisfactory	12	The project organisation plan is adequate but only partially detailed. Personnel qualifications and experience meet the minimum requirements, but there are gaps in role descriptions, substitution planning, or organisational clarity. Quality management is only briefly addressed and lacks clear responsibilities or processes. The explanations indicate performance will be sufficiently reliable, but not beyond the standard.
sufficient	8	The project organization plan provides limited information, with insufficient details about roles, qualifications, or responsibilities. Substitution arrangements are unclear. Quality management is only superficially mentioned or not integrated into the staffing structure. The explanations suggest weak overall reliability.
poor	4	The project organisation plan is incomplete or missing, with critical gaps in staff allocation, qualifications, or organisational structure. No recognisable quality management responsibilities or processes are described. The explanations do not allow a reliable evaluation of the tenderer capability.
insufficient	0	The project organization plan lacks clarity, clear roles, responsibilities, and reporting lines are absent. Personnel qualifications, substitution plans, and QA/QC integration are not addressed, preventing reliable evaluation of tenderer capability.

3.6. HSE

The evaluation of the criterion “HSE” is included in the overall evaluation of the offers with a total of 10%. A maximum of 10 points can be achieved in total.

The tenderer shall submit a project-specific HSE plan for this Contract describing how the tenderer's HSE management system will be applied to the geophysical and geotechnical survey campaign (both parts).

Expectation: The HSE plan shall include the proposed HSE personnel structure for the project, including its linkage to management, along with qualifications (CVs) of the appointed HSE staff. It is further to provide:

- Demonstration of safe handling, lifting and deployment of towed sensors, seismic sources, drilling/CPT equipment and associated equipment, including simultaneous operations with other vessels.

- Demonstration of an understanding of the environmental restrictions and permitting requirements associated with operating in the German EEZ under a BSH permit , including underwater noise mitigation for seismic sources and measures to minimise environmental disturbance in this particular project

The tenderer must create a separate document (Offer Document E: Tenderer Name: HSE plan) for the tender. A detailed, complete and comprehensible documentation in continuous text is required (max. 5 DIN A4 pages, font: Arial, font size 11).

Evaluation aspects:

The tenderer shall demonstrate that it has procedures and strategies in place regarding HSE matters and how their performance will be reviewed and monitored throughout the project.

The submission must include evidence of established procedures for ensuring the competence of all personnel. It must also include evidence of ongoing technical and HSE training programmes to ensure the continued competence of personnel and the tenderer as a whole.

The submission must include evidence of tenderer's methodology for identifying and managing environmental aspects and environmental audits. The tenderer must describe its measures to prevent pollution and provide a detailed explanation of its response procedures for incidents such as oil spills.

The evaluation for the criterion "HSE" is based on a qualitative evaluation as follows:

Grade	Points	Descriptive explanation
very good	10	The HSE plan exceeds all requirements and expectations in an outstanding manner. The HSE plan is very well-founded and very coherent that suggests very good and very efficient task fulfilment. The descriptions of the HSE plan largely or completely demonstrate professional performance in the required quality and streamlined execution of the delivery of services according to the Scope of Work. Well-structured, far above average explanations, that suggest an exceptionally good performance.
good	8	The HSE plan exceeds most requirements and expectations. The HSE plan is well- founded and coherent, that suggests good and efficient task fulfilment. The descriptions of the HSE plan highly demonstrate professional performance in the required quality and streamlined execution of the delivery of services according to the Scope of Work. Structured, above average explanations, that suggest a good performance.
satisfactory	6	The HSE plan meets the requirements and expectations in the upper average range. The HSE plan is mostly coherent, that suggests efficient task fulfilment. The description of the HSE plan only indicates professional performance in the required quality and streamlined execution of the delivery of services according to the Scope of Work. Structured, above average explanations, that suggest a good performance.
sufficient	4	The HSE plan meets the requirements and expectations in the average range. The HSE plan is partially coherent, that suggests at least partially efficient task fulfilment. The descriptions of the HSE plan only partially indicate professional performance in the required quality and streamlined execution of the delivery of services according to the Scope of Work. Partially structured, average explanations, that suggest satisfying performance.
poor	2	The HSE plan is only below average and has severe gaps and/or inconsistencies, or suggests weaknesses in performance,. The descriptions of the HSE plan hardly indicate professional performance in the required quality and streamlined execution of the delivery of services according to the Scope of Work.

insufficient	0	The HSE plan is inadequate. It fails to demonstrate a workable concept. The descriptions of HSE plan do not or only very poorly indicate professional performance in the required quality and streamlined execution of the delivery of services according to the Scope of Work. The concept has significant gaps and/or inconsistencies, or suggest significant weaknesses in performance,.

*****