Evaluation Matrix

"Benthic (benthos) Survey (TW and EEZ)"

Status: 04/11/2026

Table of Contents

1. Introduction 3
2. Overview of award criteria 3
3. Evaluation 4
3.1. Total price in EUR (net) 4
3.2. Methodological approach to benthos survey in the North Sea (TW and EEZ) 5
3.3. Risk and task management 7
3.4. Project organisation 8
3.5. HSE 9

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 price with 30%.

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

2. Overview of award criteria

No	Award Criterion	Weight	Scoring	Max achievable points
1	Total price in EUR (net)	30%	0-30	30
2	Methodological approach to benthos survey in the North Sea (TW and EEZ)	25%	0-25	25
3	Risk and task management	10%	0-10	10
4	Project organisation	25%	0-25	25
5	HSE	10%	0-10	10
	Total score	**100%**		**100**

3. Evaluation

The evaluation of offers is based on the award criteria described below.

3.1. Total price in EUR (net)

The evaluation of the main award criterion “Total 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 “[Cell F 65 of the Excel worksheet Pricing Sheet]” as stated in the **Attachment B.3** (Pricing Sheet) (= evaluation price). The evaluation price is taken from the revision of Attachment B.3 (Pricing Sheet) issued for the respective offer phase (initial offer or final offer), including any items added or amended following the negotiations. The day rates stated in Section 4 of the Pricing Sheet (Rates for Variations Vessels) are not part of the evaluation price.

(2) Evaluation Method

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

The offer with the lowest valuation price will be evaluated with the maximum of 30 points in relation to this criterion. For every other offer, the points are calculated as follows: Points = 30 – 30 × (valuation price of the offer – lowest valuation price) / lowest valuation price. The result is rounded to two decimal places using standard arithmetic rounding (a third decimal place of 0 to 4 shall result in rounding down, a third decimal place of 5 to 9 shall result in rounding up). No rounding is applied to intermediate results. Negative results are set to 0 points; 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:
Valuation 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:
30 Points × 15,000 Euro / 45,000 Euro = 10.00 Points
Result Tenderer 2: 30 Points – 10.00 Points = 20.00 Points

Example 2:
Tenderer 1: 45,000 Euro
Tenderer 2: 100,000 Euro
Tenderer 1 receives 30 Points
Calculation for Tenderer 2:
Valuation 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:
30 Points × 55,000 Euro / 45,000 Euro = 36.67 Points
Result Tenderer 2: 30 Points – 36.67 Points = –6.67 Points, results in 0 Points

3.2. Methodological approach to benthos survey in the North Sea (TW and EEZ)

The evaluation of the criterion “Methodological approach to benthos survey in the North Sea (TW and EEZ)” is included in the overall evaluation of the offers with a total of 25%. A maximum of 25 points can be achieved in total.

The tenderer shall describe and document the technical capabilities for conducting benthos survey according to the Standard Investigation Concept (StUK4) in the German EEZ (North Sea) as well as the requirements of the Lower Saxony Department for Water, Coastal and Nature Conservation (Niedersächsischer Landesbetrieb für Wasserwirtschaft, Küsten- und Naturschutz (NLWKN)), the Lower Saxony Wadden Sea National Park Administration (Nationalparkverwaltung Niedersächsisches Wattenmeer (NLPV)), and Gemeinsame Übergangsbestimmungen zum Umgang mit Baggergut in den Küstengewässern (Joint Transitional Arrangements for the Handling of Dredged Material in German Federal Coastal Waterways (GÜBAK)).

Expectation: The tenderer shall submit a method statement in accordance with the Standard Investigation Concept (StUK4) and requirements of the Lower Saxony Departments NLWKN, NLPV and the requirements of GÜBAK, addressing the following aspects:

- Completeness of the methods with regard to the requirements specified in the GASCADE/AquaDuctus Scope of Work and the quality of the alignment between the methods and the GASCADE/AquaDuctus Scope of Work.
- Proposed method(s) for the required investigations.
- Timetable including necessary preparatory and follow-up work.
- Information on the planned vessel and equipment specifications list with a short description of previous linear infrastructure projects.

The tenderer must create a separate document (Offer Document B_Tenderer Name: Method statement) for the tender. Detailed, complete and comprehensible documentation in continuous text is required (max 20 DIN A4 pages, font: Arial, font size 11).

Relevant for the evaluation is the **Attachment B.10** (Self-declaration vessel).

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: Clear and understandable description of equipment and vessels with regard to the task in the project and why it is suitable.

- Limitations of vessel deployment with regard to weather limitation (wave heights and wind speeds) when using the tools.

The evaluation for the criterion “Methodological approach to benthos survey in the North Sea (TW and EEZ)” is based on a qualitative evaluation as follows:

Grade	Points	Descriptive explanation
very good	25	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	20	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	15	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 satisfactory performance.
sufficient	10	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 sufficient performance.
poor	5	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.

3.3. 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 describe the identified risks (apart from HSE risks, which are covered under item 3.5 HSE) related to the execution and planning, as well as the specific control and mitigation measures, for the benthos survey.

Expectation: A clear description of the proposed method(s) for implementation with a view to minimising the most significant execution/planning risks (implementation & logistic, planning & methodology, safety & infrastructure, ecological impacts).

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. 5 DIN A4 pages, font: Arial, font size 11).

Evaluation aspects:

- A 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.

3.4. Project organisation

The evaluation of the criterion “Project organisation” is included in the overall evaluation of the offers with a total of 25%. A maximum of 25 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 (as described in the pricing document and below), details of their previous project experience and their CVs, including the legally required offshore training certificates:

- Project manager
- Environmental expert
- GIS engineer
- Draughtsman
- Engineer

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. 20 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/GASCADE 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/GASCADE expectations.

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

Grade	Points	Descriptive explanation
very good	25	The project organisation 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	20	The project organisation plan provides good details on roles, responsibilities, and staff qualifications. Personnel experience meets the requirements, and the organisational 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	15	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	10	The project organisation 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	5	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 organisation 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.

3.5. 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 comprehensive HSE plan describing the overall implementation of HSE principles within the tenderer's organisation.

Expectation: The HSE plan must specify the proposed HSE personnel structure, including its linkage to management, along with qualifications (CVs) of the appointed HSE staff.

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 which 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 which suggest a satisfactory 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 a sufficient 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.

*****