



Evaluation Matrix (Offers)

ILI HYRER/HYREL

Internal identifier: 2026-048

Status: 06.10.2026



Table of contents

1. Introduction	3
2. Overview of award criteria.....	3
2.1. Lots 1 and 9 (Cleaning and gauging).....	3
2.2. Lots 2 and 10 (Mapping)	4
2.3. Lots 3 and 11 (Internal and external metal-loss anomalies)	4
2.4. Lots 4 and 12 (Dents, ovalities and roof topping)	5
2.5. Lots 5 and 13 (Axial cracking and crack-like anomalies)	6
2.6. Lots 6 and 14 (Pipe material hardness variation)	7
2.7. Lots 7 and 15 (Pipe material type variation)	7
2.8. Lots 8 and 16 (Axial strain)	8
3. Evaluation	8
3.1. Price in EUR (net)	8
3.2. Performance Specification	10
3.2.1. Lots 2 and 10 (Mapping)	11
3.2.2. Lots 3 and 11 (Internal and external metal-loss anomalies)	11
3.2.3. Lots 4 and 12 (Dents, ovalities and roof topping)	12
3.2.4. Lots 5 and 13 (Axial cracking and crack-like anomalies)	12
3.2.5. Lots 6 and 14 (Pipe material hardness variation)	13
3.2.6. Lots 7 and 15 (Pipe material type variation)	13
3.2.7. Lots 8 and 16 (Axial strain)	13
3.3. Concept.....	14
4. References	17



1. Introduction

The contract will be awarded – subject to the 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 and associated sub-criteria listed below, see section 2.

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

Each award criterion (and, where applicable, sub-criterion) is weighted as a percentage. The total weightings of the individual criteria add up to 100%.

All quantitative award criteria are rounded commercially to the third decimal place (Excel function '=ROUND([evaluation result];3)').

The score of the tenders is calculated separately for each lot.

The offer with the highest total score in each lot – subject to the combination of lots (set out in Procedure Letter No. 1) – will be awarded the contract.

2. Overview of award criteria

The award criteria applicable to the evaluation of the offers are set out in detail below.

2.1. Lots 1 and 9 (Cleaning and gauging)

Nr.	Award Criterion	Weight	Max. Achievable Points
1	Price in EUR (net)	50%	50
2.	Concept	50%	50
		100 %	100



2.2. Lots 2 and 10 (Mapping)

Nr.	Award Criterion	Sub-criterion	Weight	Max. Achievable Points
1	Price in EUR (net)		40%	40
2	Performance Specification		40%	40
2.1		Accelerometer accuracy	20%	20
2.2		Gyroscope accuracy	20%	20
3.	Concept		20%	20
			100%	100

2.3. Lots 3 and 11 (Internal and external metal-loss anomalies)

Nr.	Award Criterion	Sub-criterion	Weight	Max. Achievable Points
1	Price in EUR (net)		40%	40
2	Performance Specification		40%	40
2.1		Min. depth of ext. ML in PB	10%	10
2.2		Min. depth of ext. ML in GW	10%	10
2.3		Min. depth of ext. ML in LS	10%	10
2.4		Depth sizing accuracy	5%	5
2.5		Length sizing accuracy	5%	5
3.	Concept		20%	20
			100%	100

**2.4. Lots 4 and 12 (Dents, ovalities and roof topping)**

Nr.	Award Criterion	Sub-criterion	Weight	Max. Achievable Points
1	Price in EUR (net)		40%	40
2	Performance Specification		40%	40
2.1		Min. plain dent depth	8%	8
2.2		Min. ovality	8%	8
2.3		Min. roof topping height	8%	8
2.4		Plain dent depth sizing accuracy	8%	8
2.5		Plain dent length and width sizing accuracy	8%	8
3.	Concept		20%	20
			100%	100



2.5. Lots 5 and 13 (Axial cracking and crack-like anomalies)

Nr.	Award Criterion	Sub-criterion	Weight	Max. Achievable Points
1	Price in EUR (net)		40%	40
2	Performance Specification		40%	40
2.1		Min. crack depth in PB	10%	10
2.2		Min. crack depth in GW	10%	10
2.3		Min. crack depth in LS	10%	10
2.4		Depth sizing accuracy	5%	5
2.5		Length sizing accuracy	5%	5
3.	Concept		20%	20
			100%	100



2.6. Lots 6 and 14 (Pipe material hardness variation)

Nr.	Award Criterion	Sub-criterion	Weight	Max. Achievable Points
1	Price in EUR (net)		40%	40
2	Performance Specification		40%	40
2.1		Min. hardness differential in PB	15%	15
2.2		Min. hardness differential in LS	15%	15
2.3		Hardness sizing accuracy	10%	10
3.	Concept		20%	20
			100%	100

2.7. Lots 7 and 15 (Pipe material type variation)

Nr.	Award Criterion	Sub-criterion	Weight	Max. Achievable Points
1	Price in EUR (net)		40%	40
2	Performance Specification		40%	40
2.1		Pipe material UTS	20%	20
2.2		Pipe material SMYS	20%	20
3.	Concept		20%	20
			100%	100



2.8. Lots 8 and 16 (Axial strain)

Nr.	Award Criterion	Sub-criterion	Weight	Max. Achievable Points
1	Price in EUR (net)		40%	40
2	Performance Specification		40%	40
2.1		Axial strain	20%	20
2.2		Axial strain accuracy	20%	20
3.	Concept		20%	20
			100%	100

3. Evaluation

The offer evaluation is conducted based on the award criteria and sub-criteria described below.

3.1. Price in EUR (net)

For Lot 1 and 9 the evaluation of the award criterion "Price in EUR (net)" contributes a total of 50% to the overall evaluation of the offers. A maximum of 50 points can be awarded in total.

For Lot 2 to 8 and Lot 10 to 16 the evaluation of the award criterion "Price in EUR (net)" contributes a total of 40% to the overall evaluation of the offers. A maximum of 40 points can be awarded in total.

(1) Evaluation Relevant Information

The evaluation relevant factor is the "Price in EUR (net)" per Lot in Appendix B.2 Pricing Sheet (=Evaluation Price).

(2) Evaluation Method

If multiple offers are submitted with different evaluation prices, the comparative evaluation of this criterion is conducted as follows:

The offer with the lowest evaluation price will receive 40 respectively 50 points for this criterion. The scores of offers with higher evaluation prices will be determined through linear interpolation. A score of 40 respectively 50 corresponds to the lowest evaluation price in the comparison field, a score of 0 corresponds to a (hypothetical) offer at twice the lowest evaluation price. No fewer than 0 points may be awarded.

The score will be rounded to three decimal places.

(3) Example

$$\text{Points} = [\text{maximum achievable points}] \times \left[2 - \left(\frac{[\text{evaluation price}]}{[\text{lowest evaluation price}]} \right) \right]$$

Tenderer A: 200.000,00 € (Evaluation Price)

Tenderer B: 300.000,00 € (Evaluation Price)

Points awarded to Tenderer A:

$$40 \times \left[2 - \left(\frac{200.000,00 \text{ €}}{200.000,00 \text{ €}} \right) \right] = 40$$

Points awarded to Tenderer B:

$$40 \times \left[2 - \left(\frac{300.000,00 \text{ €}}{200.000,00 \text{ €}} \right) \right] = 20$$



3.2. Performance Specification

For Lot 1 and 9 “Cleaning and gauging” no evaluation of the award criterion “Performance Specification” is considered.

For Lot 2 to 8 and Lot 10 to 16 the evaluation of the award criterion “Performance Specification” contributes a total of 40% to the overall evaluation of the offers. A maximum of 40 points can be awarded in total for each category. Evaluation is conducted using different criteria for each category as shown in sections 3.2.1 to 3.2.7. No fewer than 0 points may be awarded.

(1) Evaluation Relevant Information

The evaluation relevant factor is the “Performance specification” in Appendix B.1.1 Performance Specification.

(2) Evaluation Method

If multiple offers are submitted for a certain category, the comparative evaluation of this category is conducted as follows:

A score of maximum points as indicated for each criterion corresponds to the best performance in the comparison field for this criterion. The best performance is recognized as the most favorable performance, i.e. the highest accuracy but the smallest minimum depth.

The scores of offers with different than best performance will be determined through linear interpolation for this criterion. A score of 0 corresponds to a (hypothetical) offer at twice the best evaluation performance. Offers that do not meet one or more of the minimum requirements indicated (if any) will not be considered for evaluation of this category. The relevant offer for the lot will be excluded.

All scores will be rounded to three decimal places.

(3) Example

$$\text{Points} = [\text{maximum achievable points}] \times \left[2 - \left(\frac{[\text{evaluation performance}]}{[\text{best evaluation performance}]} \right) \right]$$

Lot 3 and 11, Criterion line 2: Depth sizing accuracy of ext. ML for Pitting at a certainty of 80%

Tenderer A: ± 1.2 mm

Tenderer B: ± 0.8 mm

Points awarded to Tenderer A:

$$10 \times \left[2 - \left(\frac{1.2 \text{ mm}}{0.8 \text{ mm}} \right) \right] = 5$$



Points awarded to Tenderer B:

$$10 \times \left[2 - \left(\frac{0.8 \text{ mm}}{0.8 \text{ mm}} \right) \right] = 10$$

3.2.1. Lots 2 and 10 (Mapping)

This category refers to definitions and parameters provided in section Appendix 1 of [1].

Description	Location	Max. points	Min. requirement
Accelerometer accuracy	n/a	20	n/a
Gyroscope accuracy	n/a	20	n/a

3.2.2. Lots 3 and 11 (Internal and external metal-loss anomalies)

This category of pipeline anomalies refers to definitions and parameters provided in section 2.4.1. of [1].

Description	Location	Max. points	Min. requirement
Min. depth of ext. ML of dimension 2t × 2t (Pitting) for detection and sizing at POD = 90%	In PB	10	10% of t
Min. depth of ext. ML of dimension 2t × 2t (Pitting) for detection and sizing at POD = 90%	In GW	10	n/a
Min. depth of ext. ML of dimension 2t × 2t (Pitting) for detection and sizing at POD = 90%	In LS	10	n/a
Depth sizing accuracy of ext. ML for Pitting at a certainty of 80%	In PB	5	n/a
Length sizing accuracy of ext. ML for Pitting at a certainty of 80%	In PB	5	n/a



3.2.3. Lots 4 and 12 (Dents, ovalities and roof topping)

This category of pipeline anomalies refers to definitions and parameters provided in section 2.4.2., 2.4.4 and 2.4.7 of [1].

Description	Location	Max. points	Min. requirement
Min. plain dent depth w.r.t. OD at POD = 90%	In PB	8	2.0%
Min. ovality w.r.t. OD at POD = 90%	n/a	8	n/a
Min. roof topping height w.r.t. OD at POD = 90%	n/a	8	n/a
Plain dent depth sizing accuracy w.r.t. the OD at a certainty of 80%	In PB	8	± 1.0%
Plain dent length and width sizing accuracy at a certainty of 80%	In PB	8	± 30 mm

3.2.4. Lots 5 and 13 (Axial cracking and crack-like anomalies)

This category of pipeline anomalies refers to definitions and the understanding provided in section 2.4.8. of [1].

Description	Location	Max. points	Min. requirement
Min. crack depth at POD = 90% with L = 50 mm	In PB	10	n/a
Min. crack depth at POD = 90% with L = 50 mm	In GW	10	n/a
Min. crack depth at POD = 90% with L = 50 mm	In LS	10	n/a
Depth sizing accuracy at a certainty of 80%	In PB	5	n/a
Length sizing accuracy at a certainty of 80%	In PB	5	n/a



3.2.5. Lots 6 and 14 (Pipe material hardness variation)

This category of pipeline anomalies refers to definitions and the understanding provided in section 2.4.12. of [1].

Description	Location	Max. points	Min. requirement
Min. hardness differential w.r.t. nominal pipe body at POD = 90%	In PB	15	n/a
Min. hardness differential w.r.t. nominal pipe body at POD = 90%	In LS	15	n/a
Hardness sizing accuracy at a certainty of 80%	In PB	10	n/a

3.2.6. Lots 7 and 15 (Pipe material type variation)

This category of pipeline anomalies refers to definitions and the understanding provided in section 2.4.13. of [1].

Description	Location	Max. points	Min. requirement
Pipe material UTS sizing accuracy at a certainty of 80%	n/a	20	± 75 MPa
Pipe material SMYS sizing accuracy at a certainty of 80%	n/a	20	± 75 MPa

3.2.7. Lots 8 and 16 (Axial strain)

This category refers to definitions and the understanding provided in section 19.10 of [2].

Description	Location	Max. points	Min. requirement
Axial strain at POD = 90%	n/a	20	0.025%
Axial strain accuracy at a certainty of 80%	n/a	20	n/a



3.3. Concept

For Lot 1 and 9 the evaluation of the award criterion "Concept" contributes a total of 50% to the overall evaluation of the offers. A maximum of 50 points can be awarded in total.

For Lot 2 to 8 and Lot 10 to 16 the evaluation of the award criterion "Concept" contributes a total of 20% to the overall evaluation of the offers. A maximum of 20 points can be awarded in total.

(1) Evaluation-Relevant Aspects

This award criterion evaluates the concept.

For Lot 1 and 9 the tenderer shall address at least the following evaluation relevant information:

- Staff planing (Qualification, etc.)
- Pig availability with respect to the planned execution periods. A granularity of calendar weeks is preferred.
- Minimum turnaround time of pigs in between runs and requirements to ensure the stated turnaround time can be met.
- Pig data sheets including maximum inspection.
- Implementation of HSE requirements.
- Statement on any other company procedure or equipment limitation that might affect the schedule of tool runs.

For Lot 2 to 8 and Lot 10 to 16 the tenderer shall address at least the following evaluation relevant information:

- Staff planning
Minimum requirement (failure to meet will result in exclusion):
Personnel operating ILI tools, processing or analysing ILI data must be qualified according to the ANSI/ASNT standard for personnel qualification and certification for ILI technologies used in the examination of pipelines (ANSI/ASNT ILI-PQ-2023).
There shall be at least one (1) ILI tool operator onsite that holds a level 2 and at least one (1) ILI tool operator available for support that holds a level 3. There shall be at least one (1) data analyst for the analysis and review of anomalies that holds a level 2 and at least one (1) data analyst for the report reviews that holds a level 3.
- ILI tool availability with respect to the planned execution periods. A granularity of calendar weeks is preferred.
- Minimum turnaround time of pigs and ILI tools in between runs and requirements to ensure the stated turnaround time can be met.
- ILI tool data sheets including maximum inspection distance based on calculated battery lifetime assuming a tool velocity of 2 m/s and remaining battery safety.
- Method statement to ensure operational and data analysis quality.



- In case requested ILI reporting times cannot be met, alternative expedited reporting timelines must be provided for:
 - Data quality report
 - Preliminary inspection report
 - Final inspection report
- Implementation of HSE requirements.
- Statement on any other company procedure or equipment limitation that might affect the schedule of tool runs, data processing, analysis and reporting.

(2) Evaluation Method

The concept will be subject to an expert assessment in accordance with the criteria set out below. Half points may also be awarded to ensure an appropriate evaluation of the concept:

0 – 1 points

The explanations are not comprehensible and are insufficiently substantiated from a technical perspective. Sound arguments or supporting evidence are lacking. It is not apparent that the required service can be performed, or it is apparent that it cannot be performed.

2 points

The explanations are barely comprehensible. The technical substantiation is inadequate or contains significant gaps. There are serious doubts as to whether the required service can be performed to more than a minor extent.

3 points

The explanations are comprehensible; however, the technical substantiation remains weak and/or superficial. There are evident gaps in the reasoning or methodological derivation. The required service can be performed in part.

4 points

The explanations are comprehensible, and the technical substantiation is sound, although not consistently detailed. There are isolated methodological or argumentative weaknesses, but these do not materially impair the overall assessment. It is apparent that the required service can be performed to a large extent.

5 points

The explanations are readily comprehensible, and the technical substantiation is convincing and coherent. Relevant technical methods and arguments are appropriately presented and supported. It is apparent that the required service can be performed in full.

The ratio of the evaluation points awarded to the maximum evaluation points achievable is multiplied by the weighting of the criterion.



(3) Example

$$\text{Points} = [\text{maximum achievable points}] \times \frac{[\text{evaluation points awarded}]}{[\text{maximum achievable evaluation points}]}$$

Tenderer A: 2,5 points (evaluation points awarded)

Tenderer B: 4,5 points (evaluation points awarded)

Points awarded to Tenderer A:

$$20 \times \frac{2,5}{5} = 10$$

Points awarded to Tenderer B:

$$20 \times \frac{4,5}{5} = 18$$



4. References

[1] Pipeline Operators Forum, 100 Specifications and requirements for In-Line Inspection of pipelines, 2021

[2] Penspen, The Pipeline Defect Assessment Manual, Edition 2.1, 2024