

Evaluation Matrix

“Environmental survey and Environmental Impact Assessment (EIA) for Shore Crossing”

Status: 18/08/2026

Table of Contents

1. Introduction	3
2. Overview of award criteria	3
3. Evaluation	3
3.1. Total price in EUR (net)	3
3.2. Relevant environmental experience and geographical expertise of key personnel in accordance with project type and area	4
3.2.1. Relevant environmental experience and geographical expertise	5
3.2.2. Project type and area of experience	5
3.3. Project organisation chart	7
3.4. Quality of the submitted project execution plan and schedule in accordance with the SoW	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
2.1	Relevant environmental experience and geographical expertise of key personnel in accordance with project type and area	35%	0-35	35
2.2	Project organisation chart	20%	0-20	20
2.3	Quality of the submitted project execution plan and schedule in accordance with the SoW	15%	0-15	15
	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 33 of the Excel worksheet Pricing Sheet]” as stated in the **Attachment B.3** (Pricing Sheet) (= 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 amount of the valuation 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 valuation price of the offer with the lowest amount of the valuation price, which results in the ratio "Points per Euro". The ratio "Points per Euro" will be rounded to four decimal places using standard arithmetic rounding. A fifth decimal place of 0 to 4 shall result in rounding down, and a fifth decimal place of 5 to 9 shall result in rounding up. 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 = 0.0007 Points/Euro

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:

0.0007 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 = 0.0007 Points/Euro

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:

0.0007 Points/Euro multiplied by 55,000 Euro = 38.5 Points

Result tenderer 2: 30 Points – 38.5 Points = -8.5 Points results in 0 Points

3.2. Relevant environmental experience and geographical expertise of key personnel in accordance with project type and area

The evaluation of the criterion "Relevant environmental experience and geographical expertise of key personnel in accordance with project type and area" is included in the overall evaluation of the offers with a total of 35%. A maximum of 35 points can be achieved in total.

The evaluation will be based on the relevant environmental experience and geographical expertise of key personnel, with particular consideration to the relevance and quality of the referenced projects to be filled in **Attachment B.8** (Key Personnel CVs and experience).

The tenderer shall complete **Attachment B.8** (Key personnel CVs and experience) for each key individual proposed for the AquaDuctus project (one person per role; a person may not be nominated for more than one role). The key personnel are defined as follows:

- Project manager
- GIS expert
- Senior environmental expert

Expectation: The tenderer shall demonstrate experience of its key personnel, as far as possible within the past 10 years, in preparing environmental documentation for the planning approval procedure for comparable linear infrastructure projects in the German Wadden Sea area, including projects involving trenchless shore crossing construction techniques.

Tenderer is to provide 1 to 3 reference assignments of each of the nominated key person within the **Attachment B.8** Key personnel CVs and experience form. At least one reference contract is required. The references shall fulfil the following requirements:

- a) Contract value $\geq$ €100,000 net;
- b) Personal working hours of the nominated key person: $\geq$ 400 hours for Project manager and Senior environmental expert each; $\geq$ 100 hours for GIS expert;
- c) Services provided within the last 10 years prior to the publication of the contract notice;
- d) Relevance to comparable linear infrastructure projects in the German Wadden Sea area involving trenchless shore crossing construction techniques.

The submitted references must include information on the above criteria and include, as a minimum, the following information to demonstrate comparability:

3.2.1. Relevant environmental experience and geographical expertise

Expectation: The key personnel should as far as possible, have experience in preparing environmental documentation for the planning approval procedure in the German Wadden Sea area.

The submitted information to the “Relevant environmental experience” stated in **Attachment B.8** (Key Personnel CVs and experience), Cell 17 will be used to evaluate this criterion.

3.2.2. Project type and area of experience

Expectation: Professional experience of a similar type, scope, and experience.

The submitted Information to the “Project type and area of experience” stated in **Attachment B.8** (Key Personnel CVs and experience), Cells 19-21 will be used to evaluate this criterion.

Aspects relevant to the evaluation

- 1 Preparation of environmental application documentation including environmental impact assessment and trenchless shore crossing construction techniques for linear infrastructure in the German Wadden Sea area
- 2 Managing/supporting during the planning approval procedure for a linear infrastructure project in the German Wadden Sea area
- 3 Managing/supporting the permit compliance assurance for a linear infrastructure project in the German Wadden Sea area

Evaluation aspects: a concise description of relevant previous linear infrastructure projects, with particular emphasis on trenchless shore-crossing construction techniques as documented in environmental application submissions. The assessment will ascertain the completeness and assess relevance of the submitted project references, as well as demonstrated direct experience for linear infrastructure projects in the German Wadden Sea area within the specified time frame. Particular attention will be given to the scale and complexity of these projects in comparison to the requirements of the current project.

The evaluation for the criterion “Relevant environmental experience and geographical expertise of key personnel in accordance with project type and area” is based on a qualitative evaluation as follows:

Grade	Points	Descriptive explanation
very good	35	The environmental expertise and geographical experience of the key personnel, as outlined in Attachment B.8 (Key Personnel CVs and Experience) with regards to the list of comparable projects significantly exceeds the stated requirements. Based on the submitted documentation, the tenderer's very good performance can be inferred.
good	30	The environmental experience and geographical expertise of key personnel as outlined in Attachment B.8 (Key Personnel CVs and Experience) with regards to the list of comparable projects is detailed and demonstrates the ability to perform the work which meets the requirements. Based on the documentation, the tenderer's good performance can be inferred.
satisfactory	25	The environmental experience and geographical expertise of key personnel as outlined in Attachment B.8 (Key Personnel CVs and Experience) with regards to the list of comparable projects 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. Based on the documentation, the tenderer's satisfactory performance can be inferred.
sufficient	20	The environmental experience and geographical expertise of key personnel as outlined in Attachment B.8 (Key Personnel CVs and Experience) with regards to the list of comparable projects includes limited details (i.e. some aspects are left open or questionable) but the offered solution does meet the requirements. Based on the documentation, the tenderer's sufficient performance can be inferred.
poor	10	The environmental experience and geographical expertise of key personnel as outlined in Attachment B.8 (Key Personnel CVs and Experience) with regards to the list of comparable

		projects is only below average and has severe gaps and/or inconsistencies or suggest weaknesses in performance. Based on the documentation, the tenderer's poor performance can be inferred.
insufficient	0	The environmental experience and geographical expertise of key personnel as outlined in Attachment B.8 (Key Personnel CVs and Experience) with regards to the list of comparable projects is not satisfactory in several 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. Based on the documentation, the tenderer's insufficient performance can be inferred.

3.3. Project organisation chart

The evaluation of the criterion "Project organisation chart" 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 project organisation chart 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 organisation chart (organigram) shall provide full transparency on the project's human resource structure and management hierarchy, as well as a short management description on how to provide high-quality work. The description should convincingly demonstrate the tenderer's ability to ensure that qualified and competent staff will be available throughout the entire project, enabling efficient resource utilisation, reliable delivery of all contractual obligations, and robust quality assurance.

The tenderer must create a separate document (Offer Document C_ Tenderer Name: Project organisation chart) 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:

- Personnel identification: The tenderer provides a complete list of project personnel as defined, supplemented by information on the role, qualification, know-how and experience of each individual.
- 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 smooth and uninterrupted project execution.

- Availability of the required know-how and experience: The tenderer provides evidence that staff members with the technical skills, certifications, and project experience necessary for their respective roles are integrated in the project organisation.
- 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 chart" is based on a qualitative evaluation as follows:

Grade	Points	Descriptive explanation
very good	20	The project organisation chart demonstrates a very high level of professionalism. Roles, responsibilities, and reporting lines are fully clear. Qualified and experienced personnel is integrated into the project organisation in such a way that one can expect the project to run smoothly 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 organisation chart provides good detail on roles, responsibilities, and staff qualifications. The organisational chart is coherent, and qualified and experienced personnel is integrated into the project organisation in such a way that one can expect the project to run reliably well. 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 chart is adequate but only partially detailed. Qualified and experienced personnel is integrated into the project organisation in such a way that one can expect the project to run sufficiently reliable 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 which will be sufficiently reliable, but not beyond the standard.

sufficient	8	The project organisation chart provides limited information, with insufficient details about roles, qualifications, or responsibilities. Qualified and experienced personnel is integrated into the project organisation in such a way that one can expect the project to run reliably well. 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 chart is incomplete or missing, with critical gaps in staff allocation, or organisational structure. No recognisable quality management responsibilities or processes are described. The explanations indicate a poor performance.
insufficient	0	The project organisation is largely lacking clear roles, responsibilities, and reporting lines. Qualified and experienced personnel is insufficiently integrated into the project organisation, no adequate substitution plans, and QA/QC integration. The explanations indicate an insufficient performance.

3.4. Quality of the submitted project execution plan and schedule in accordance with the SoW

The evaluation of the criterion “Quality of the submitted project execution plan and schedule in accordance with the SoW” is included in the overall evaluation of the offers with a total of 15%. A maximum of 15 points can be achieved in total.

The tenderer shall describe and document the capabilities for conducting environmental consulting works in accordance with the Scope of Work and schedule.

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

The schedule must be detailed, complete and comprehensible described (DIN A4, Arial), which has to show the milestones set out in the Scope of Work. The schedule may not exceed 50 tasks and milestones. The document should be submitted, in Primavera, MS Project or equivalent application with an MS Project import file export and pdf (the schedule must be uploaded with a zip file).

The Project execution plan (PEP) must outline a fast, efficient, and high-quality approach to service delivery. The PEP is a project-specific, practical, and clearly structured plan, demonstrating the tenderer’s early engagement with project conditions. The PEP presents initial solution approaches, including quality management, cost and schedule control, and pricing considerations. It reflects a solid understanding of the required scope of services and identifies key success factors, without going into excessive detail. The proposed headlines are:

1. PEP purpose and scope
2. Project description
3. Project timeline
4. Detailed Scope of Works
5. Objectives, expectations and critical success factors
6. Project organisation

7. Administration and communication
8. Project schedule and cost estimating
9. Project control
10. Permitting and regulatory compliance
11. Risks and risk mitigation management
12. Close-out and lessons learned

Expectation: a complete proposal meeting the requirements of the Scope of Work with the following attachments:

- Project execution plan
- Schedule (The project time schedule will be assessed based on its clarity, feasibility, and alignment with the overall project's objectives and deadlines)

Evaluation aspects: The project execution plan and schedule shall demonstrate:

- 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 technical resources and required equipment (not personnel resources) to each phase of the project, demonstrating an efficient and balanced use of 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.

The evaluation for the criterion "Quality of the submitted project execution plan and schedule in accordance with the SoW" is based on a qualitative evaluation as follows:

Grade	Points	Descriptive explanation
very good	15	The project execution plan (PEP) and schedule exceed all requirements and expectations in an outstanding manner. The PEP and schedule are very well-founded and very coherent that suggests a very good and very efficient task fulfilment. The descriptions of the PEP largely or completely demonstrate professional performance in the required quality and a smooth 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	12	The project execution plan (PEP) and schedule exceed most requirements and expectations. The PEP and schedule are well- founded and coherent, that suggests a good and efficient task fulfilment. The descriptions of the PEP highly demonstrate professional performance in the required quality and a smooth execution of the delivery of services according to the Scope of Work. Structured, above average explanations, that suggest a good performance.
satisfactory	9	The project execution plan (PEP) and schedule meet the requirements and expectations in the upper average range. The PEP and schedule are mostly coherent, that suggests an efficient task fulfilment. The description of the PEP only indicates professional performance in the required quality and a smooth execution of the delivery of services according to the Scope of Work. Structured, above average explanations, that suggest a good performance.
sufficient	6	The project execution plan (PEP) and schedule meet the requirements and expectations in the average range. The PEP and schedule are partially coherent, that suggests an at least partially efficient task fulfilment. The descriptions of the draft PEP only partially indicate professional performance in the required quality and a smooth execution of the delivery of services according to the Scope of Work. Partially structured, average explanations, that suggest a satisfying performance.
poor	3	The project execution plan (PEP) and schedule are only below average and has severe gaps and/or inconsistencies or indicate weaknesses in performance. The descriptions of the PEP hardly indicate professional performance in the required quality and a smooth execution of the delivery of services according to the Scope of Work.
insufficient	0	The project execution plan (PEP) and schedule are inadequate. They fail to demonstrate a workable concept. The descriptions of the PEP do not or only very poorly indicate professional performance in the required quality and a smooth 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.
