14.10.2016

WP2 Comparative impact analysis
Tender evaluation criteria

1 General

Tenders will be evaluated and scored in terms of qualitative factors referred to below, on the basis of the extent to which the service offered will increase the likelihood of high-quality operations and financial performance.

In comparing of tenders, there will be used focal points set below, considered the elements included in them as well as weightings of quality factors in the manner described in tender selection criteria.

The quality criteria consist of:
- The tenderer organization's experience in projects of similar type
- Experience of designated to project personnel in projects of similar type (number of projects and personnel).
- Experience of designated to project personnel in projects of similar type (duration of cooperation in months and € value of projects).

2 Personnel

Project manager, experience of equivalent assignments (Annex B2_1)

- Proven experience in similar tasks is appreciated. By similar task is understood assessments of a large scale transport investments, which have included assessment of highways, tunnel, tunnel systems, railways, bridges, or streets and roads.
- Evaluation shall be carried out based on references given in form B.2_1:
- With regard to reference objects, it is appreciated that the job title and contents of the reference correspond with the assignment now under procurement and that the scope of reference (duration and value € for the person involved) is equivalent with the subject-matter in question.

Level	Points	Criteria and justification
Excellent	9 - 10	All references are derived from project manager role in assessment of large-scale transport investments. Contents and scope of references correspond excellently to the assignment under procurement.
Good	7 - 8	Among references, there are those derived from project manager role in assessment of large-scale transport investments. Contents and scope of references correspond well to the assignment under procurement.
Satisfactory	5 - 6	Among references, there are those derived from project manager role in assessment of large-scale transport investments. Majority of given references correspond in scope to the assignment under procurement.
Weak	3-4	Among references, there are those derived from project manager role in assessment of large-scale transport investments. Part of given references correspond in content and scope to the assignment under procurement.
Poor	1-2	Among references, there are those derived from assessment of large-scale transport investments. Given references correspond poorly in content and scope to the assignment under procurement or there are only few references.

Key-persons, references of corresponding tasks (Annexes B2_2-7)

- traffic volume estimations (B2_2)
- wider comparative impact analysis (B2_3)
- standard cost-benefit analysis (B2_4)
- general traffic systems and costs (B2_5)
- road and rail traffic systems and costs (B2_6)
- maritime systems and costs (B2_7)

- By similar task is understood assessments of a large scale transport investments, which have included assessment of highways, tunnel, tunnel systems, railways, bridges, or streets and roads.
- Traffic volume estimations means experience of assessments of passenger and cargo volumes on large-scale transport systems, e.g. assessment of highways, tunnel, tunnel systems, railways, bridges, or streets and roads.
- Wider comparative impact analysis means experience in assessments of comprehensive impact of large-scale transport investments, such as, among other things, assessments from social and economic point of view e.g. of highways, tunnel, tunnel systems, railways, bridges, or streets and roads.
- Standard cost-benefit analysis means experience in assessment of impacts of large-scale transport investments, e.g. assessment of highways, tunnel, tunnel systems, railways, bridges, or streets and roads. The experience in project must be gained in assessments carried out according to Finnish, Estonian and European methodology.
- General traffic systems and costs means experience in assessment of operation and costs in large-scale transport investment e.g. assessment of highways, tunnel, tunnel systems, railways, bridges, or streets and roads.
- Road and rail traffic systems and costs means experience in assessment of operation and costs in large-scale highway and railway investment e.g. assessment of highways, tunnel, tunnel systems, railways, bridges, or streets and roads.
- Maritime systems and costs means experience in assessment of large-scale maritime functionalities and costs, e.g, assessments of ports, operative costs, fixed costs and competitive situation.
- Evaluation shall be carried out based on references given in forms B.2_2-7:
- In comparison, priority will be given to references performed in role of a key-person. References presented in other roles will be taken into account as secondary. With regard to reference objects, it is appreciated that the job title and contents of the reference correspond with the assignment under procurement and that the scope of reference (duration and value € for the person involved) is equivalent with the subject-matter in question.

Level	Points	Criteria and justifications
Excellent	9-10	All or next to all references of the key-person are performed in the same key-person role to which he is offered. Contents and scope of references correspond excellently to the assignment under procurement.
Good	7-8	Among the references there are assignments performed in both key-person's role and other roles. Majority of references, however correspond to the key-person's role he is now offered. Contents and scope of references correspond well to the assignment under procurement.
Satisfactory	5-6	Among the references there are mainly works carried out in other roles, and, an individual or none work accomplished on the role to which the person is now offered. Contents and scope of majority of the references correspond to the assignment under procurement.
Weak	3-4	References consist of works in other roles than the key-person role to which the person is now offered. Contents and scope of the references correspond partly to the assignment under procurement.
Poor	1-2	References consist of works in other roles. Given references correspond poorly in content and scope to the assignment under procurement or there are only few references.
	0	The tender must be awarded for evaluation of key-person at least with 1 point. Otherwise, the tender will not be qualitatively accepted and cannot be selected.

3 Projectplan

With regard to project plan section "Background and estimations" will be appreciated:

- Added value to the customer's mission statement brought by the consultant's description. In particular will be appreciated reflection of the consultant's professional expertise as an extension to the customer's mission statement so that specific expertise is anticipated to bring quality to the outcome of the consultant's work.
- Knowledge of volume estimations of different means of transport and existing transport systems allocated to the scope of this assignment and the project entity.

Project plan section "Background and estimations" will be evaluated as average of the subsections above based on criteria below.

Assessment factor	Points	Criteria and justification
Excellent	9-10	In the project plan, description of courses of conduct and priorities are presented at excellent level, and the customer can anticipate added value from the quality of outcome. Coordination of various sectors of planning is described at excellent level. The description shows in detail and with high quality, how the consultant manages the assignment entity. The project plan shows at excellent level cooperation between various work packages and ensuring of the total quality of analysis. Description of courses of conduct shows at excellent level the approval procedures and identifies the points of adoption by the customer within this assignment.
Good	7-8	In the project plan, description of courses of conduct and priorities are presented at good level, and based on the description the customer can anticipate some added value from the quality of outcome. Coordination of various sectors of planning is described at good level. The description shows in detail, how the consultant manages the assignment entity. The project plan shows at good level cooperation between various work packages and ensuring of the total quality of analysis. Description of courses of conduct shows at good level the approval procedures and identifies the points of adoption by the customer within this assignment.

Satisfactory	5-6	In the project plan, description of courses of conduct and priorities are presented at satisfactory level. Based on the description the customer cannot anticipate any particular added value from the quality of outcome. Coordination of various sectors of planning is described at satisfactory level. The description shows at general level, how the consultant manages the assignment entity. The project plan shows at satisfactory level cooperation between various work packages and ensuring of the total quality of analysis. Description of courses of conduct shows some approval procedures, but the points of adoption by the customer are actually not allocated.
Weak	3-4	In the project plan, description of courses of conduct and priorities are presented at incomplete level, furthermore it is not targeted to this assignment. Coordination of various sectors of planning is described at incomplete level. The description does not actually show how the consultant manages the assignment entity. The project plan shows at incomplete level cooperation between various work packages and ensuring of the total quality of analysis. Description of courses of conduct shows some approval procedures, but the points of adoption by the customer are not allocated.

Poor	1-2	In the project plan, description of courses of conduct and priorities are presented at poor level, or not presented at all. Coordination of various sectors of planning is touched in the project plan, but as a whole, it is presented at a very insufficient level. The project plan shows at poor level cooperation between various work packages and ensuring of the total quality of analysis. Description of courses of conduct touches approval procedures, but as a whole, at a very insufficient level.
(not a ground for rejection)	0	No such section exists in the project plan.

4 Project plan section ”Comparative impact analysis”- is appreciated in this project as follows:

- The comparative impact analysis (CIA) shall be made both for FL and Zero+ -alternatives. The CIA shall include social, economic and demographic aspects with both direct and indirect and dynamic effects. In the tender, the methodology of the analysis has to be clearly presented with detailed explanations and justifications.
- The customer will evaluate methodologies of analysis based on their extent. Particular attention will be paid to reasoning, why the particular methodologies were chosen.
- In section ”Comparative impact analysis” the customer appreciates based on commonly approved methodologies in-depth analysis, direct, indirect and dynamic impacts of transport investments included.

Comparative impact analysis section will be evaluated as average of the subsections above based on criteria below.

Assessment factor	Points	Criteria and justifications
Excellent	9-10	Comparative impact analysis Different methodologies of analysis are identified in particularly extent

		way as well as and their grounds. Capability to justify why the particular methodologies have been chosen for this work. The consultant's wide range expertise in analyzing transport investments gives to the customer extra added value.
Good	7-8	Comparative impact analysis Different methodologies of analysis are identified comprehensively as well as and their grounds. Capability to justify why the particular methodologies have been chosen for this work. The consultant's expertise in analyzing transport investments gives to the customer added value.
Satisfactory	5-6	Comparative impact analysis Different methodologies of analysis are identified as well as and their grounds. Capability to tell at general level, how they are applicable in this work.
Weak	3-4	Comparative impact analysis Different methodologies of analysis are identified as well as and their grounds, but they are not targeted to this work.
Poor	1-2	Comparative impact analysis has been overlooked in the project plan almost completely.
Ground for rejection	0	No such section exists in the project plan.

5 Project plan section ”Standard cost-benefit analysis” –is appreciated as follows:

The standard cost-benefit analysis shall be made for the FL-solution and 0+ solution in contrast to Zero-alternative. The analysis should be made not only for the tunnel, but for the whole transport chain from the origin of the travel to the destination. The alternative start and end points of the travel chain have to be presented. The standard analysis have to be carried out in Finnish, Estonian and EU standard methods.

The customer appreciates in particular the explanation and justification of the methods taken have to be given in the tender.

Assessment factor	Points	Criteria and justifications
Excellent	9-10	Standard cost-benefit analysis Different methodologies of analysis are identified in particularly extent way as well as and their grounds. Capability to justify why the particular methodologies have been chosen for this work. The consultant’s wide range expertise in analyzing transport investments gives to the customer extra added value.
Good	7-8	Standard cost-benefit analysis Different methodologies of analysis are identified comprehensively as well as and their grounds. Capability to justify why the particular methodologies have been chosen for this work. The consultant’s expertise in analyzing transport investments gives to the customer extra added value.
Satisfactory	5-6	Standard cost-benefit analysis Different methodologies of analysis are identified as well as and their grounds. Capability to tell at general level, how they are applicable in this work.

Weak	3-4	Standard cost-benefit analysis Different methodologies of analysis are identified as well as and their grounds, but they are not targeted to this work.
Poor	1-2	Standard cost-benefit analysis has been overlooked in the project plan almost completely.
Ground for rejection	0	No such section exists in the project plan.

6 Preliminary quality plan

With regard to preliminary quality plan will be appreciated:

- With regard to the preliminary quality plan it will be evaluated, how the company quality system methods are targeted to contents of procurement. In particular will be appreciated reflection of the consultant's professional expertise and that specific expertise is anticipated to bring quality to the outcome of the consultant's work.
- The customer appreciates a clear and appropriate to the content of the procurement description of quality management methods, responsibilities and documentation. Especially will be appreciated effectiveness of the described and that they contribute to the implementation of a high-quality plan.

Preliminary quality plan section will be evaluated as average of the subsections above based on criteria below.

Assessment factor	**Points**	**Criteria and justification**
Excellent	9-10	In the preliminary quality plan, the company's quality management methods have been identified and targeted in detail and particularly comprehensively with regard to the scope of assignation. Quality management methods will bring additional value to the customer. Quality management methods, responsibilities and documentation are described at excellent level. The

		description shows in detail and with high quality, how the consultant manages the entity of quality.
Good	7-8	In the preliminary quality plan, the company's quality management methods have been identified and targeted well with regard to the scope of assignation. Quality management methods will bring some additional value to the customer. Quality management methods, responsibilities and documentation are described well. The description shows in detail, how the consultant manages the entity of quality.
Satisfactory	5-6	In the preliminary quality plan, the company's quality management methods have been identified and targeted at general level with regard to the scope of assignation. Quality management methods, responsibilities and documentation are described at satisfactory level. The description shows at general level, how the consultant manages the entity of quality
Weak	3-4	In the preliminary quality plan, the company's quality management methods have been identified with regard to the scope of assignation, but not targeted Quality management methods, responsibilities and documentation are described at weak level. The description does not actually show, how the consultant manages the entity of quality

Poor	1-2	In the preliminary quality plan, the company's quality system/quality management methods have been touched, but not targeted to this assignment. Quality management methods, responsibilities and documentation have been touched in the project plan, but, seen as a whole, far too insufficently
Ground for re-jection	0	No such section exists in the project plan.