See criteria and justifications in Annex 5 to the Invitation to Tender

Tenderers	AECOM Baltics SIA	Ramboll Finland Oy, Sito Oy, Strafica Oy, Kaupunkitutkimus TA Oy, Pöyry Finland Oy	SYSTRA Ltd Oxera Consulting LLP, Praxis Center for Policy Studies, SYSTRA SA, Trafix Oy	TheLINK: Amberg Engineering AG, Amberg Loglay AG, Sweco Finland Oy, Sweco Environment Ltd, OÜ Hendrikson & Ko, WSP Finland Oy, WSP Sverige AB	VR Track Oy – Egis Rail
Project plan Annex B3					
Background and estimations. 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.	Customer cannot see any added value to customer´s mission statement. Scope of this assignment is missing in particular in volume estimations, methods in volume estimations and forecasting are missing and data sources are weak. There is a general plan which reflects consultant´s professional expertise but it does not reflect challenges in this region or bring added value in this assignment.	Background estimation is detailed and shows consultant´s expertise and identification of points of adoption. This brings added value to the customer´s mission statement. Estimation methods are not explained very well and in detail but the background estimations reflect understanding of different means of transport and estimation needs linked to them as well as links of volume estimations and the project entity. FRISBEE model is a black box model and should be opened and explained in the offer to obtain higher score.	Background analysis is general and does not show added value to the customer´s mission statement. General plan for volume estimations exists and it seems to reflect consultant´s expertise but it has not been written in detail to respond this assignment. Based on this documentation it is difficult to evaluate how the colume analysis would be done and what would be the added value to the customer.	Cursory background information description and lack of volume estimation plans. Has not been targeted to this assignment. Does not reflect consultants professional expertise.	Good background information and very good volume estimation plan which shows good expertise but not in excellent level as not detailed enough. Background information and volume estimations both emphasize consultant´s knowledge of Finland, lack of Estonia´s role cannot be anticipated to bring quality to the outcome of the consultant´s work. EMME and Transtools should have been opened in more detail.

	AECOM Baltics SIA	Ramboll Finland Oy, Sito Oy, Strafica Oy, Kaupunkitutkimus TA Oy, Pöyry Finland Oy	SYSTRA Ltd Oxera Consulting LLP, Praxis Center for Policy Studies, SYSTRA SA, Trafix Oy	TheLINK: Amberg Engineering AG, Amberg Loglay AG, Sweco Finland Oy, Sweco Environment Ltd, OÜ Hendrikson & Ko, WSP Finland Oy, WSP Sverige AB	VR Track Oy – Egis Rail
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 justifica-tions. – 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 dynam-ic impacts of transport investments included.	Methodology of the CIA analysis has been well and clearly presented but there are no detailed explanations reflecting this case. Capability to tell about the commonly approved methodologies and raise research questions at a general level but reasoning behing the choosen method for this case is missing.	Applies clearly to the project and reflects deep understanding and indepth analysis of this case. Excellent capability to justify in a clear way why the particular methodology has been chosen to this CIA. All the aspects of the CIA needs have been taken into account. The consultant’s expertise in analyzing transport investments gives to the customer added value.	CIA has no added value or understanding of the scope of the work. The chosen, commonly approved CIA methodology is presented in a very general way but not targeted to the scope of this assignment and lacking justification and reasoning.	CIA has been overlooked in the project plan almost completely. It is included in project plan pictures but its content has not been opened nor methodology introduced.	Methodologies have been described in detail but justification and reasoning does not fit very well to this work. Impact analysis concentrates very much on qualitative methods. RAILPAG guide should have been opened in more detail, now it is left in general level and its justifications and reasoning for this assignment are difficult to evaluate. Multicriteria analysis described in detail is not the wider comparative impact analysis needed in this tender as some of the criteria will be evaluated on qualitative basis only, which is not enough in this case.
	AECOM Baltics SIA	Ramboll Finland Oy, Sito Oy, Strafica Oy, Kaupunkitutkimus TA Oy, Pöyry Finland Oy	SYSTRA Ltd Oxera Consulting LLP, Praxis Center for Policy Studies, SYSTRA SA, Trafix Oy	TheLINK: Amberg Engineering AG, Amberg Loglay AG, Sweco Finland Oy, Sweco Environment Ltd, OÜ Hendrikson & Ko, WSP Finland Oy, WSP Sverige AB	VR Track Oy – Egis Rail

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.	Different methodologies of analysis are identified comprehensively as well as their reasoning. The project plan shows capability to justify why the particular methodologies have been chosen for this work and reasoning gives the customer extra added value. Travel chain has been presented and need to compare different solutions (0,0+,FL) is acknowledged.	Analyses and methodology have been clearly presented and justified. The consultant's wide range of expertise in analyzing Helsinki transport investments, models and transport nodes shows good understanding of regional transport and travelchains, which gives the customer extra added value. Travel chain has been presented and need to compare different solutions (0,0+,FL) is acknowledged.	Very general description, standard cost benefit analysis has not been opened in detail. Project plan does not actually show how the consultant manages the assignment entity and how the analysis are targeted to this work. Travel chain has been presented and need to compare different solutions (0,0+,FL) is acknowledged.	CB analysis has been overlooked almost completely. Methodology of the analysis has not been described and it has not been descrbied that it will be done according to the standards requested.	Standard cost-benefit analysis are identified as well as methodologies and their grounds. Tenderer has the capability to tell at a general level how CBAs are applicable in this work. CBA includes indication of the travel chain requested in the tender documentation. The consultant’s expertise in analyzing transport investments gives to the customer extra added value in particular in comparison of the different solutions (0,0+,FL).