

Capital Programme

Now the drawing board Then all aboard

ORIGINAL

Date
13 April 2017
Version
1.0

**C5200 – Engineering Advisor
Annex L – Award Criteria**

Perform today. Create tomorrow.

Schiphol

CONTENTS

1. TABLE AWARD CRITERIA A-C	3
2. CALCULATION SHEET AWARD CRITERIA A-C	4
3. SCORING TABLE AWARD CRITERION A.1	5
4. SCORING TABLE AWARD CRITERION A.2	6
5. SCORING TABLE AWARD CRITERION B.1	7
6. SCORING TABLE AWARD CRITERION B.2	8
7. SCORING TABLE AWARD CRITERION B.3	9
8. SCORING TABLE AWARD CRITERION C.1	10
9. SCORING TABLE AWARD CRITERION C.2	11
10. SCORING TABLE AWARD CRITERION C.3	12

1. TABLE AWARD CRITERIA A-C

	Source for evaluation	Sub-criterion	Focal area	Goals and priorities SNBV	C. PRICE
A. PEER REVIEWING	Plan of Approach - Vision on the Appointment - Award Criterion A (described below) - Peer reviewing plan v0 - Risk overview - Annex(es) Tenderer	A.1 Understanding of, approach to and management of the peer reviewing process A.2 Risk management (design and engineering)	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Understanding of, approach to and management of peer reviewing the design deliverables as summarised in annex I - Identification of critical design and engineering issues - Tools and methods used for peer reviewing - Approach to challenging others (e.g. SNBV and her contracted Design Consultants) - Risk management in relation to design and engineering 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Realisation of integrated designs that comply with the Client's requirements and are aligned with its strategic vision (see annex J Ambitions Document for more information) - Realisation of sound design and engineering solutions and well-constructed pier, terminal and other assets 	Lump sum offers for: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Peer reviewing pier and airside design deliverables (definitive and technical design deliverables) - Peer reviewing terminal design deliverables (masterplan, preliminary, definitive and technical design deliverables)
B. TEAM COMPOSITION AND STAFFING	Plan of Approach - Vision on the Appointment - Award Criterion B (described below) - CV's - Risk overview - Interview	B.1 Knowledge and experience Core Team Members B.2 Interviews with Core Team Members B.3 Provision of specialists	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Individual competences, experience and knowledge - Interaction between Core Team Members - Maintenance of accrued knowledge and continuous improvement in quality of delivered Services - Adequate and timely provision of specialists 	To attract a professional, stable, capable, experienced and pro-active Consultant	Monthly rates for professional experts and specialists

2. CALCULATION SHEET AWARD CRITERIA A-C

Criterion	Sub-criterion	Maximum score	Proposal score
A. Peer reviewing	A.1 Understanding of, approach to and management of the peer reviewing process	15	
	A.2 Risk management (design and engineering)	5	
B. Team composition and staffing	B.1 Knowledge and experience Core Team Members	20	
	B.2 Interviews with Core Team Members	20	
	B.3 Provision of specialists	10	
B. Price	C.1 Lump sum offers peer reviews pier & airside and terminal	10	
	C.2 Total monthly rates seconded staff	15	
	C.3 Total rates specialists	5	
MAXIMUM TOTAL SCORE		100	
PROPOSAL SCORE			

3. SCORING TABLE AWARD

CRITERION A.1

A.1 Understanding of, approach to and management of the peer reviewing process	
Value (% of maximum score; 15 points)	Appreciation
100%	<p>The Plan of Approach contributes excellently to the realisation of the Consultant's deliverables and provides the assurance to meet the 'goals and priorities SNBV' as determined by all of the <u>evaluation aspects of the understanding of, approach to and management of the peer reviewing process</u> being substantially demonstrated in the Plan of Approach. The <u>evaluation aspects of the understanding of, approach to and management of the peer reviewing process</u> are:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - In-depth understanding of the peer reviewing process, including inherent understanding of the importance of this process, is demonstrated; - There is a coherent approach to peer reviewing; - There is a clear method of managing the reviewing process; - There is a systematic approach to identifying critical design and engineering issues; - The tools and methods used are appropriate to support the peer reviewing process; - The approach provides a clear basis upon which to understand, communicate, influence and argue the need for certain activities to be performed and enables the Consultant to challenge others (e.g. SNBV and her Contracted Designers) based on the results of the peer reviewing process.
80%	<p>The Plan of Approach contributes adequately to the realisation of the Consultant's deliverables and provides the assurance to meet the 'goals and priorities SNBV' as determined by six of the <u>evaluation aspects of the understanding of, approach to and management of the peer reviewing process</u> being substantially demonstrated in the Plan of Approach.</p>
20%	<p>The Plan of Approach contributes poorly to the realisation of the Consultant's deliverables and provides the assurance to meet the 'goals and priorities SNBV' as determined by five of the <u>evaluation aspects of the understanding of, approach to and management of the peer reviewing process</u> being substantially demonstrated in the Plan of Approach.</p>
0%	<p>The Plan of Approach shows that the Tenderer is not capable of realising the Consultant's deliverables and does not provide the assurance to meet the 'goals and priorities SNBV' as determined by less than five of the <u>evaluation aspects of the understanding of, approach to and management of the peer reviewing process</u> being substantially demonstrated in the Plan of Approach.</p>

4. SCORING TABLE AWARD CRITERION A.2

A.2 Risk management (design and engineering)	
Value (% of maximum score; 5 points)	Appreciation
100%	<p>The Plan of Approach contributes excellently to minimizing SNBV risks in relation to design and engineering and provides the assurance to meet the 'goals and priorities SNBV' as determined by all of the <u>evaluation aspects of risk management (peer reviewing)</u> being substantially demonstrated in the Plan of Approach. The <u>evaluation aspects of risk management (peer reviewing)</u> are:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - There is a coherent approach to design and engineering risk identification and management during the peer reviewing process; - There is a systematic approach based on a proven tool kit, tailored to the specific situation of an airport; - It is a pro-active, results oriented, transparent and solution driven approach; - It demonstrates a deep understanding of the SNBV risks and how they can be mitigated.
80%	<p>The Plan of Approach contributes adequately to minimizing SNBV risks in relation to design and engineering and provides the assurance to meet the 'goals and priorities SNBV' as determined by three of the <u>evaluation aspects of risk management (peer reviewing)</u> being substantially demonstrated in the Plan of Approach.</p>
20%	<p>The Plan of Approach contributes poorly to minimizing SNBV risks in relation to design and engineering and provides the assurance to meet the 'goals and priorities SNBV' as determined by two of the <u>evaluation aspects of risk management (peer reviewing)</u> being substantially demonstrated in the Plan of Approach.</p>
0%	<p>The Plan of Approach shows that the Tenderer is not capable of minimizing SNBV risks in relation to design and engineering and does not provide the assurance to meet the 'goals and priorities SNBV' as determined by less than two of the <u>evaluation aspects of risk management (peer reviewing)</u> being substantially demonstrated in the Plan of Approach.</p>

5. SCORING TABLE AWARD

CRITERION B.1

B.1 Knowledge and experience Core Team Members	
Value (% of maximum score; 20 points)	Appreciation
100%	<p>The knowledge and experience of Core Team Members contribute excellently to meet the 'goals and priorities SNBV' as determined by all of the <u>evaluation aspects of knowledge and experience Core Team Members</u> being substantially demonstrated in the Plan of Approach. The <u>evaluation aspects of knowledge and experience Core Team Members</u> are:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Excellent coverage between Core Team Members CV's and job profiles contained in Appendix 2; - Deep knowledge and experience that is appropriate and relevant in relation to the Scope of Services as described in Appendix 1; - Demonstrated capability to collaborate across contractual lines; - Pro-active, results oriented and solution driven individual, that looks to create consensus on a common vision, is aware of the broader project status and the implications of the Engineering Advisor Services on the overall project delivery.
80%	<p>The Plan of Approach contributes adequately to meet the 'goals and priorities SNBV' as determined by three of the <u>evaluation aspects of knowledge and experience Core Team Members</u> being substantially demonstrated in the Plan of Approach.</p>
20%	<p>The Plan of Approach contributes poorly to meet the 'goals and priorities SNBV' as determined by two of the <u>evaluation aspects of knowledge and experience Core Team Members</u> being substantially demonstrated in the Plan of Approach.</p>
0%	<p>The Plan of Approach shows that the Tenderer is not capable of contributing Core Team Members with the required knowledge and experience and does not provide the assurance to meet the 'goals and priorities SNBV' as determined by less than two of the <u>evaluation aspects of knowledge and experience Core Team Members</u> being substantially demonstrated in the Plan of Approach.</p>

6. SCORING TABLE AWARD

CRITERION B.2

B.2 Interviews with Core Team Members	
Value (% of maximum score; 20 points)	Appreciation
100%	<p>The capabilities, qualifications, experience of Core Team Members and the interaction between them contribute excellently to meet the 'goals and priorities SNBV' as determined by all of the <u>evaluation aspects of interviews with Core Team Members</u> being substantially demonstrated during the interviews with the Core Team Members. The <u>evaluation aspects of Interviews with Core Team Members</u> are:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Excellent ability to communicate, and influence; - Deep familiarity with the Plan of Approach; - Motivated, results oriented and pragmatic individual; can work with team, Client and others; sufficient strength of character to take leadership when necessary; - Positive and productive interaction between Core Team Members.
80%	<p>The capabilities, qualifications, experience of Core Team Members and the interaction between them contribute adequately to meet the 'goals and priorities SNBV' as determined by three of the <u>evaluation aspects of interviews with Core Team Members</u> being substantially demonstrated during the interviews with the Core Team Members.</p>
20%	<p>The capabilities, qualifications, experience of Core Team Members and the interaction between them contribute poorly to meet the 'goals and priorities SNBV' as determined by two of the <u>evaluation aspects of interviews with Core Team Members</u> being substantially demonstrated during the interviews with the Core Team Members.</p>
0%	<p>The capabilities, qualifications, experience of Core Team Members and the interaction between them do not/ barely contribute to meet the 'goals and priorities SNBV' as determined by less than two of the <u>evaluation aspects of interviews with Core Team Members</u> being substantially demonstrated during the interviews with the Core Team Members.</p>

7. SCORING TABLE AWARD CRITERION B.3

B.3 Provision of specialists	
Value (% of maximum score; 10 points)	Appreciation
100%	<p>The Plan of Approach contributes excellently to minimizing SNBV risks in relation to the provision of specialists and provides the assurance to meet the 'goals and priorities SNBV' as determined by all of the <u>evaluation aspects of provision of specialists</u> being substantially demonstrated in the Plan of Approach. The <u>evaluation aspects of provision of specialists</u> are:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - There is a coherent approach to risk identification with regards to staffing management in relation to the provision of specialists; - There is an ongoing and systematic approach to sourcing the specialists as listed in the Scope of Services (Appendix 1); - There is a pro-active approach to identifying and securing appropriate specialists throughout the duration of the Agreement at appropriate times; - It demonstrates a deep understanding of the SNBV risks and how they can be mitigated.
80%	<p>The Plan of Approach contributes adequately to minimizing SNBV risks in relation to the provision of specialists and provides the assurance to meet the 'goals and priorities SNBV' as determined by three of the <u>evaluation aspects of provision of specialists</u> being substantially demonstrated in the Plan of Approach.</p>
20%	<p>The Plan of Approach contributes poorly to minimizing SNBV risks in relation to the provision of specialists and provides the assurance to meet the 'goals and priorities SNBV' as determined by two of the <u>evaluation aspects of provision of specialists</u> being substantially demonstrated in the Plan of Approach.</p>
0%	<p>The Plan of Approach shows that the Tenderer is not capable of minimizing SNBV risks in relation to the provision of specialists and does not provide the assurance to meet the 'goals and priorities SNBV' as determined by less than two of the <u>evaluation aspects of provision of specialists</u> being substantially demonstrated in the Plan of Approach.</p>

8. SCORING TABLE AWARD CRITERION C.1

C.1 Lump sum offers peer reviews pier & airside and terminal	
Value	Appreciation
10 points	Lowest total lump sum offer (= total lump sum offers pier & airside + total lump sum offers terminal).
8 points	Second lowest total lump sum offer (= total lump sum offers pier & airside + total lump sum offers terminal).
6 points	Third lowest total lump sum offer (= total lump sum offers pier & airside + total lump sum offers terminal).
4 points	Fourth lowest total lump sum offer (= total lump sum offers pier & airside + total lump sum offers terminal).
2 points	Fifth lowest total lump sum offer (= total lump sum offers pier & airside + total lump sum offers terminal) and all remaining lump sum offers.

In case one or more Tenderers submit equal lump sum offers, they will be awarded an equal amount of points.

9. SCORING TABLE AWARD CRITERION C.2

C.2 Total monthly rates seconded staff	
Value	Appreciation
15 points	Lowest total monthly rates seconded staff.
12 points	Second lowest total monthly rates seconded staff.
9 points	Third lowest total monthly rates seconded staff.
6 points	Fourth lowest total monthly rates seconded staff.
3 points	Fifth lowest total monthly rates seconded staff.

In case one or more Tenderers submit equal lump sum offers, they will be awarded an equal amount of points.

10. SCORING TABLE AWARD CRITERION C.3

C.3 Total rates specialists	
Value	Appreciation
5 points	Lowest total rates specialists (=total daily rate + total monthly rate).
4 points	Second lowest total rates specialists (=total daily rate + total monthly rate).
3 points	Third lowest total rates specialists (=total daily rate + total monthly rate)..
2 points	Fourth lowest total rates specialists (=total daily rate + total monthly rate)..
1 points	Fifth lowest total rates specialists (=total daily rate + total monthly rate)..

In case one or more Tenderers submit equal lump sum offers, they will be awarded an equal amount of points.