



ENEXIS
PERSONEEL B.V.

DRAFT - RANKING CRITERIA DIALOGUE PHASE

SMART DESIGN SOLUTION

REFERENCE NUMBER: IRT-1001030

Notwithstanding exceptions provided for by law, no part of this invitation to tender may be duplicated and/or disclosed without the written consent of Enexis.

version 2026

CONTENT

Criterion 1 - Alignment of the Solution Direction with SDS (50%)	3
Criterion 2 - Quality of the dialogue contribution (50%)	4

Criterion 1 - Alignment of the Solution Direction with SDS (50%)

CRITERION 1:

Objective

Assess the extent to which the demonstrated solution aligns with Enexis' current and future design, engineering, and asset registration processes.

ASSESSMENT ASPECTS

- Support for the SDS vision.
- Support for design and engineering processes.
- Alignment with the desired future way of working.
- Integration capabilities within the application landscape.
- Flexibility and scalability of the solution.
- Ability to support future developments.

SCORING METHODOLOGY

- ◆ **10: Excellent**, The demonstrated solution is fully and convincingly aligned with the SDS vision and supports the design, engineering, and asset registration processes across the entire value chain. The solution clearly demonstrates a future-proof architecture, strong integration capabilities, scalability, flexibility, and the ability to support future developments. The supplier provides compelling evidence and creates a high degree of confidence in successful implementation and long-term value creation.
- ◆ **7: Good**, The demonstrated solution aligns well with the SDS vision and supports the key design, engineering, and asset registration processes. Integration capabilities, scalability, and future development possibilities are clearly described and largely meet Enexis' objectives. Only minor concerns or dependencies remain.
- ◆ **5: Satisfactory**, The demonstrated solution aligns with the SDS vision at a general level and supports the main processes. However, several aspects remain insufficiently substantiated, unclear, or dependent on future developments. The solution meets the minimum expectations but provides limited added value.
- ◆ **3: Insufficient**, The demonstrated solution shows limited alignment with the SDS vision and/or the desired future way of working. Significant gaps, uncertainties, or risks are present regarding process support, integration, scalability, or future suitability.
- ◆ **0: Unsatisfactory**, The demonstrated solution does not align, or aligns only marginally, with the SDS vision and provides insufficient confidence that Enexis' objectives can be achieved.

Criterion 2 - Quality of the dialogue contribution (50%)

CRITERION 2: QUALITY OF THE DIALOGUE CONTRIBUTION (50%)

Objective

Assess the extent to which the supplier demonstrates an understanding of the underlying needs and actively contributes to the development of the most suitable solution for Enexis throughout the dialogue process.

ASSESSMENT ASPECTS

- Understanding of the strategic objectives of SDS.
- Understanding of Enexis' design, engineering, and asset registration processes.
- Relevance and quality of the questions raised.
- Ability to identify risks and dependencies.
- Ability to identify opportunities and improvement initiatives.
- Extent to which the supplier thinks from the perspective of Enexis' interests rather than solely from the perspective of its standard product functionality.
- Contribution to refining and improving the solution direction.

SCORING METHODOLOGY

- ◆ **10: Excellent**, Throughout the dialogue, the supplier demonstrates a thorough understanding of the SDS objectives and the Enexis context. The supplier asks highly relevant and insightful questions, proactively identifies risks, opportunities, and dependencies, and makes a substantial contribution to improving the solution direction. The supplier consistently acts in the interest of Enexis and contributes significantly to the development of the most suitable solution.
- ◆ **7: Good**, The supplier demonstrates a strong understanding of the objectives and context and provides a constructive contribution throughout the dialogue. Relevant questions are raised, risks and opportunities are identified, and the supplier actively contributes to refining the solution direction with the interests of Enexis clearly in mind.
- ◆ **5: Satisfactory**, The supplier demonstrates an adequate understanding of the objectives and provides useful input during the dialogue. However, the contribution is largely reactive and remains focused primarily on the supplier's own solution rather than actively helping to shape the best overall solution for Enexis.
- ◆ **3: Insufficient**, The supplier demonstrates a limited understanding of the underlying objectives and provides only a limited contribution to the further development of the solution direction. Questions, observations, and suggestions have limited relevance and risks or opportunities are scarcely identified.
- ◆ **0: Unsatisfactory**, The supplier provides little or no meaningful contribution to the dialogue, demonstrates insufficient understanding of the objectives, or focuses exclusively on promoting its own solution without addressing the needs and interests of Enexis.

The assessment focuses on the demonstrated quality of the proposed solution direction and the supplier's contribution to the dialogue process. Particular attention will be given to the supplier's understanding of Enexis' objectives, the quality of the insights provided, and the extent to which the supplier contributes to the development of the most suitable solution for Enexis. The assessment is not based on the commercial attractiveness of the solution or the volume of available functionality, but on the substantive quality and added value of the contribution to the competitive dialogue process.

The score is determined by multiplying the mark obtained (divided by 10) by the criterion's count. For example, if a criterion has 100 as its maximum number of points and the determined number is an 7, then the final score of that criterion is $7/10 \times 100 = 70$.

If the elaboration of the award criteria exceeds the specified number of pages, the text that is more than the prescribed number of pages will not be included in the assessment. We ask you to submit the elaboration in a PDF file of no more than the specified number of A4 per award criterion.