

CRITERIA AND METHODOLOGY FOR EVALUATING PROPOSALS

1. This annex provides the criteria for evaluating the most economically advantageous proposal, their values, formulas used to calculate the economic benefit of proposals, and a description of the expert evaluation methodology.
2. The Suppliers, when disclosing the values of the parameters in their proposal, must realistically assess their ability to fulfil the commitments regarding the proposed services throughout the entire duration of the service procurement contract.
3. The evaluation criteria for proposals are presented in the table below:

Evaluation criteria for proposals:

Evaluation criteria	Relative weight	Maximum points
First criterion: Price (excluding VAT) (A)	A = 50	<i>Maximum rating: A (Min. 0 points, Max. 50 points)</i>
Second criterion: Experience of specialists (B)	B = 15	<i>Maximum rating: B (Min. 0 points, Max. 15 points)</i>
Third criterion: Technical Proposal and Interview with the Supplier's Team (C)	C = 35	<i>Maximum rating: C (Min. 0 points, Max. 35 points)</i>
<p>Economic benefit (S) of the proposal is calculated by summing up the economic benefit scores assigned to price (A), specialist experience (B), and Technical Proposal and Interview with the Supplier's Team (C) used in evaluating the proposal of the Supplier.</p> $S = A + B + C$		

Evaluation methodology

1. First criterion: Price (excluding VAT) (A)

Evaluation methodology
<p>The purpose of this criterion is to evaluate the cost of the proposed services. The Supplier's price (excluding VAT) (A) for evaluation purposes is considered as the total proposed price of the services (excluding VAT), which includes all the Supplier's expenses, payable amounts, taxes (excluding VAT), and fees related to service provision.</p> <p>The score for the price (A) of the proposal is calculated by multiplying the ratio of the minimum proposed price (A_{min}) and the evaluated proposal price (A_p) by the weight of the price comparison.</p> $A = \frac{A_{min}}{A_p} \cdot 50$

2. Second criterion: Experience of specialists (B)

Evaluation methodology

The purpose of this criterion is to evaluate the additional experience of the specialists proposed by the Supplier meeting the minimum qualification requirements, in terms of providing the services. The evaluation encompasses the experience of specialists that exceeds the minimum qualification requirements taking into account their competencies, additional completed contracts/projects, or contracts in which the specialists participated in performing the required functions, demonstrating greater experience than specified and required in the minimum qualification requirements.

Note:

- All specialists proposed by the Supplier must be dedicated to the provision of the services. To replace the proposed specialists during the validity period of the contract, a specialist with an equivalent or higher qualification, accompanied by supporting documents proving this must be proposed, and the approval of the Buyer confirming the suitability of the proposed specialist and compliance with the qualification proposed by the Supplier must be obtained.

- All evaluated specialists receiving scores for their experience must be the same as those stated to demonstrate compliance with the minimum qualification requirements of the participants.

- Projects that are used to demonstrate specialist's compliance with the minimum qualification requirements are not considered in the evaluation of experience of specialists (i.e. do not receive additional points in the evaluation). The evaluated project must be completed, i.e., a service acceptance and handover certificate must be signed.

- The experience of only one specialist is evaluated in each position, except for Legal Team. If more than one specialist is proposed for Team Coordinator (Project Manager) or Economist (finance – investment expert), the evaluation will be based on the experience of the specialist with the least experience among all the specialists listed in the supplier's submitted list (according to form provided in Annex 7 to Special Procurement Conditions).

- The Supplier is encouraged and welcome to form a wider team as deemed needed for provision of specific aspects of the service. Nevertheless, the evaluation and scoring will be based solely on the experience of the following specialists: Team Coordinator (Project Manager), Economist (finance – investment expert), Legal Advisor. The Supplier shall not receive additional points for any other specialists engaged.

The score for specialist experience (B) is calculated by multiplying the ratio of the sum of points for the Supplier's proposed specialist experience (B_p) to the maximum sum of points for specialist experience by the weight of the specialist experience comparison.

$$B = \frac{B_p}{10} \cdot 15$$

2.1. Team Coordinator (Project Manager)

Criterion	Criterion Compliance Level	Awarded Points
1. Over the last 3 years (calculated until the last day of application submission), has either led or been responsible for at least 2 (two) strategic consulting service contracts or study development services or projects with a value of no less than 100 000.00 EUR (excluding VAT) per contract. The services were provided to a company or group of companies operating in countries within the European Union and/or Organisation for Economic Co-operation and Development (OECD).	Implemented 2 contracts with a value of no less than 100 000.00 EUR (excluding VAT) per contract	1
	Implemented 3 or more contracts with a value of no less than 100 000.00 EUR (excluding VAT) per contract	1,5
2. During the past 5 years, has been in charge of providing strategic consulting services or the preparation of studies related to the financing and/or corporate governance of energy projects with a value of no less than EUR 100 million (excluding VAT).	Implemented 1 contract	1
	Implemented 2 or more contracts	2
3. Over the past 5 years, has provided strategic consulting services related to regulatory regimes/issues for companies or groups of companies engaged in regulated electricity sector activities.	Consulted 1 company or groups of companies	0,5
	Consulted 2 companies or groups of companies	1
	Consulted 3 or more companies or groups of companies	1,5
The maximum number of points for Team Coordinator (project manager) criteria		5,0

2.2. Economist (finance – investment expert)

Criterion	Criterion Compliance Level	Awarded Points
1. In the last 3 years (calculated until the last day of application submission), has participated in or been responsible for providing consultations in at least 2 (two) for financial modelling and/or investment opportunity assessment and/or Strategic Consulting Services for a company or group of companies, where the contract value was not	Implemented 2 contracts with a value of no less than 70 000.00 EUR (excluding VAT) per contract	1,5
	Implemented 3 or more contracts with a value of no less than 70 000.00 EUR (excluding VAT) per contract	2

less than 70 000.00 EUR (excluding VAT) per contract.		
The maximum number of points for Economist criteria		2

2.3. Legal Advisor(s)

Criterion	Criterion Compliance Level	Awarded Points
<p>1. For the purposes of this procurement, “Legal Team” means one or more individual Legal Advisors proposed by the Supplier to provide the legal advisory services under the contract.</p> <p>Over the past 3 years, (calculated until the final date for submission of applications), the Legal Team must include at least one Legal Advisor who has personally participated in, or been responsible for, the delivery of at least one contract that involved legal analysis or legal advisory services related to the assessment, development, or implementation of energy legislation and/or energy infrastructure project development in Germany or the Baltic states (Lithuania or Latvia). The contract value must be no less than EUR 70 000.00 (excluding VAT).</p> <p>The services were provided to company, or to a group of companies, operating in one or more countries, that are members of either the European Union or Organisation for Economic Co-operation and Development (OECD).</p>	<p>The Legal Team has collectively delivered one or more contracts (each with a value of not less than EUR 70 000.00 excluding VAT) that demonstrate legal advisory experience in each of Germany, Lithuania, and Latvia (i.e. all three countries are covered at least once).</p>	1
	<p>In addition to meeting the 1-point criterion, the Legal Team includes at least one Legal Advisor who has either:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> provided legal advice on a cross-border electricity interconnector contract, or gained relevant legal advisory experience in at least two further EU Member States or the United Kingdom (other than Germany, Lithuania or Latvia). 	2
	<p>In addition to meeting the 1-point criterion, the Legal Team includes at least one Legal Advisor who has both:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> provided legal advice on a cross-border electricity interconnector contract, and Gained relevant legal advisory experience in at least two further EU Member States or the United Kingdom (other than Germany, Lithuania or Latvia). 	3
The maximum number of points for Legal Advisor(s) criteria		3

Examples:

- 1 contract in Germany and Lithuania and Latvia = 1 point.
- 2 in Germany + 1 in Lithuania + 1 in Latvia = 1 point.

3. Third criterion: Technical Proposal and Interview with the Supplier's Team (C)

Evaluation methodology

The purpose of this criterion is to evaluate the Supplier's vision, methodology, and understanding of the services requested by the Buyer. The evaluation under this criterion is based on two parts:

1. **A written technical proposal**, submitted together with the Supplier's offer; and
2. **An interview**, during which the Supplier presents and explains the submitted proposal and answers related questions.

The written technical proposal must not exceed 10 pages and shall clearly describe the Supplier's proposed methodology, approach to implementation, and key delivery elements of the Study.

If the written technical proposal exceeds 10 pages, only the first 10 pages will be evaluated, and any content beyond this limit will not be taken into consideration during the evaluation.

The proposal must address, at minimum:

- Understanding of the procurement object and objectives of the Study;
- The proposed analytical methodology and logic for evaluating financing, ownership, and governance models;
- A draft outline or narrative structure of the final Study report;
- A detailed work plan and timeline, including key deliverables and stakeholder interaction milestones;
- Roles and responsibilities of proposed team members and coordination mechanisms;
- Risk identification and mitigation measures;
- The stakeholder engagement strategy, including proposed sessions, interviews, and feedback loops;
- A list of information, resources, and support required from the Buyer.

The written technical proposal will be evaluated by the appointed representatives of the Buyer. Each representative will provide an individual assessment and score. The final interview score will be calculated as the arithmetic average of all individual scores.

The interview with the Supplier's team will be conducted remotely (via Microsoft Teams or a similar platform) and will last up to 1 hour. An invitation to the interview will be sent no less than 5 business days before the scheduled date.

The Supplier shall be represented by the Team Coordinator and may additionally include up to two (2) supporting experts (e.g., legal, financial), all of whom must be the individuals proposed for the execution of the contract. These representatives may participate in the presentation and respond to specific technical questions. This option is provided to ensure that expertise relevant to key aspects of the Study can be demonstrated and addressed during the discussion.

At the beginning of the interview, the Supplier's team, led by the Team Coordinator, will deliver a presentation lasting up to 30 minutes. An extension of up to 10 additional minutes may be granted by the Buyer upon request, provided it is necessary to clearly cover the required topics.

The Supplier is responsible for choosing the visual tools suitable for remote presentation (such as MS PowerPoint slides or other programs and methods) and determining the scope of the presentation within the specified time limits. Upon request by the Buyer, the Supplier must submit their prepared presentation via email. The interview will be recorded for internal purposes of the Buyer only, ensuring objectivity and impartiality.

The second part of the interview will be organized as the questions and answers session. The Supplier will be provided with a preliminary list of questions at least 2 business days prior to the meeting, which will serve as the basis for the interview's Q&A part.

The interview will be evaluated by the appointed representatives of the Buyer. Each representative will provide an individual assessment and score. The final interview score will be calculated as the arithmetic average of all individual scores.

If necessary, the Buyer may request brief written clarifications within 2 business days following the interview.

The total score for criterion (C) is calculated by summing the points awarded for the written technical proposal and the interview, and then proportionally adjusting the total to reflect the overall weight of criterion (C) in the evaluation framework. The score is calculated using the following formula:

$$C = \frac{C_t + C_i}{25} \cdot 35$$

Where:

- C_t - the score awarded for the written technical proposal (maximum 15 points), evaluated based on the clarity, relevance, feasibility, and completeness of the proposed methodology;
- C_i - the score awarded for the Interview (maximum 10 points), evaluated based on the Supplier's ability to explain, justify, and demonstrate the practical readiness to implement their proposal.

3.1. Scores for the written Technical proposal:

Criterion	Criterion Compliance Level	Awarded Points
<p>1. Understanding of the procurement object and strategic context. The written technical proposal demonstrates the Supplier's understanding of the Study's purpose, its strategic value to the Baltic and EU context, and the key constraints such as regulatory complexity, investment scale, and electricity tariff sensitivity.</p>	The proposal shows limited or generic understanding of the Study's objectives and lacks context.	0
	The proposal reflects a general understanding of the Study's objectives and context but lacks depth or specificity.	0,5
	The proposal presents a clear, contextualized understanding of the Study's purpose and strategic drivers.	1
<p>2. Methodology and analytical logic. The technical proposal must provide a clear, structured, and tailored methodology for delivering the Study, including the approach to evaluating financing, ownership, and governance models, benchmarking case studies, and addressing regulatory feasibility.</p>	The methodology does not cover some or all of the required topics.	0
	The methodology covers all of the required topics, but lacks clarity and depth, relevance to the procurement object and/or is short of concise steps to ensure smooth delivery of the services. Most topics are covered vaguely or too broadly.	2

	The methodology is relevant, covers all the required topics but may lack depth or clarity in some (minority) of the topics or is not sufficiently specific in terms of draft project plan.	4
	The methodology is relevant, fully and comprehensively addresses all the listed topics with clear explanations and supporting details. Additional, relevant topics for the Buyer are addressed briefly in order to ensure smooth provision of services	6
3. Work plan and timeline. The proposal includes a realistic and phased work plan, clearly linking activities to deliverables and accounting for stakeholder involvement and review points.	The work plan is vague, lacks detail, or appears unrealistic.	0
	The work plan is generally clear but lacks integration of deliverables, stakeholder steps, or concrete timing.	1,5
	The work plan is detailed, realistic, and shows a logical phasing of tasks, stakeholder sessions, and deliverables.	2
4. Team roles and resource planning. The proposal defines roles of the Supplier's team, linking expert functions to specific tasks and clearly describing the coordination mechanisms.	Team roles are unclear or disconnected from the work plan.	0
	Team roles are generally described, but internal coordination and responsibilities are not clearly linked to outputs.	1
	Team roles and coordination are clearly structured, and team members are logically assigned to key tasks.	1,5
5. Buyer support and assumptions. The proposal defines what support, data, access, or inputs the Supplier will require from the Buyer, and outlines key assumptions impacting delivery.	No Buyer support requirements or assumptions are defined.	0
	Buyer support is briefly mentioned but lacks specificity.	0,5
	Buyer support is described in detail, specific data, access, or stakeholder facilitation needs are clearly listed, with reasonable assumptions stated.	1
6. Risk management and stakeholder strategy. The proposal identifies delivery risks and outlines mitigation strategies, as well as a stakeholder engagement plan.	Risks or stakeholder engagement are not meaningfully addressed, lacking a more serious or substantive description in the proposal.	0
	Risks and stakeholder steps are mentioned but they are neither detailed nor	0,5

	operational - lacking the practical detail and definition required for implementation.	
	The proposal provides a clear risk register and practical stakeholder engagement approach, including planned interactions and mitigation strategies.	1
7. Structure and logic of the final deliverable. The proposal outlines the intended structure and narrative flow of the final report, showing how it will support Buyer decision-making.	No structure or logic of the final deliverable is provided	0
	A general outline or structure is given but lacks detail or decision-use orientation.	1
	A well-structured and purposeful outline is provided, aligned with the Study's goals and Buyer decision-making needs.	1,5
8. Structure of the technical proposal. The presentation is well-structured and organized, with clear sections and a logical flow of information.	The technical proposal lacks structure and coherence, making it challenging to follow the flow of information.	0
	The technical proposal has some structure, but it lacks a clear organisation, and information is unconnected (fragmented).	0,5
	The technical proposal is well-structured, organised and has a logical progression of ideas.	1
The maximum number of points for technical proposal part criteria combined		15

3.2. Scores for the Presentation Part of the Interview with the Supplier's Team:

Criterion	Criterion Compliance Level	Awarded Points
1. Structure of the presentation. The presentation delivered by the Supplier's team is well-structured and organized, with clear sections and a logical flow of information.	The presentation lacks structure and coherence, making it challenging to follow the flow of information.	0
	The presentation has some structure, but it lacks a clear organization, and information is unconnected (fragmented).	0,5
	The presentation is well-structured, organized and has a logical progression of ideas.	1
2. Visual elements and information summary. The visual elements used by the Supplier's team in the presentation, such as charts,	The visual elements and summarization of information are of poor quality, making it difficult to understand the information presented.	0

graphs, and illustrations, are of high quality, making the information easily understandable, readable, and well summarized.	The visual elements and summarization of information are adequate but lack clarity or fail to improve the overall presentation.	0,5
	The visual elements and summarization of information are of good quality, engaging, and assists in conveying the information effectively.	1
The maximum number of points for the presentation part of the interview, delivered by the Supplier's team		2

3.3. Scores for the interview Q&A session with the Supplier's team:

Criterion	Criterion Compliance Level	Awarded Points
1. Understanding and reflection on Buyer's needs (as defined in the Technical specification). The Supplier's team answers demonstrate a good understanding of the Buyer's needs and reflect on the topics discussed during the interview.	The Supplier's team answers are irrelevant, do not show an understanding of the Buyer's needs, and they fail to reflect upon the topics adequately.	0
	The Supplier's team answers partially demonstrate an understanding of the Buyer's needs, but the reflections are not comprehensive and insightful.	1
	The Supplier's team answers show a good understanding of the Buyer's needs and offer meaningful, relevant reflections on the topics discussed.	3
	The Supplier's team answers showcase an excellent understanding of the Buyer's needs and provide thoughtful and in-depth reflections on the interview topics, with relevant coverage and insights of additional topics (when applicable).	4
2. Understanding and explanation of the vision for service implementation. The Supplier's team answers demonstrate a good understanding and present a clear vision of how the services will be implemented to meet the Buyer's requirements.	The Supplier's team answers lack a clear understanding of how the services will be implemented, and their vision is vague or uncertain, the answers do not explain and expand upon key issues.	0
	The Supplier's team answers show some understanding of service implementation, but their vision and explanation of key issues is not detailed or specific and relevant.	1

	The Supplier's team answers show a good understanding of service implementation and present a clear vision of how the services will be delivered to meet the Buyer's requirements. Key issues are addressed and explained.	3
	The Supplier's team answers demonstrate an excellent understanding of service implementation and offer a highly detailed and well-thought-out vision for delivering the services effectively, as well as addresses possible areas of expansion (i.e. additional, relevant topics). The answers elaborate and cover key issues, that are well-defined and addressed.	4
The maximum number of points for the Q&A part of the interview with the Supplier's team		8