

Part 0.c DETAILED DEFINITION OF THE EVALUATION CRITERIA AND RULES OF THE TENDER EVALUATION

pursuant to Section 33 of Act No. 134/2016 Coll., on Public Procurement,
as amended (hereinafter referred to as the "PPA" or the "Act")

Public Contract:

**"High-efficient combined heat and power facility utilizing
renewable sources (OHB II - line K1) "**

over-the-limit utilities contract for construction works awarded in a negotiated
procedure with prior publication pursuant to the provisions of Section 60 of the
PPA,



SAKO Brno, a.s.

registered address: Jedovnická 4247/2, 628 00 Brno

ID No: 60713470

Part 0 - Procurement documentation

List of contents:

- 1. Definition of evaluation criteria 3**
- 2. Basic tender evaluation procedure 4**
- 3. K.1 Overall financial advantageousness 6**
- 4. K.2 Quality of performance..... 8**
- 5. K.3 Layout of the construction and technological solution 14**
- 6. List of appendices 19**

Part 0 - Procurement documentation

1. Definition of evaluation criteria

1.1. Evaluation criteria

The tenders will be evaluated in accordance with Section 114 et. seq. of the PPA on the basis of their economic advantageousness. The most economically advantageous tender is the tender which, in summary, meets the defined evaluation criteria best.

Pursuant to Section 116 of the PPA, the contracting authority set out the following evaluation criteria:

Criterion	Evaluation criteria	Weight
K.1	Overall financial advantageousness	70 %
K.2	Quality of performance	25 %
K.3	Layout of the construction and technological solution	5 %

The contracting authority reserves the right to award the same number of points to individual tenders in the evaluation of the above evaluation criteria, if the participants' tenders provide the same data or contain data indicating the same quality/standard of the offered performance, in particular for the purposes of evaluation based on evaluation criteria K.2 - K.3 (including sub-criteria).

The most economically advantageous tender is the tender that receives the highest total number of points for all the evaluation criteria.

Considering the sub-criteria (K.2), the evaluation criteria are defined as follows:

	Evaluation criteria	Weight
K.1	Overall financial advantageousness	70 %
K.2	Quality of performance	25 %
<i>K.2.1</i>	<i>Proposed technology and solution concept</i>	<i>75 %</i>
<i>K.2.2</i>	<i>Technical guarantees</i>	<i>15 %</i>
<i>K.2.3</i>	<i>Environmental parameters</i>	<i>10 %</i>
K.3	Layout of the construction and technological solution	5 %

Part 0 - Procurement documentation

2. Basic tender evaluation procedure

2.1. Participants ranking:

The contracting authority will evaluate the participants' tenders by means of a scoring method based on the following criteria in the manner set out herein below.

The participants will be ranked based on the awarded sum of points according to individual criteria in relation to values achieved as the sum for the evaluation sub-criteria in relation to each tender (in the case of K.2). Each tender will be awarded a point value that will reflect the success rate of the tender in relation to the relevant evaluation criterion or sub-criterion. A higher total score means a higher ranking within the given criterion or sub-criterion.

As regards the point score, the score for each evaluation criterion and evaluation sub-criterion will be rounded to two decimal places according to the mathematical rules of rounding; such rounding shall be performed by the participant in its tender.

The point values received by the participant within the individual sub-criteria will be weighed by the weight of the given sub-criterion. The points received for all sub-criteria within the relevant evaluation criterion will be added up and weighted by the weight of the relevant evaluation criterion; this will determine the point score of the tender awarded within the relevant evaluation criterion (K.2).

The individual point values received by the participant within the individual evaluation criteria K.1 to K.3 will be added up; the point values thus obtained will determine the overall score of the specific tender.

The participant with the highest total number of points will rank the first. A higher total number of points means a higher ranking of the participant's tender.

In case of equality of points in the total sum, the tender with a higher point score according to the evaluation criterion K.1 will be considered better. In case of equality of tender points even after making comparison within this sub-criterion, the ranking will be determined by a higher point score within the evaluation criterion K.2.

Part 0 - Procurement documentation

For the purposes of tender evaluation, each participant is responsible for providing all data and information so that the contracting authority can properly evaluate the tenders according to the defined evaluation criteria, with the contracting authority requesting the most accurate description and information possible. Within the evaluation criteria K.1 to K.3, as well as within the individual sub-criteria, the participant shall provide a sufficient description so that the contracting authority can properly evaluate the tenders. The lack of data and information provided by the participant may result in a lower score. The data and information provided for evaluation purposes in the final tenders (or in the indicative tenders in the event that the public contract has been awarded on the basis of indicative tenders) are also binding for the performance of the public contract, unless specified otherwise.

Part 0 - Procurement documentation

3. K.1 Overall financial advantageousness

- 3.1. Evaluation criterion K.1 has a weight of 70%.
- 3.2. The participant's point score for the evaluation criterion *the Overall financial advantageousness (K.1)* will be calculated in the manner specified in the evaluation table, the binding model of which forms part 0.d to the Procurement documentation (hereinafter referred to as the "**Economic model**").¹
- 3.3. The participant is obliged to fill in the Economic model according to the instructions and explanations given therein. Based on the Economic model, the overall financial advantageousness will be evaluated based on the total value of aggregated costs in the form of Net Present Value (NPV) consisting of
- a) total tender Contract Amount (including options required by the contracting authority² and the contracting authority's savings in relation to the shorter performance period offered by the participant³) (*Item "1.1.5 Celková nabídková Cena Díla / Total tender Contract Amount", part "1. Cena Díla / Contract Amount", sheet „Vstupy_Inputs“*);
 - b) Capitalized costs of guaranteed consumables consumption (*Items⁴ in part „2. Garantovaná spotřeba / Consumption guarantee“, sheet „Vstupy_Inputs“*);

¹The binding form of the Economic model is given in the form of an evaluation table with automatic calculation formulae and more detailed instructions are listed on the sheet entitled „Manuál_Manual“.

²In the event that the contracting authority decides not to require any of the options during the procurement procedure any longer, the Economic Model will be adjusted in this respect before inviting for the final tender submission. In the event that the contracting authority decides not to request any of the options after selecting the contractor within the procurement procedure, the price of the performance of the Works will be automatically reduced by the offered price of the options no longer requested pursuant to the Obchodních podmínek/draft contract. The contracting authority decides not to request the option within the period specified in the contract. The binding form of the Economic model will be published in the "*.PDF" format until the end of the time-limit for submission of the requests to participate.

³The binding model of the Economic model, sheet " *Inputs_Inputs*", part 1 "1. Cena Díla / Contract Amount" takes into account the savings generated by the contracting authority in relation to the shorter performance period offered by the participant, with a maximum performance period of 36 months; this shall be respected by the participant. An offer longer than the maximum performance period will be considered by the contracting authority as non-complying with the procurement terms and conditions.

⁴In the Economic model, these are the following items:

- 2.1.1 Spotřeba vody - kotel / water consumption - boiler
- 2.1.2 Spotřeba pitné vody / fresh water consumption
- 2.1.3 Spotřeba močoviny / urea consumption
- 2.1.4 Spotřeba nehašeného vápna / quick lime consumption
- 2.1.5 Spotřeba hydroxidu vápenatého / hydrated lime consumption
- 2.1.6 Spotřeba aktivního uhlí / active carbon consumption
- 2.1.7 Spotřeba stlačeného přístrojového vzduchu / instrument air consumption
- 2.1.8 Spotřeba stlačeného procesního vzduchu / process air consumption
- 2.1.9 Odpad - škvára / IBA residue (nepodléhá garanci/not subjected to the guarantee)

Part 0 - Procurement documentation

- c) Costs of replacing the main parts of technology (*Item "Reference regular fixed maintenance cost" in part "3. Hlavní spotřební díly a náklady na údržbu / Main wear parts and cost for maintenance", sheet „Jednotkové ceny /_Unit prices“*) and *costs of main technology wear parts over the reference period (Items in part "3. Hlavní spotřební díly a náklady na údržbu / Main wear parts and cost for maintenance", sheet "Vstupy_Inputs"); and*
- d) *Incomes from guaranteed energy production (Item "4.2 Výroba energie / Energy production" in part "4. Výstupní garantované parametry Linky / Output guarantees for the Line ", sheet „Vstupy_Inputs“),*

whereas the amount of costs and incomes according to letter (b) to (d) will be evaluated over a period of 7 years (reference period) while taking into account the Weighted Average Cost of Capital (WACC) rate at 5% and while taking into account the year-on-year inflation rate and the minimum required operating time per year of operation, all this by using data according to part 0.d and formula according to part 0.e to the Procurement documentation.

- 3.4.** The point score for criterion K.1 The overall financial advantageousness will be calculated according to the following formula:

$$\left(1 - \frac{(\text{Value of the evaluated tender} - \text{Value of the most advantageous tender})}{\text{Value of the most advantageous tender}}\right) * 70$$

The contracting authority warns that if a result with a negative value is obtained on the basis of the calculation based on this formula, the evaluated tender of the participant will receive 0 points for this criterion.

2.1.10 Popel z kotle a zbytky ze systému čištění spalin / Boiler ash and FGT residue
2.1.11 Spotřeba ostatních chemikálií / Other chemicals consumption*

Part 0 - Procurement documentation

4. K.2 Quality of performance

4.1. The evaluation criterion K.2 is sub-divided into 3 sub-criteria with a total weight of this criterion of 25%.

4.2. The point score for criterion *K.2 Quality of performance* will be calculated by summing up the score awarded for all sub-criteria K.2.1 to K.2.3 listed herein below. The method of evaluating these sub-criteria is described below under this Section 4.

4.3. K.2.1 Proposed technology and solution concept

As part of this sub-criterion the contracting authority will evaluate

- the quality of the solution to the key components offered by the participant, and
- the method of implementing the project in terms of the offered solution to key components implementation.

In its tender, the participant shall draw up a Concept for the implementation of the public contract execution (hereinafter referred to as the "**concept**"), which will describe in detail

- technical solutions to the individual parts of executing the works,
- method of implementing such executions,
- technologies and materials which the execution will be based on from the point of view of design and installation/assembly of the key components.

For the purposes of the tender evaluation, the contracting authority considers the following components as the key components:

- incineration grate
- incineration furnace and boiler design
- waste cranes
- turbine, by-pass, condenser
- flue gas treatment system
- control system
- design of HV/LV system
- auxiliary technological operations

In addition to the technical descriptions and information concerning the key components, i.e. technologies and materials, the participant shall also define risks in relation to which the participant considers the proposed technologies and materials as the most appropriate for the contracting authority in the given case, i.e. what damages or other losses might occur if these components were not delivered in the form and quality offered by the participant.

Part 0 - Procurement documentation

During the evaluation, the contracting authority will approach the concept based on the following preferences (the following will contribute to a positive evaluation of the relevant tender):

- a) the concept (its philosophy) will result in a guaranteed execution of (technologically) maximally efficient works in the maximum quality, which will meet the requirements set out by the contracting authority in the procurement documentation,
- b) the concept will be comprehensible, fitting and will contain information necessary for the evaluation according to this sub-criterion, in relation to the key components separately as well as to their mutual functioning as a whole,
- c) the concept will contain information and data which will clearly indicate that it is a comprehensive and compact concept, however focused on (taking into account) the specific requirements and needs of the contracting authority according to the procurement documentation, as well as offering a comprehensive and robust solution that will guarantee future operation to the maximum extent with minimal risks and maximum simple and safe maintenance, as well as its maximum simple integration into the existing plant operated by the contracting authority,
- d) the concept will define why the relevant technologies and materials of the key components are proposed and what, in the opinion of the participant, is their advantage (added value) over other possible solutions, while specifying why this technology was selected and, for example, why a different technology was not selected, particularly if such different technology is widely used,
- e) the concept offers high-quality, reliable, maximally standardized (uniform and integrated) technologies and materials (e.g. on one platform or line) for a maximum part of the performance and provides the contracting authority with a maximum guarantee of eliminating unexpected defects, interruptions or any other damage,
- f) the concept contains the most accurate procedures (process schedule) for the execution (design, installation/erection of the key components), including a clear strategy for the project progress implementation,
- g) The concept includes a solution to the operation philosophy with an adequate number of backup solutions/redundancies and a maximum degree of automating the key components operation.

Each concept will be evaluated according to the following point scale (**Table No. 1**):

<p style="text-align: center;">Verbal evaluation</p> <p>(extent to which the concept will result in meeting the parameters and preferences mentioned above)</p>	<p style="text-align: center;">Points</p>
<p><i>corresponds to the maximum extent</i> - the concept is comprehensive, clearly defined in the required level of detail and takes maximum account of the specific needs and</p>	<p style="text-align: center;">100</p>

Part 0 - Procurement documentation

<p>requirements of the contracting authority, it contains a range of reliable standardized technologies/materials to the maximum extent while listing their advantages over other solutions, the offered solution is highly comprehensive and robust, suitable process procedures for the implementation of execution are clearly given, the concept contains a very high degree of automation and redundancy of the solution as well as a clear definition of risks that can be eliminated by using key components offered by the participant</p>	
<p>corresponds above standard - the concept is comprehensive and defined above standard, to a high extent it takes into account the specific needs and requirements of the contracting authority, it contains a range of reliable standardized technologies/materials in a wide range while listing their advantages over other solutions, the offered solution is highly comprehensive and robust, the concept contains a high degree of automation and redundancy of the solution as well as a clear definition of risks that can be eliminated by using the key components offered by the participant</p>	90
<p>corresponds very well - the concept is comprehensive and very well defined, it sufficiently takes into account the specific needs and requirements of the contracting authority, it contains a range of reliable standardized technologies/materials to an extent above the minimum requirements while listing their advantages over other solutions, the offered solution is highly comprehensive and robust, suitable process procedures for the implementation of execution are clearly given, the concept contains a good degree of automation and</p>	80

Part 0 - Procurement documentation

<p>redundancy of the solution as well as a clear definition of risks that can be eliminated by using key components offered by the participant</p>	
<p>corresponds adequately - the concept is defined to the required extent and takes into account the specific needs and requirements of the contracting authority, it contains a range of reliable standardized technologies/materials to the extent of the minimum requirements, i.e. the solution is comprehensive and robust, with a reasonable degree of automation and redundancy, as well as partial definition of risks that can be eliminated by using key components offered by the participant</p>	<p>70</p>
<p>corresponds on average - the concept does not contain some of the required concept elements (although the execution would have these elements but it was not adequately expressed in the tender) prepared so that it can be evaluated "corresponds to the maximum extent", "corresponds above standard", "corresponds very well" or "corresponds adequately", or the solution does not contain a reasonable degree of automation or redundancy or a partial definition of risks that can be eliminated by using the key components offered by the participant</p>	<p>40</p>
<p>corresponds to a minimum extent - the concept does not contain several of the required concept elements (although the execution would have these elements but it was not adequately expressed in the tender) prepared so that it can be evaluated as "corresponds to the maximum extent", "corresponds above standard", "corresponds very well" or "corresponds adequately", " or corresponds on average" or meaning of a number of pieces of</p>	<p>20</p>

Part 0 - Procurement documentation

information and internal connections in the concept is not entirely obvious	
does not correspond - the concept has not been developed or it apparently contains principal shortcomings or ambiguities, or it completely omits the above preferences of the contracting authority	0

Point score for sub-criterion *K.2.1 The proposed technology and solution concept* is defined above through a point evaluation. The awarded point score of the participant's tender according to the above *Table No. 1* will be weighed by this sub-criterion; this will determine the point score of the participant's tender for this sub-criterion.

4.4. K. 2.2 Technical guarantees

Within this sub-criterion *K.2.2 Technical guarantees*, the contracting authority will evaluate the guaranteed period of continuous operation offered by the participant beyond the required minimum of 8000 hours pursuant to Section 2.3.1 of Part.III A20 Procedure for Guarantee Tests, which the participant is obliged to stipulate in integral (rounded) tens of hours (e.g. 8,250 hours) in accordance with Table No. 2 "Availability" of part II.h Guarantees. In this sub-criterion, the contracting authority will evaluate the total (absolute) guaranteed period of continuous operation. A tender with a longer guaranteed period of continuous operation is considered as a more suitable tender.

The score for sub-criterion *K.2.2 Technical Guarantee* will be calculated according to the following formula:

$$\frac{\text{Value of the evaluated tender}}{\text{Value of the most advantageous tender}} * 15$$

For the purposes of tender evaluation, the longest guaranteed period of continuous operation is a permissible time of 10,000 hours. If a participant offers a longer period, a period of 10,000 hours will be used for the purposes of evaluating its tender (however, the time offered by the participant will be binding).

The participant must respect the shortest permissible (minimum) guaranteed period of continuous operation in the tender. If the participant offers a shorter period, it will be considered as non-complying with the procurement conditions.

Part 0 - Procurement documentation

4.5. K.2.3 Environmental parameters

In this sub-criterion *K.2.3 Ecological parameters*, the contracting authority will evaluate the numerical value of NOx emissions offered by the participant, which will be lower than the maximum⁵ determined according to Table No. 3 "Environmental compliance", part.II.h Guarantees. In this sub-criterion, the contracting authority will evaluate the total (absolute) guaranteed value of NOx emissions, which the participant is obliged to specify in integral (rounded) tens of mg/Nm³ (e.g. 100) or half tens (e.g. 105). A tender with a lower guaranteed emission value is considered as a more suitable tender.

The score for sub-criterion *K.2.3 Environmental parameters* will be calculated according to the following formula:

$$\frac{\text{Value of the most advantageous tender}}{\text{Value of the evaluated tender}} * 10$$
For the purposes of tender evaluation, the lowest guaranteed value of NOx emissions shall not be lower than the value achieved while respecting the specifications defined by the contracting authority, i.e. the requirement for nitrogen oxide emission reduction method - selective non-catalytic reduction (SNCR), otherwise the participant will be awarded 0 points for this sub-criterion.

The participant shall respect the shortest permissible (minimum) guaranteed period of continuous operation in the tender. If the participant offers a higher value, it will be considered as non-complying with the procurement conditions.

⁵The maximum permissible value is numerically expressed as 120 mg/Nm³.

Part 0 - Procurement documentation

5. K.3 Layout of the construction and technological solution

- 5.1. Evaluation criterion K.3 has a weight of 5 %.
- 5.2. The participant's point score for criterion *K.3 The layout of the construction and technological solution* will be determined on the basis of the degree of complying with the following preferences of the contracting authority in relation to the layout solution.
- 5.3. The participant shall prepare a Layout study (hereinafter referred to as the "**study**") in the tender specifying in particular the following
- the general view (scheme) of the layout of the whole plant (works), which will indicate the internal layout of the plant as well as its external layout (appearance),
 - accesses and serviceability of the plant and limitations of these accesses/serviceability, including the definition of relevant measurement data (scale/dimensions) to make it obvious
 - how the building will be entered, through how many accesses, through what type of accesses,
 - plant access restrictions for the purpose of operating individual components of the boiler, grate and other key components,
 - how the main maintenance handling areas are addressed with respect to the operation of key components,
 - connection with the existing operation of the contracting authority.

During the evaluation, the contracting authority will approach the study based on the following preferences (the following will contribute to a positive evaluation of the relevant tender):

- a) the study will be clear, accurate and will contain the necessary information for evaluation according to the criterion
- b) the study will contain information and data which will clearly indicate that it is a comprehensive and integral study but focused on (taking into account) the specific requirements and needs of the contracting authority according to the tender documentation and respecting the zoning permit documentation and the zoning permit itself,
- c) the study will indicate that
 - entrances and corridors to the plant are designed to guarantee maximum safety of the operators and equipment and their number corresponds to the requirements for maximum availability of key equipment components for operation and/or maintenance (e.g. uniform height arrangement or the key

Part 0 - Procurement documentation

equipment components are easily accessible from the maintenance access level) as well as occupational health and safety standards,

- the internal plant layout enables a maximum degree of availability and accessibility of individual key components of the plant for operation and/or maintenance while maintaining the necessary occupational health and safety standards (individual key components, especially frequently used, are as easily accessible as possible for their standard operation and/or maintenance),
- the internal layout is designed systematically, the individual access points are logically/systematically connected to each other or designed as intuitively as possible, including escape routes,
- maximally simple connection for serviceability with the existing contracting authority's plant (e.g. uniform height arrangement or non-colliding servicing and handling routes).

Each study will be evaluated according to the following point scale (**Table No. 2**):

<p style="text-align: center;">Verbal evaluation</p> <p>(extent to which the study will result in meeting the parameters and preferences mentioned above)</p>	<p style="text-align: center;">Points</p>
<p>corresponds to the maximum extent- the study is clearly arranged and gives a maximum level of detail and takes into maximum account the specific needs and requirements of the contracting authority, while the entrances to the plant are designed to guarantee maximum occupational health and safety and appropriate access to individual key components, the internal layout also enables maximally safe and the simplest possible access to key equipment components for easy operation or maintenance; the internal layout is intuitive and systematic with a very suitable design of escape routes; the proposed solution enables very easy operation of the equipment, also in connection with the existing plant operated by the contracting authority</p>	<p style="text-align: center;">100</p>
<p>corresponds above standard - the study is clearly arranged and gives an above-</p>	<p style="text-align: center;">90</p>

Part 0 - Procurement documentation

<p>standard level of detail and takes into above-standard account the specific needs and requirements of the contracting authority, while the entrances to the plant are designed to guarantee a very high level of occupational health and safety and appropriate access to individual key components, internal layout also allows safe and easy access to key equipment components for easy operation or maintenance; the internal layout is systematic with a suitable solution for escape routes; the proposed solution enables very easy operation of the equipment, also in connection with the existing plant operated by the contracting authority</p>	
<p>corresponds very well the study is clearly arranged and gives a very good level of detail and takes into account the specific needs and requirements of the contracting authority, while the entrances to the plant are designed to guarantee very good occupational health and safety and good access to individual key components, the internal layout also enables safe and the simplest possible access to key equipment components for easy operation or maintenance; the internal layout is systematic with a good design of escape routes; the proposed solution enables easy operation of the equipment, also in connection with the existing plant operated by the contracting authority</p>	80
<p>corresponds adequately - the study is defined in an adequate level of detail, it takes into account the specific needs and requirements of the contracting authority, while the entrances to the plant are designed to guarantee adequate level of occupational health and safety and</p>	70

Part 0 - Procurement documentation

<p>appropriate access to individual key components, internal layout also allows safe and easy access to key equipment components for reasonably easy operation or maintenance; the internal layout is essentially systematic with a good design of escape routes; the proposed solution enables good operation of the equipment, also in connection with the existing plant operated by the contracting authority</p>	
<p>corresponds on average - the study does not contain some of the required study elements (although the execution would have these elements but it was not adequately expressed in the tender) prepared so that it can be evaluated as "corresponds to the maximum extent", "corresponds above standard", "corresponds very well" or "corresponds adequately", or the study does not contain even a reasonable degree of elements preferred by the contracting authority or some of them are missing</p>	40
<p>corresponds to a minimum extent - the study does not contain several of the required study elements (although the execution would have these elements but it was not adequately expressed in the tender) prepared so that it can be evaluated "corresponds to the maximum extent", "corresponds above standard", "corresponds very well" or "corresponds adequately", " or corresponds on average" or the study does not include several elements preferred by the contracting authority or the meaning of a number of pieces of information and internal connections in the study is not entirely obvious</p>	20
<p>does not correspond - the study has not been developed or it obviously contains</p>	0

Part 0 - Procurement documentation

principal shortcomings or ambiguities or it completely omits the above preferences of the contracting authority	
---	--

Point score for criterion *K.3.1 The layout of the construction and technological solution* is defined above through a point evaluation. The point score awarded to the participant's tender according to the above *Table No. 2* will be weighed by this criterion; this will determine the point score of the participant's tender for this criterion.

Part 0 - Procurement documentation

6. List of appendices

Part 0.c to the Procurement documentation - Detailed definition of the evaluation criteria and rules of tender evaluation further refers to the following parts of Procurement documentation:

Part 0.d: Binding form of the Economic Model

Part 0.e: Formula for economic model calculation