

## Summary from dialogue with the market regarding locks in Trollhätte canal, March 2024

The feedback on the presented business plan was overall positive. Regarding the excavation and lock contracts in Lilla Edet, most of the suppliers considered that these works should be parted in separate contracts.

On the other hand, regarding Trollhättan, there were arguments made both for dividing the construction of locks and rock excavation into separate contracts, and for having these works in a joint contract, with a supplier majority for one large contract where the rock excavation works is included in the lock construction works. Part of this was motivated by the fact that the choice of design of the locks in Trollhättan affects the execution of the rock excavation works, and thereby the prerequisites for procurement in accordance to the current time schedule.

The participating suppliers emphasized the importance of an early collaboration. The response to the proposed business orientation, where the locks are carried out with an early contractor involvement, was along the same line positive. There were different opinions on whether these should be carried out as design and build contracts or construction contracts based on the allocation of risks.

We perceived that the responses to the proposed forms of compensation were generally positive. It was highlighted that the number of suppliers that may submit tenders should be limited at the pre-qualification stage. The reason for this is to create a greater commitment in the tender stage, and a knowledge that you have a good chance to win the contract.

A recurring input was that the project needs to be clear about the commercial conditions already in the prequalification stage. This regards both in terms of what is known and clarified, but also related to what is still uncertain.

The importance of a proper level of percentage for contractor's fee was emphasized, as well as the relevance of the demarcation list and its scope. The suppliers were positive to have the percentage of the contractor's fee predetermined, to avoid that from becoming a competitive element.

The response to the suggested added value was in line to ensure that the evaluation should not be based on simply a document. The proposal to have a couple of contractors competing in a so-called Phase 0 around possible designs of a technical challenge that the client is facing was discussed.

Furthermore, there was an understanding that penalties are needed, but a message was sent from the suppliers that these should be limited to critical risks, and that the supplier must be able to control them. The importance to strike a balance between carrots and sticks was also communicated. The participating suppliers were positive to bonuses and wish to see bonuses that rewards the right behavior.