

APPENDIX 2

The evaluation criteria

The Contract Notice was published through contracts finder on 20th December 2017 and simultaneously the Invitation to Tender (ITT) documentation was published on the HPCS e-tendering system. The tender responses were required to be submitted by 1pm on 6th February 2018.

It was made clear within the tender documentation that post-tender clarification meetings may be held. This option was taken with clarification meeting being held with the three providers on 20th February 2018.

Technical merit formed 70% of the final score and commercial merit formed 30% of the final score. The evaluation method was devised with a view to determining a clear order of merit from the technical and financial point of view.

The technical evaluation questions and weightings included in the ITT documents are reproduced in the table below.

Evaluation Matrix for Final Selection Process	Weighting
Satisfactory Completion of Company and Eligibility Questionnaire	Pass/Fail
Satisfactory demonstration of relevant experience by providing in the Selection Questionnaire up to three examples of works contracts, in any combination from either the private or public sector, that are relevant to the Council's requirements as set out in the Contract Documents	Pass/Fail
Confirmation – Unequivocal sign off of the terms and conditions of contract (as amended by the Council)	Pass/Fail
Fully completed and signed Document Set.	Pass/Fail
Method Statements	70%
• Understanding of the Contract Documents	15%
• Method Statement	15%
• Programme	15%
• Supply Chain Management	5%
• Key Personnel & overall team structure	5%
• Quality Assurance	5%
• Health and Safety	5%
• Risk Identification and Mitigation	5%
Quality Weighting	70%

Pricing Proposals	30%
Price Weighting	30%
Total	100%

Ref	Question - Understanding of the Contract Documents
MS1	<p>Please provide details of your understanding of the requirements of the Contract Documents and any areas that you believe will need particular management, cost and technical attention together with details of how you propose to meet these requirements.</p> <p>Maximum word limit - 1000 (No attachments permitted)</p>
Ref	Question – Method Statement
MS2	<p>Please provide details of your proposed method of working to satisfy the requirements of the Contract Specification and Drawings and in particular the constraints specified in Specification Appendix 1/13. Sufficient information must be provided to allow the tender evaluation team to judge the efficacy of the proposals.</p> <p>Maximum word limit – 1000 (No attachments permitted)</p>
Ref	Question – Programme
MS3	<p>Please provide a draft programme covering the period from the award of the Works Contractor’s Contract to the date for completion. The draft programme shall address all matters necessary to achieve the project requirements and all of the constraints included within Specification Appendix 1/13.</p>
Ref	Question – Supply Chain Management
MS4	<p>Please demonstrate your experience of, and commitment to managing your Supply Chain in carrying out the Works with the aims of: -</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • achieving a better and more collaborative way of working with your Supply Chain; • ensuring that the Supply Chain is fully involved in the development of through life cost calculations and associated management of risk; optimising the use of labour and materials to minimise waste and the cost of construction; • improving the quality and functionality of the Works by early and continuous involvement of the supply chain in the planning of the Works; and • Achieving continuous improvement within the Supply Chain. <p>Maximum word limit – 1000 (No attachments permitted)</p>
Ref	Question – Key Personnel & Overall Team Structure.
MS4	<p>Please supply a list of Key Personnel and a Team Structure in the form of an organogram of those who will be responsible for the conduct of those tasks regarded as essential to the successful conduct of the Works Contractor’s Contract. The list of Key Personnel shall include, as a minimum, the individuals who are to act as the following: -</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • the project director who will have overall responsibility for the tenderer’s performance of the Works Contractor’s Contract; • the contract manager or similar person who will have day to day responsibility for the tenderer’s carrying out of the Works on site.

	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • where the procurement strategy is “Works Contractor’s Design”, the lead designer and the members of the design team including any specialist supply chain members who will be engaged by the tenderer to carry out any part of the Works Contractor’s Design; • the site health and safety officer; • the competent person or persons who will act as the Works Contractor’s permanent site staff with authority to receive and action any Project Manager’s Directions or Change Orders during the construction of the Works in accordance the Works Contractor’s Conditions of Contract. <p>Please demonstrate (by submitting detailed curricula vitae in the form of the “Structure of Curriculum Vitae for Key Personnel” attached) that the nominated staff have the necessary experience, background and qualifications to undertake the essential tasks.</p> <p>Maximum word limit – 1000 (Attachments permitted)</p>
Ref	Question – Quality Assurance
MS6	<p>Please provide details of the quality assurance regime to be adopted for the execution of the Works and proof of certification under ISO 9001:2000 or some other appropriate accreditation acceptable to the Council.</p> <p>Maximum word limit – 1000 (Attachments permitted)</p>
Ref	Question – Health and Safety
MS7	<p>Please provide a Health & Safety policy statement together with a statement showing how the policy will be implemented and maintained on site.</p> <p>Maximum word limit – 1000 (No attachments permitted)</p>
Ref	Question – Risk Identification and Mitigation
MS8	<p>Please describe your approach to risk management as it applies to the Contract Documents.</p> <p>Maximum word limit – 1000 (No attachments permitted)</p>

It is important to note that the objective of the procurement procedure was to ensure that the evaluation of tenders was executed in a systematic and consistent manner, which eliminates bias and ensures the contract is awarded on value for money based on ‘Most Economically Advantageous Tender’ (MEAT) and that the council complies with the Public Contract Regulations 2015. The MEAT basis for contract award and the supporting criteria for that basis were provided to the bidders in the ITT.

The tender evaluation-marking scheme notified to the bidders in the ITT document is reproduced below.

The total score for the Method Statement questions (1 to 8 above) is 70%. Each Method Statement was evaluated with scores of up to 5 points maximum for each Method Question. Scores were allocated based on the following scoring matrix:

Score	Criterion	Elemental Breakdown
0	Question not answered.	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> No response given to the Question or a material part of the Question Inappropriate or irrelevant response
1	Poor – Falls well short of meeting the requirements of the Question.	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Only a minimal response made to the Question or a material part of the Question. Substantially inappropriate and/or irrelevant response. Fails to show a material understanding of all of the requirements of the Question or a material part of the Question
2	Below Expectations – Meets some of the requirements of the Question.	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Partially addresses a few of the elements / points set out in the Question or part of the Question Does not however show a full understanding of key aspects of the Question or material parts of the Question
3	Satisfactory – Broadly meets the requirements of the Question.	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> An acceptable response submitted in terms of level of detail, accuracy and relevance, with some omissions that reduce the extent to which the contract aims will be achieved. Indicates a broad understanding of the Question or the material parts of the Question but does not cover all the points required by the Question
4	Good – Meets all major requirements of the Question.	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Meets most but not all of the points set out in the Question or in the material parts of the Question but is still a comprehensive response Provides a robust answer showing how the Tenderer will put theory into practice Workable and practical methods/proposals provided in the response
5	Excellent – Meets essentially all the requirements of the Question. No significant reservations	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Essentially meets all the points set out in the Question or the material parts of the Question Response demonstrates that the Tenderer has exceptional ability which shows clear potential to provide an exceptional service under the contract

Initial scores out of 5 for each individual Method Statement were then translated into a weighted points score. The total weighted score, a sum of the scores for all the Method Statements were then expressed as a percentage. This procedure establishes the adjusted quality score for each bidder.

Tender Evaluation Panel

The Evaluation Panel was selected by the council within the procurement process. The Technical Evaluators comprised of three members and a moderator to ensure a fair and objective decision was reached.

Seamus Hayes (Strategic Procurement) was appointed as the moderator to check and validate the scoring and to manage the moderation and consensus process. It is important to note that the consensus score was the final score taken forward and used to rank the bids.

The Tender Evaluation Panel was composed of the following members:

Name	Position	Role
Peter Watson	Project Manager Major Projects	Technical Evaluation
Dana Rasheed	Project Manager	Technical Evaluation
Dave Butcher	Resident Engineer	Technical Evaluation
Jenny Kingston	muf architecture/art LLP	Technical Evaluation
Glenn Edwards	Senior Quantity Surveyor	Commercial Evaluation
Seamus Hayes	Interim Delivery Manager	Moderator

All members of the Tender Evaluation Panel were given a copy of tender evaluation guidance produced by Strategic Procurement.

Tendering Opening

Four Tender Responses were received by the due date/time and these were evaluated in accordance with the approved evaluation process and methodology. The results of the evaluation are detailed below.

Each tender was checked for basic compliance with the requirements of the ITT and that each tender complied with the mandatory (i.e. Pass/Fail) requirements of the ITT, as follows:

- Satisfactory completion of Selection Questionnaire

Satisfactory demonstration of relevant experience by providing three examples of contracts completed for a public/private sector body which are directly relevant to the Council's requirements

- Signed Tender Document Set;
- Completed Tender Response on Technical and Professional Ability;
- Completed Excel Pricing Schedule;

Three tenders passed the eligibility, relevant experience and compliance checks summarised above which enabled them to progress to the second stage evaluation which involved the evaluation of their technical and commercial responses.

Evaluation Process

Quality Assessment

The quality assessment was based upon a method statement comprising of a series of questions (1 to 8) relevant to this project, which the bidders were required to answer within a specified word limit for each question.

Evaluation of the completed method statements were carried out by a panel of three council officers and one external architectural representative. The technical merit scores of the tenders were assessed by each member of the technical evaluation team (working in isolation) in accordance with the assessment model set out in the procurement documents and without visibility of the tender prices.

Without visibility of the tender prices, the tenders were scored by the technical evaluators (working in isolation) against each of the technical evaluation categories on a scale of 0 to 5. The respective scores were then weighted in accordance with the weightings set out in the ITT documentation. As part of the process, each evaluator completed a detailed rationale to support their scores to ensure that subsequent differences in opinion could be explained.

Price Assessment

Bidders were required to complete a Pricing Schedule (Bill of quantities)

The lump sum price was used to score the pricing proposal in accordance with the predetermined formula detailed below:

The maximum marks available for this part of the Tender was 30% and this score was awarded to the bidder who submitted the lowest total cost. The remaining bidders received marks on a pro rata basis from the cheapest to the most expensive price. The overall pricing score was calculated as follows, which was communicated to the bidders in the ITT document:

If three Tender Responses are received and Bidder A has quoted £150,000 as their total price, Bidder B has quoted £250,000 and Bidder C has quoted £300,000 then the calculation will be as follows:

Bidder A Score = $\frac{£150,000}{£150,000} \times 30\%$ (Maximum available marks) = 30%

Bidder B Score = $\frac{£150,000}{£250,000} \times 30\%$ (Maximum available marks) = 18%

Bidder C Score = $\frac{£150,000}{£300,000} \times 30\%$ (Maximum available marks) = 15%

A comparison of the quoted rates/prices can be found in the attachment to this report. It includes the scores allocated to each tender using the mechanism described above.