

**Reablement and Neuro-rehabilitation ITT evaluation methodology**

**1.1 Quality Criteria**

The Criteria for the quality evaluation is contained in the Table below:

Evaluation Criteria	Sub Criteria	Criteria Overall Weighting	Sub- criteria weighting	Question Reference
Mobilisation	Approach to Mobilisation	5	5	1
Service Delivery	Approach to delivering the service and ability to achieve outcomes	20	20	2
User experience	Approach to delivering relationship centred care	12	5	3
	Ability to minimise duplication for Service Users		7	4
Partnership Working	Approach to delivering Shared goal setting and support planning	27	12	5
	Approach to Cross discipline working		3	6
	Ability to effectively transfer work to other services		3	7
	Approach to support the Council's commitment to the Ethical Care charter		9	8
Resources	Staff development and training	16	8	9
	Safeguarding		8	10
<b>Total</b>		<b>80</b>	<b>80</b>	

**1.2 Quality Scoring**

Scoring of Tenderers responses for the purposes of Quality will be based on the following scale shown in table 2 below:

**Table 2**

Assessment	Score	Basis of score
No Submission	0 points	No submission was made or answer given to the question or part there of.
Very Poor	1 points	Some information provided but unacceptable, unsatisfactory response that does not comply or meet any requirements.

<b>Assessment</b>	<b>Score</b>	<b>Basis of score</b>
Poor	2 points	Only some of the requirements met.
Acceptable	3 points	A satisfactory response which meets the basic requirements, or is capable of meeting basic requirements with minor adjustments prior to the start of the contract.
Good	4 points	Good response, which meets all requirements and gives some confidence.
Excellent	5 points	Outstanding response, exceeds expectations, adds value, shows innovation and creative solutions and gives full confidence.

- 1.3 A maximum score of 80 can be achieved for responses to the quality evaluation criteria contained in Table 1.
- 1.4 The response to each question will be scored from 0 to 5 using the guidance in the Table 2 above. These scores will then be divided by the maximum score available (5) and then multiplied by the sub weightings shown in Table 1 for each element. A final quality score (out of 80 points) is achieved by adding all weighted scores together.
- 1.5 Tenderers evaluation scores will be based on their written responses to method statements 1 to 10.
- 1.6 The Council reserves the right to clarify this (and its veracity and accuracy verified) by the following methods:
- Clarification meetings and by responses to clarification questions raised by the Council (if any)
  - Validation visits (this will involve a small team of Council officers with the expertise of these services visiting the Provider's premises where the service is to be operated from in order to validate Provider responses to any chosen method statements 1-10)
  - Obtaining references from previous or current contracts.
- 1.7 The initial score will be based on the evaluators' review of the Tenderers' response document and may be updated following further clarification of the response ascertained in the other methods outlined above. The final scores therefore may differ from the initial scores to reflect the full evaluation process undertaken by the panel. Overall scores will be calculated to ascertain the Tenderer's overall percentage score.
- 1.8 In respect of all method statement responses, there must be a clear distinction between clarifications and omissions; this process is not about providing an opportunity to address something that has not been included in a tender, as this would be unfair to other Tenderers.
- 1.9 The Evaluation Panel shall conduct a 'consensus scoring process' where moderation of the scores awarded during the exercise will take place. The moderation shall give regard to any variance in the scores between the evaluators, together with the subsequent assessment following any clarification obtained from the Tenderer. A consensus score will be agreed by the evaluators for each of the evaluation criteria.

## 1.10 Threshold for Quality Evaluation

The Council requires submissions received to be of a consistently good level of quality across all areas so Tenderers will be required to achieve a minimum score of 3 in all 10 questions. Quality scores for submissions meeting or exceeding the thresholds set for quality will be taken forward to the third stage of the process.

## 2 Stage 2 – Price Assessment

- 2.1 A 20% weighting for price will apply to the two reablement contracts (North and South). The prices submitted for Neuro rehabilitation will not be scored but will be reviewed at Stage 4 of the process.

A	Contract Price (20%)	Weightings
1	Price per hour for the North of the Borough	20%
2	Price per hour for the South of the Borough	20%
3	Price per hour for the neuro-rehabilitation service	Not weighted but reviewed at stage 4

### 2.2 A – Contract Price for reablement Contracts Price scoring approach (20%)

To evaluate the tendered price the following calculation will be applied:  
The lowest 5 bids will be averaged and then uplifted by 20%. Bids above the calculated acceptable price level will be deemed unaffordable and automatically eliminated.

The lowest bid will receive the top weighted score of 20. The remaining bidders (who have not been excluded) will receive a pro rata score relative to the difference between the bid price and the averaged lowest five bids+20% as set out below.

	Weighted score	Evaluation	Sum
A1	Weighted score for the North contract	$\frac{((\text{Average of the lowest five bids} + 20\%) - \text{Tendered Bid}) \times 20}{(\text{Lowest 5 Bids} + 20\%) - \text{Lowest Bid}}$	A1
A2	Weighted score for the South contract	$\frac{((\text{Average of the lowest five bids} + 20\%) - \text{Tendered Bid}) \times 20}{(\text{Lowest 5 Bids} + 20\%) - \text{Lowest Bid}}$	A2

### Worked example:

Bidder	Cost	Difference	Score/20
Bidder	£25.78	-£7.98	0.00
Bidder	£22.05	-£4.25	0.00
Bidder	£21.45	-£3.65	0.00
Bidder	£19.84	-£2.04	0.00

<b>Bidder</b>	<b>Cost</b>	<b>Difference</b>	<b>Score/20</b>
Bidder	£16.55	£1.25	6.65
Bidder	£15.55	£2.25	11.97
Bidder	£15.48	£2.32	12.34
Bidder	£14.90	£2.90	15.43
Bidder	£14.20	£3.60	19.15
Bidder	£14.04	£3.76	20.00
<b>Avg lowest 5</b>	<b>£14.83</b>		
Plus 20%	£17.80		

### 2.3 B: Sustainability – Breakdown of the Hourly Rate

- 2.4 All prices submitted need to be sustainable for the life of the contract. To test this, the Council intends to carry out an assessment of the price breakdown information gathered in the pricing schedule. This information will be cross referenced with the Tenderers proposals contained in the method statements.
- 2.5 Evaluation of the “cost breakdown of the hourly rate” will be undertaken to ensure the service provided will meet the specification requirements for Southwark Ethical Care Charter (including the London Living Wage) and provide confidence in the financial robustness of the tendered value to reduce the risk of Provider failure arising.
- 2.6 The price evaluation panel will review the proposed financial breakdown of costs as provided in the “Pricing Schedule Spreadsheet” as part of its robustness and efficiency evaluation of the Tender to ensure they can meet the needs of the service throughout the life of the contract.
- 2.7 This section is a PASS/ FAIL section and failure in this section will mean a failure of the whole Tender evaluation. In order to Pass this section, Tenderers will need to receive a score of 4 (medium level of confidence) or more in this section.
- 2.8 Applicant’s responses to this section will be scored as follow

<b>Score</b>	<b>Explanation</b>
5	High level of confidence in the information provided through reviewing the hourly cost breakdown against the criteria set out below.
4	Medium level of confidence in the information provided through reviewing the hourly cost breakdown against the criteria set out below.
3	Some confidence in the information provided through reviewing the hourly cost breakdown against the criteria set out below.
2	Low confidence in the information provided through reviewing the hourly cost breakdown against the criteria set out below.
0	Failure to provide the information required to allow the review.

- 2.9 When assessing confidence the Price Evaluation Panel will consider factors such as:

- Ensuring that the direct staff rate per hour covers London Living Wage costs, on costs and Southwark Ethical Care Charter costs;
- The Panel's knowledge of current market pricing.

2.10 Where Tenderers initially receive a score of 3 or less in this section, they will be given the opportunity to respond to the Council's concerns at a clarification meeting. The Council will supply a list of its key concerns prior to this meeting. Responses to clarifications raised will be reviewed and may affect the final score for this section B.

2.11 All price submissions passing the sustainability review will go forward to the next stage in the process

**Abnormally low bids**

2.12 Notwithstanding the scoring methodology referred to above, Bidders are advised that the Council will scrutinise very carefully any Tender that contains a Price which appears very low (having regard, amongst other things, to the Prices submitted in the other Tenders received). In this regard, Bidders' attention is drawn to the Council's power under regulation 30 (6) of the Public Contract Regulations 2006 (as amended) to disregard/reject any Tender that is abnormally low.

**3 Stage 3 - Ranking and recommendation for North and South contracts**

3.13 At this stage, scores achieved for both quality and price will be combined and submission total scores will be ranked. This process will happen for both reablement contracts North and South. The highest ranked Tenderer for each contract area will go forward to the next stage of the process.

3.14 Only one contract shall be awarded per Tenderer. In the event that the same Provider is ranked highest for both contract areas the award recommendation will be made on the best overall value for the Council.

3.15 **NB.** The best overall value will be based on the best cost combination.

North Contract (lower valued contract)		South Contract (higher valued contract)	
Tenderer A	84	Tenderer A	87
Tenderer B	80	Tenderer D	85
Tenderer C	78	Tenderer C	84
Tenderer D	75	Tenderer B	80

3.16 In the example above comparisons will be made on Tenderer A for North and Tenderer D for South against Tenderer A for South and Tenderer B for North. The combination that produces the best overall value for the Council will be recommended for award.

**4 Stage 4 - Recommendation for Neuro Rehabilitation contract**

4.1 At this stage the Neuro Rehabilitation prices of the two successful providers will be reviewed and the cheapest provider for this element will be recommended for award of the Neuro Rehabilitation contract.