

London Borough of Southwark

Visible Difference and Planned Projects

Section 6

Evaluation Methodology

Contents

EVALUATION OF TENDERS 3
EVALUATION STAGES..... 3
EVALUATION TEAM 3
STAGE ONE - COMPLIANCE 3
STAGE TWO - QUALITY 3
QUALITY SCORING SCALE 6
STAGE THREE - PRICE 7
ABNORMALLY LOW TENDERS 8
DISCLAIMER 9
STAGE FOUR - FINAL SELECTION AND RECOMMENDATION 9
TIE BREAK 9

Evaluation Methodology

EVALUATION OF TENDERS

1. This schedule sets out the methodology that will be used to evaluate tenders received in relation to the provision of visible difference and planned projects contracts.
2. Following the initial evaluation stages described in the methodology, the Employer will evaluate the tender submissions using a weighted model of 70:30 in favour of price.
3. The award recommendations will be made on the basis of most economically advantageous tenders (MEAT) evaluated as described in this methodology.

EVALUATION STAGES

4. The evaluation shall comprise of 4 stages:
 - a. Stage One - Compliance
 - b. Stage Two - Quality
 - c. Stage Three - Price
 - d. Stage Four - Final selection and recommendation

EVALUATION TEAM

5. An evaluation team has been established to undertake a comprehensive, systematic and consistent evaluation of each tender. This team will be split in to two groups, one for quality and one for price. Both groups will be made up of Employer officers with expertise in their specific areas i.e. quality evaluation panel will include individuals experienced in maintenance work provisions and price evaluation panel will be made up of individuals with financial expertise.

STAGE ONE - COMPLIANCE

6. Tenders will be checked initially for completeness and compliance with the ITT. Whilst the Employer shall be entitled to seek clarification from tenderers in order to determine if a tender is complete and/or compliant, tenderers should note that the Employer reserves the right to reject tenders that are not complete and/or compliant. Tenderers are referred to 'Checklist of documents' to be returned' in Section 9 of the tender documents.
7. For tendering purposes, tenderers are required to confirm as part of their Tender that if awarded a Contract, they will be able to provide the required levels of insurance cover in the Contract as set out in the Contract Particulars. The Employer regards this confirmation as a compliance issue and reserves the right to reject any tender – without further consideration – in the event that they fail to provide such confirmation as part of their tender.
8. Tenderers are required to submit the Parent Company Guarantee Undertaking, if applicable, set out in the ITT and contained in Section 7a of the tender documents.

STAGE TWO - QUALITY

9. Tenderers will be required to submit four (4) method statement proposals answering the questions contained within this Quality Submission Schedule. These method statements, once approved by the Employer, will be incorporated into the Contract as the Contractor's planned way of working/operating throughout the Contract Period.
10. All submissions will be scored against the same criteria/ sub criteria and sub-weightings as

set out in this schedule.

11. The weighting for each method statement proposal is set out in the following table:

Criterion	Requirement or sub-criteria in respect of Method Statements	Sub-Criteria Weighting	Criteria Weighting
Mobilisation Method Statement 1	A. Resource structure	2	4
	B. Roles and responsibilities	2	
Service Delivery Method Statement 2	A. Road re-surfacing Works	6	15
	B. Drainage de-scaling and repairs Works	3	
	C. Water main replacements Works	3	
	D. Boundary walls and fencing Works	3	
Quality control and compliance Method Statement 3	A. Quality and compliance during and on completion of the Works	5	9
	B. Leaseholders	4	
London Living Wage Method Statement 4	A. Administer and monitor	1	2
	B. Identification of productivity gains	1	
Total Quality Score			30

QUALITY SCORING SCALE

12. The scoring of a tenderer's method statement will be based on the following scale:

Score	Descriptions
0	Cannot be scored No information provided or incapable of being taken forward either because the Contractor does not demonstrate an understanding of the Employer's requirements or because the solution is incapable of meeting our requirements.
1	Unsatisfactory Although the Contractor does demonstrate an understanding of the Employer's requirements there are some major risks or omissions in relation to the proposed solution to deliver the Works and the Employer would not be confident of its requirements being met.
2	Satisfactory A response which is capable of meeting the Employer's requirements but is unlikely to go beyond this.
3	Good A response which shows that the Contractor demonstrates an understanding of the Employer's requirements, has a credible methodology to deliver the Works and could evolve into additional benefits.
4	Very Good A response which shows that the Contractor demonstrates an understanding of the Employer's requirements, has a credible methodology to deliver the Works alongside a clear process and plan to deliver additional benefits and deliver value.
5	Excellent A response which shows how the service can comprehensively be taken to the next level in terms of exceeding the Employer's requirements and/or offering significant added value to the Employer's overall strategic requirements and objectives.

13. Each question will be scored and then the sub-weighting applied to give a weighted score for quality. The score will be to the nearest two decimal points.

Examples

Points Awarded	Sub Criteria Score	Calculation	Total Score
1	3	$1/5 \times 3$	0.60
3	3	$3/5 \times 3$	1.80
5	3	$5/5 \times 3$	3.00

14. A tenderer's evaluation score will be based on the tenderer's written tender submission, but this may be clarified (and its veracity and accuracy verified) by the following methods:
- Clarification meetings
 - By responses to clarification questions raised by the Employer
15. Tenderers will not be able to address any omissions in their tender submission during any clarification process.
16. The initial score will be based on the evaluators' review of the tenderer's tender submission and be updated based on any further clarification. The final scores may differ from the initial scores to reflect the full evaluation process

undertaken by the evaluation panel. Overall scores will be calculated to ascertain the tenderer's overall percentage score.

17. 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. A consensus score will be agreed by the evaluators for each of the evaluation criteria.

QUALITY THRESHOLDS

18. The scoring table is set out at paragraph 12. Each response to the award criteria will be marked out of a possible score of 5. The scoring will be based on the general principles and descriptions shown in the table at paragraph 12.
19. Tenderers should note that for method statements two (2), three (3) and four (4) a tenderer must score 2 (satisfactory) for each of the sub-criteria otherwise it may be rejected.

STAGE THREE - PRICE

20. A price evaluation model ("the model") has been designed to help the Employer carry out a robust evaluation of price. The model has been prepared using data obtained on planned maintenance visits in relation to the service and predicted annual spend levels. The tenderers' percentage adjustments and rates captured in the price schedule will be used to populate the model.
21. The model has been produced in Microsoft Excel 2010.
22. Tenderers should note that Schedule of Rates in Annex 1, 2, 3, 4, 5, 6 and 7 are pre-priced and that their tender percentage adjustment should include for all costs as detailed within the Preliminaries, Technical Specification and the Contract Documents. The total of each Annex will be calculated and carried forward to the summary page.
23. Where appropriate each Annex will be adjusted by the tender percentage adjustments, inserted in the Form of Tender as follows:
 - (i). Annex 1 Pre-Priced Schedule of Rates for Resurfacing of Roads and Paths multiplied by indicative quantities derived from surveys and subject to percentage adjustment A1.
 - (ii). Annex 2 Pre-Priced Schedule of Rates for Drainage and De-scaling Works multiplied by indicative quantities derived from surveys and subject to percentage adjustment A2.
 - (iii). Annex 3 Pre-Priced Schedule of Rates for Water Mains Replacement Works multiplied by indicative quantities derived from surveys and subject to percentage adjustment A3.
 - (iv). Annex 4 Pre-Priced Schedule of Rates for Painting and Decoration Works multiplied by indicative quantities derived from surveys and subject to percentage adjustment A4.
 - (v). Annex 5 Pre-Priced Schedule of Rates for Fencing Works multiplied by indicative quantities derived from surveys and subject to percentage adjustment A5.

- (vi). Annex 6 Pre-Priced Schedule of Rates for Estate Boundary Wall Works multiplied by indicative quantities derived from surveys and subject to percentage adjustment A6.
 - (i). Annex 7 Pre-Priced Schedule of Rates for Scaffolding Works multiplied by indicative quantities derived from surveys and subject to percentage adjustment A7.
 - (vii). Annex 8 Tenderers' Schedule of Hourly Charges, inserted in the Form of Tender and multiplied by indicative number of hours.
24. As noted, the Employer reserves the right to clarify or hold clarification meetings with tenderers concerning any aspects arising from a tenderer's submission including without limitation, the tenderer's response to these sections.
25. The tenderer with the lowest lump sum price will be awarded 70 points. The lowest cost submitted will be used as the baseline for establishing the % weighting for the remaining bidders using the following formula:
- The following formula will be used to evaluate the score - $(A/B) \times C$ - where:
- A = Lowest Lump Sum Price
 - B = Next Lowest Lump Sum Price
 - C = Overall Weighting for Price
- Example:
- | | |
|-------------------------------------|-------------------|
| Lowest tender £450,000. | Awarded 70 points |
| Next lowest tender £650,000. | |
| $£450,000 / £650,000 \times 70\% =$ | Awarded 57 points |
26. For the avoidance of doubt where the lowest price is scored this will be divided by itself as A/A rather than A/B so will score maximum Price score.

ABNORMALLY LOW TENDERS

27. The Employer 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 tender submissions received). The tenderers' attention is drawn to the Employer's power under regulation 69(5) of the Public Contract Regulations 2015 to disregard/reject any tender that is abnormally low.

DISCLAIMER

28. The price will be evaluated by applying the figures in the tenderer's completed pricing evaluation model to the assumed volumes of Works. These assumed volumes are made by the Employer purely for the purpose of evaluating tenders and for no other purpose and are not an indication or prediction of the quantities of works which the Employer will require or which the Contractor will provide under any awarded Contract.
29. Save for the purpose of comparing tenders the quantities inserted in the evaluation model by the Employer shall not bind the Employer in any way and do not constitute any warranty, representation, indication, estimate or prediction

of the volumes and quantities of any works which the Employer may require or the Contractor will provide under any awarded Contract.

STAGE FOUR - FINAL SELECTION AND RECOMMENDATION

30. The price score will then be added to the quality score. The total score will then be used to rank the tender submissions.
31. The top two (2) scoring tenders shall be awarded a Contract. Contract B will be awarded to the tenderer achieving the best price for the Council and its leaseholders.

TIE BREAK

32. In the event of a tie break (where two or more top scoring tenderers have the same total weighted score including both quality and price), the Employer shall select from amongst those tenderers the submission of the tender with the highest weighted score for method statement 2. In the event that this still results in a tie break the Employer shall select from amongst those tenderers the submission with the highest weighted score for price.