

Call-off Tender Evaluation Methodology – Mini Competition

Based on Framework Agreement for Landscaping Works Projects within the London Borough of Southwark

Project: Camberwell New Cemetery Area B with associated Landscaping works

Introduction

1. This section details the methodology that will be used for assessing each Call-off Tender Submission responding to this Call-off Invitation to Tender (ITT) mini tender competition.
2. The contract for Camberwell New Cemetery – Area B with associated Landscaping works will be awarded to the most economically advantageous tenders (MEAT) evaluated as described in this methodology and based on the Framework Agreement for Landscaping Works Projects within the London Borough of Southwark.
3. The evaluation for this call-off tender comprise of 4 stages:
 - Stage One – Compliance - Requirement of the Contractor to state whether any of the circumstances relating to its economic and financial standing or technical or professional ability as disclosed in its responses to its pre-qualification questionnaire have *altered* from the tender submission for the Framework Agreement for Landscaping Works Projects within the London Borough of Southwark
 - Stage 2 – Suitability - Capability of each tenderer which shall be evaluated as follows:

The Contractor shall provide a written statement as to whether all the statements it made in response to the suitability questionnaire ('its Suitability Response') would be the same if made at the date of submission under this mini competition as per the tender submission for the Framework Agreement for Landscaping Works Projects within the London Borough of Southwark. If it's statement is that its Suitability Response would denote a worse position in relation to any matter the Employer shall, using the evaluation criteria used to evaluate the responses to the suitability questionnaire, consider whether the Contractor remains capable of carrying out the Works. If the result of that evaluation is that the Contractor is not so capable, its tender shall be rejected
 - Stage Three - Quality
 - Stage Four - Price
4. Stages three and four shall be scored; the weightings to be applied are 30% quality and 70% price.
5. Award of the contract for work for "Camberwell New Cemetery Area B with associated Landscaping works" shall be determined as set out later in this methodology.
6. In evaluating the Tender, the Council shall be seeking to endure the most economically advantageous Tender and is not obliged to accept the lowest or any tender.

Stage One - Compliance

7. Mini Competition Tender Submissions will be subject to an initial compliance check to confirm that they
 - a) have been submitted on time,
 - b) are completed correctly and in full,

JCT Intermediate Form of Contract

1b Call-off Tender Evaluation Methodology – Camberwell New Cemetery Area B with associated Landscaping works

c) meet all the requirements of the Call-off Invitation to Tender

8. The Council reserve the right to reject any Mini Competition Tender Submission that fails the initial compliance check at stage 1, or any Tender submissions that receive a fail for any of the pass or fail questions at stage 2, as per the stipulations above and any rejected Tender Submissions will not be subject to the detailed Stage 3 and Stage 4 evaluation.

Stage Two - Suitability

9. The Contractor shall provide a written statement as to whether all the statements it made in response to the suitability questionnaire ('its Suitability Response') would be the same if made at the date of submission under this mini competition as per the tender submission for the Framework Agreement for Landscaping Works Projects within the London Borough of Southwark. If it's statement is that its Suitability Response would denote a worse position in relation to any matter the Employer shall using the evaluation criteria used to evaluate the responses to the suitability questionnaire, consider whether the Contractor remains capable of carrying out the Works. If the result of that evaluation is that the Contractor is not so capable, its tender shall be rejected
10. In Appendix B there are three questions that relate to capability and experience that must be completed. Each question will be marked on the basis of the scoring table shown in paragraph 19. Bidders must achieve a minimum score of three (3) "satisfactory" for each of these questions in order to proceed to the next stage. Where the bidder scores less than three (3) the Council reserves the right to reject the tender.
11. Please note that whenever used in this questionnaire, the term "Supplier" refers to a sole proprietor, partnership, incorporated company, co-operative, as appropriate, and the term "officer" refers to any director, company secretary, partner, associate or other person occupying a position of responsibility within the organisation.
12. Please include, where appropriate, any supporting documents marking clearly on all enclosures the name of your firm and the number of the question to which they refer. You should provide an index of all documents referred to in the completed questionnaire.
13. Please submit in a manner that makes it easy for the Council to assess. All responses must be in English, and any electronic submission must be MS Word compatible. All responses must be uploaded and made available to the council via e-procurement portal ProContract <https://procontract.due-north.com/Login>.

Stage Three- Quality

Quality criteria

14. Tenderers will be required to submit method statements answering the questions contained in Appendix B. Tenderers are required to answer questions Q1.1, Q2.1, Q3.1 & Q3.2. These method statements, once approved by the council, will be incorporated into contract agreement as the Contractor's planned way of working/operating throughout the Contract Period.
15. In submitting these method statements, Tenderers may provide evidence to subsist their response.

16. Each method statement (all sub-criteria inclusive) must not exceed 3 sides of A4 size paper using "Arial" 11 point font. Any part of the response in excess of the page allowance will be disregarded.
17. Tenderers are advised to read the Specification in the ITT Documents prior to answering the quality question.
18. The requirement for each method statement is set out in Appendix B.
19. The weighting for each method statement is set out in the following table:

Method Statement – See Appendix B	Section Weighting	Question	Question Weighting	Max Score (if tenderer scored highest mark i.e. 5)	Minimum pass score
1. Q1.1 Hard and Soft Landscaping Contracts (Project Specific Technical Ability & Understanding of Delivery Requirements)	12	Q 1.1	12	12	7
2. Q2.1 Contract Management and Delivery (Project (<i>specific</i>) and contract Management)	6	Q 2.1	6	6	3
3. Q3.1 & 3.2 Technical and Professional Ability – Project Specific	6	Q 3.1	6	6	3
	6	Q 3.2	6	6	3
Total Quality Score	30		30	30	16

Example

*Total score divided by maximum score x 30= 4/5x30= 24% out of 30%

Quality Scoring

20. Each quality question will be awarded appropriate marks based on the following basis:

Assessment	Score	Basis of score
Cannot be scored	0 points	No information provided or incapable of being taken forward either because the tenderer does not demonstrate an understanding of our requirements or because the solution is incapable of meeting our requirements
Unsatisfactory	1 point	Although the tenderer does demonstrate an understanding of our requirements there are some major risks or omissions in relation to the proposed solution to deliver the service and we would not be confident of our requirements being met
Less than satisfactory	2 points	A response which is capable of meeting our requirements but fail to provide adequate evidence that these requirements can be satisfied
Satisfactory	3 points	A response which shows that the tenderer demonstrates an understanding of our requirements has a credible methodology to deliver the service and could evolve into additional benefits.
Good	4 points	A response which shows that the tenderer demonstrates an understanding of our requirements, has a credible methodology to deliver the service alongside a clear process and plan to deliver additional benefits and deliver value
Very Good	5 points	A response which shows how the service can comprehensively be taken to the next level in terms of exceeding our requirements and/or offering significant added value to the council's overall strategic requirements and objectives.

21. Each question will be scored and then the criteria weighting applied to give a weighted score for quality.

22. 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 / clarification presentations
- By responses to clarification questions raised by the Employer
- Written feedback from referees

23. Tenderers will not be able to address any omissions in their Tender Submission during any clarification process.

24. 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 panel. Overall scores will be calculated to ascertain the Tenderer's overall percentage score.
25. The evaluation panel will 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.
26. Any Tender Submission scoring 3 (out of 5) or less for any single sub question of a method statement may be rejected.

Stage Four - Price

27. The pricing document will be examined in order to detect any computational errors. Where an examination reveals an error or discrepancy between these prices and the overall tender figure, this will be addressed using Alternative 1 under the Tendering Practice Note 2012.
28. The fees/charges/rates submitted by the Contractor in its Framework Tender shall form the basis of how the Contractor shall calculate its prices under any Call-Off Contract.

Ref	Criteria	Maximum Points Available
(1)	Returned Contract Sum Analysis	70
		70

29. The price evaluation score will make up 70% of the final score.
30. Tenderers are required to complete the attached Contract Sum Analysis. Each remaining Tenderers' price will be awarded a score based on the percentage difference between their price and that of the most competitive price.
31. An example of the methodology which will be applied are included below:

Ref (1) Contract Sum analysis

Contractors Tender sum – Lowest Tender sum) / Lowest Tender sum = % adjustment

70 Points – (70 x % adjustment) = Price Score

Note: All scores achieved will be taken to two decimal places and rounded up or down for each criterion.

Abnormally low tenders

32. 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 Tender Submissions received). The council reserves the right to reject any Tender Submission that it considers to be abnormally low.

Tie break

33. Tie Break

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 council shall select from amongst those tenderers the submission of the tenderer with the highest weighted score for price. In the event that this still results in a tie break the Council shall then select the Tenderer with the highest weighted score for Method Statement 1. (Q1.1)

Final selection and recommendation

The scores achieved for both quality and price will be added together to give an overall score. The overall scores will then be used to rank the Tender Submissions. The top scoring tenderer shall be recommended for appointment.