

LONDON BOROUGH OF SOUTHWARK

MEASURED TERM CONTRACT

FOR

REPAIR AND MAINTENANCE

Of

**Fire Fighting Equipment, Fire Alarms, Emergency Lighting,
Warden Call and Door Entry**

Volume 1

Document Number 3a

SCHEDULE 2

Evaluation Methodology

Contents

Evaluation of Tenders	Page 3
Evaluation for Compliance	Page 3
Principal Criteria	Page 3
Quality Criteria	Page 4
Quality Scoring Scale	Page 6
Evaluation of Price	Page 7
Abnormally Low Tenders	Page 9
Disclaimer	Page 9
Final Selection and Recommendation	Page 10
Tie Break	Page 10

Evaluation Methodology

EVALUATION OF TENDERS

1. This schedule sets out the methodology that will be used to evaluate Tenders received in relation to the Fire Fighting Equipment, Fire Alarms, Emergency Lighting, Warden Call and Door Entry Contract
2. The Contract will be awarded to the Most Economically Advantageous Tender evaluated as described in this methodology.
3. The evaluation criteria comprise of two elements, quality and price. The weightings to be applied are 30% quality and 70% price. The quality element contains sub weightings which are set out in this Schedule.

EVALUATION FOR COMPLIANCE

4. Tenders will be checked initially for completeness and compliance with the Instructions to Tenderers. Whilst the Council 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 Council reserves the right to reject Tenders that are not complete and/or compliant. Tenderers are referred to The Checklist Of Documents To Be Returned in volume 5 of the tender documents.
5. For tendering purposes, Tenderers are required to confirm as part of their Tender that if awarded the Contract they will be able to provide the required levels of insurance cover in the Contract as set out in the Contract Particulars. The Council 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
6. Tenderers are required to submit the Parent Company Guarantee Undertaking, if applicable, and Performance Bond Undertaking set out in the Instructions to Tenderers and contained in the Form of Tender

OVERALL EVALUATION WEIGHTING

7. The Council has allocated a maximum weighting for each of the two principal criteria shown in the table below which reflects the relative importance attributed by the Council:

Evaluation Criteria	Weighting %
Quality (Tenderers Proposals)	30
Price	70
	100

8. The total score for Quality Criteria will be added to the Price Criteria score to give a total percentage score out of 100. All Tenders will be ranked in accordance with their overall total percentage score.

QUALITY CRITERIA

9. Tenderers will be required to submit four Method Statement proposals answering the questions contained within this Quality Submission Schedule. These Method Statements, once approved by the Council, 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 table below:

<u>Criterion</u>	<u>Requirement or sub-criteria in respect of Method Statements</u>		<u>Sub-Criteria Weighting</u>	<u>Criteria Weighting</u>
Mobilisation Method Statement 1	A. Resources		1	5
	B. Approach		3	
	C. Plan		1	
Service Delivery Method Statement 2	A. Resources	I. Responsive repairs	2	15
		II. Planned Maintenance and Periodic Testing	2	
	B. Quality Control	I. Direct Employees	1	
		II. Sub-contractors and suppliers	2	
		III. Health and Safety	1	
	C. Business Objectives	I. Right first time	2	
		II. Complaints and feedback	1	
		III. Meeting the needs of Residents.	1	
	D. Scenario		3	
Management Method Statement 3	A. Structure Chart		1	8
	B. Roles and responsibilities		2	
	C. Quality of management resources		2	
	D. Recruitment and selection	I. Staff	3	
		II. Sub contractor's		
III. Suppliers				
London Living Wage Method Statement 4	A. Proposals to administer, monitor and report to the Council for direct employees and sub-contractors		1	2
	B. Identification of productivity gains and other benefits including measurement and reporting		1	
Total Quality Score				30

QUALITY SCORING SCALE

12. Scoring of Tenderers Method Statements will be based on the following scale:

Score	Scoring Guidelines
10	Outstanding - response exceeds requirements, is fully evidenced, adds value and benefits and demonstrates practical innovation and tangible creativity to business solutions, with full confidence in capability to deliver.
9	Excellent - response meets all requirements while providing fully evidenced additional value and benefits and a high level of confidence.
8	Good - response meets all requirements with a good evidence base and some added benefits together with higher level of confidence.
7	Good - response meets all requirements with a good evidence base and some added benefits.
6	Satisfactory - response is complete and meets all minimum requirements while providing appropriate evidence to support these together with a higher level of confidence.
5	Satisfactory - response is complete and meets all minimum requirements, and provides appropriate evidence.
4	Less than satisfactory – response is complete but fails to provide adequate evidence that all minimum requirements can be satisfied.
3	Less than satisfactory – response is complete but fails to satisfy all minimum requirements or fails to provide adequate evidence that these requirements can be satisfied.
2	Poor – response is in part incomplete, non compliant, fails to meet any minimum requirements or lacks an evidence base.
1	Poor – response is incomplete, non compliant, fails to meet any minimum requirements, lacks an evidence base or is unlawful.
0	No response – no submission was made.

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
0	3	0/10 x 3	0.00
5	3	5/10 x 3	1.50
10	3	10/10 x 3	3.00

14. A Tenderer's evaluation score will be based on the Tenderer's written Tender, but this will be clarified (and its veracity and accuracy verified) by the following methods:
 - Clarification meetings / clarification presentations
 - By responses to clarification questions raised by the Council (if any)
 - Written feedback from referees (if taken up).
15. The initial score will be based on the evaluators' review of the Tenderers' response document and be updated based on 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.
16. There is a possibility that during the verification process there may arise uncertainties in what Tenderers have stated in their submissions. The evaluation process has a built-in opportunity to attend to uncertainties, through a process of clarification. These will be identified by evaluators as they are verifying submissions through the clarification interviews and site visits.
17. To manage this process openly and fairly there will also be a process of moderating and agreeing clarifications to avoid there being any preferential treatment shown to any Tenderer, and to ensure that any areas for clarification are consolidated.
18. There needs to be a careful distinction between clarifications and omissions and the process is not about providing an opportunity to address something that has not been addressed as this would be unfair to other Tenderers.
19. Tenderers are advised that 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.

EVALUATION OF PRICE

20. A Price Evaluation Model has been designed to help the Council carry out a robust evaluation of price. The model has been prepared using historical data

in relation to the service and predicted annual spend levels. The rates, prices and percentage adjustments captured in the Form of Tender will be used to populate the model.

21. The Price Evaluation Model has been produced in Microsoft Excel 2003.
22. Tenderers should note that all Schedule of Rates are Pre Priced and that their Tendered percentage adjustments should include for all costs as detailed within the Preliminaries and the Contract Documents. The total of each Annex will be calculated and carried to the summary page.
23. Where appropriate each Annex will be adjusted by the Tendered percentage adjustments, inserted in the Form of Tender as follows;
 - (i). Annex 1 Pre Priced Schedule of Rates for Warden Call System PPM/Service Visits subject to percentage adjustment A1.
 - (ii). Annex 2 Pre Priced Schedule of Rates for Warden Call System subject to percentage adjustment A2 and multiplied by indicative quantities derived from previous historical data.
 - (iii). Annex 3 Pre Priced Schedule of Rates for Door Entry Systems subject to percentage adjustment A3 and multiplied by indicative quantities derived from previous historical data.
 - (iv). Annex 4 Pre Priced Schedule of Rates for Fire Alarm System PPM/Service Visits subject to percentage adjustment A4.
 - (v). Annex 5 Pre Priced Schedule of Rates for Fire Detection Systems subject to percentage adjustment A5 and multiplied by indicative quantities derived from historical data.
 - (vi). Annex 6 Pre Priced Schedule of Rates for Emergency Lighting PPM/Service Visits subject to percentage adjustment A6.
 - (vii). Annex 7 Pre Priced Schedule of Rates for Emergency Lighting Systems subject to percentage adjustment A7 and multiplied by indicative quantities derived from historical data.
 - (viii). Annex 8 Pre Priced Schedule of Rates for Fire Fighting Equipment PPM/Service Visits subject to percentage adjustment A8.
 - (ix). Annex 9 Pre Priced Schedule of Rates for Fire Fighting Equipment subject to percentage adjustment A9 and multiplied by indicative quantities derived from historical data.
 - (x). Annex 10 Tenderers Schedule of Hourly Charges, inserted in the Form of Tender and multiplied by indicative number of hours derived from historical data.
 - (xi). Annex 11 Tenderers cost for Performance Bond as detailed in the Form of Tender.

24. 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 £650,000. Awarded 70 points

Next Lowest Tender £700,000.

$\frac{£650,000}{£700,000} \times 70\% =$ Awarded 65 points

25. 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

26. Notwithstanding the scoring methodology referred to above, Tenderers 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, Tenderers 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.

DISCLAIMER

27. The Price will be evaluated by applying the figures in the Tenderers completed Pricing Evaluation Model to the assumed volumes of Works. These assumed volumes are made by the Council 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 Council will require or which the Contractor will provide under any awarded Contract.
28. Save for the purpose of comparing Tenders the quantities inserted in the evaluation model by the Council shall not bind the Council in any way and do not constitute any warranty, representation, indication, estimate or prediction of the volumes and quantities of any works which the Council may require or the Contractor will provide under any awarded Contract.

FINAL SELECTION AND RECOMMENDATION

29. The Price score will then be added to the Quality score. The total score will then be used to rank the Tender submissions.

30. All tenders will be ranked in accordance with their overall Total score.

TIE BREAK

31. 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 Tender with the highest weighted score for Method Statement 3. In the event that this still results in a Tie Break the Council shall select from amongst those Tenderers the submission with the highest weighted score for price.