

# Tender Evaluation Methodology

## 1. Introduction

This section sets out the methodology that will be used to evaluate Tenders received in relation to the Warm, Dry and Safe tender.

The Contract will be awarded to the Most Economically Advantageous Tender evaluated as described in this methodology.

The evaluation comprises of 3 stages:

- Stage One - Compliance
- Stage Two - Quality
- Stage Three - Price

Stage One will be scored on a pass/fail basis. Stages Two and Three shall be scored; the weightings to be applied are 30 % quality and 70 % price.

## 2. Evaluation of Tenders

### Stage One - Compliance

Tenders will be subject to an initial compliance check to confirm that the:

- a) Tenders have been submitted on time, are completed correctly and meet the requirements of the Invitation to Tender.
- b) Tenders are sufficiently complete to enable them to be evaluated in accordance with this Section.
- c) Tenderer has not contravened any of the terms and conditions of the tender process.
- d) Tenderer has submitted a Tender that is capable of being accepted.

Tenders that do not meet a) – d) may be rejected at this Stage.

Tenders that pass this Stage will be subject to a detailed evaluation in accordance with the criteria and weightings set out in this document.

### Stage Two - Quality

Tenderers will be required to submit six (6) method statement proposals answering the questions contained within this section. 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.

## Quality Scoring

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

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 and evidence base or is unlawful.
0	No response – no submission was made.

## **Method Statement Questions**

Each method statement should be restricted to a maximum of 3 sides of A4 size paper using "Arial" 11 point font. If this is exceeded, the tender will be discarded at Stage 1 - Compliance.

In submitting these method statements, Tenderers are requested to provide evidence of their experience, achievements and benefit outcomes.

This section carries 30 points based on the submissions/answers provided to method statements required below:

Criterion	Requirement	Criteria Weighting
Method Statement 1: Mobilisation	Provide your proposed approach and methodology of your pre-commencement activities identifying how they comply with contract requirements and assist in avoiding future financial, quality and programme risks.	5
Method Statement 2: Health and Safety	Provide your proposed approach and method statement for managing Health and Safety on site and/or provide your Health and Safety plan. Identify your approach to continuously improving health and safety on site.	5
Method Statement 3: Risk Management	Provide your proposed approach and methodology for managing risks on site. Your proposal should identify specific risks you anticipate, how you propose to manage them and a proposed Risk Register.	5
Method Statement 4: Resident and Leaseholder Engagement	Provide your proposed approach and identify how you involve and engage residents and leaseholders for the duration of the project to obtain and satisfy their requirements and objectives. Please provide consultation documents where you have previously engaged leaseholders and residents when on site i.e. newsletters, appointment letters, resident profile forms, information letters. The maximum of 3 sides of A4 does not apply to this	5

	method statement.	
Method Statement 5: Quality Control	Provide details of your quality assurance and quality control proposals. This should cover all of the project stages (from pre-commencement, design/procurement to defects liability period) and should include the maximum warranties you proposed to provide for various building elements, quality management of sub-contractors and suppliers, defects liability management and stakeholder (statutory bodies, residence, sub-contractors, local community) liaisons.	5
Method Statement 6: Programme Management	Provide your proposal and methodology to ensure efficient programming and delivery on time. Identify the risks to the programme and how you propose to manage them.	5
	Total Quality score	30

### **Stage Three - Price**

There are two elements to the price evaluation as shown in the table below:

Ref	Criteria	<u>Maximum Points Available</u>
(1)	Tender sum	60
(2)	Schedule of Rates	10
		70

The method of scoring each criterion will be that the Tenderer with the most competitive price will receive the maximum points available for that criterion. Each remaining Tenderers' price will be awarded a score based on the percentage difference between their price and that of the most competitive price.

An example of the methodology which will be applied is included below:-

### **Contract sum as shown on form of tender**

The lowest Contractor will be awarded 60 points for this element with the other contractors being scored proportionally less based upon their percentage difference from the lowest contractor, as shown below:-

$(\text{Contractors Tender sum} - \text{Lowest Tender sum}) / \text{Lowest Tender sum} = \% \text{ adjustment}$

$60 \text{ Points} - (60 \times \% \text{ adjustment}) = \text{Price Score}$

### **Schedule of rates total as shown on tender summary**

The lowest Contractor will be awarded 10 points for this element with the other contractors being scored proportionally less based upon their percentage difference from the lowest contractor, as shown below:-

$(\text{Contractors SoR sum} - \text{Lowest SoR sum}) / \text{Lowest SoR sum} = \% \text{ adjustment}$

$10 \text{ Points} - (10 \times \% \text{ adjustment}) = \text{Schedule of rates score}$

Note: Tenderers will not be awarded negative scores. In the event of a negative score being achieved, the Tenderer will be awarded 0 points for that criterion (i.e. Score 5 in the example above). All scores achieved will be taken to two decimal places and rounded up or down for each criterion.

### **Abnormally Low tenders**

Notwithstanding the scoring methodology referred to above, Tenderers are advised that 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 Tenders received). The Employer reserves the right to disregard/reject any tender that is abnormally low.

### **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.

### **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 Employer shall select from amongst those Tenders the submission of the Tender with the highest weighted score for quality.