

# Tender Evaluation Methodology

## Introduction

1. This section sets out the methodology that will be used to evaluate Tenders received in relation to the Warm, Dry and Safe tender.
2. The Contract will be awarded to the Most Economically Advantageous Tender evaluated as described in this methodology.
3. The evaluation comprises of 3 stages:
  - Stage One - Compliance
  - Stage Two - Quality
  - Stage Three - Price
4. 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.

## Evaluation of Tenders

### Stage One - Compliance

5. Tenders will be subject to an initial compliance check to confirm that they have been submitted on time, are completed correctly, meet the requirements of the Invitation to Tender and are sufficiently complete to enable them to be evaluated in accordance with this Section.
6. 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

#### Quality Criteria

7. Tenderers will be required to submit four (4) 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.
8. In submitting these method statements, Tenderers are requested to provide evidence of their experience, achievements and benefit outcomes.
9. In order to ensure that tenderers' responses to the method statement questions remain concise, the Employer has set an overall, fully inclusive, page limit of 3 sides of A4 for method statements 1,3 and 4. This page limit does not apply to method statement 2. Any tenderer that omits to answer a question may be rejected. Where a tenderer exceeds the overall page limit, the Employer will not consider any pages beyond the initial 3 sides of A4 limit. The font has been set at Arial size 11; tenderers are not permitted to change the font or reduce the font size.

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

Criterion	Requirement	Criteria Weighting
<b>Method Statement 1:</b> Risk Management / Health and Safety	Provide your proposed approach and methodology for managing risks on site and in relation to programme delivery. Your proposal should identify specific risks you anticipate, how you propose to manage them and a proposed Risk Register as well as a Health and Safety Plan.	8
<b>Method Statement 2:</b> 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 <b>does not apply</b> to this method statement.	7
<b>Method Statement 3:</b> 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.	7
<b>Method Statement 4:</b> Programme Management and Mobilisation	Provide your proposal and methodology to ensure efficient programming and delivery on time including a mobilisation methodology. Identify the risks to the programme and how you propose to manage them.	8
<b>Total Quality score</b>		<b>30</b>

## Quality Scoring

11. 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.

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

13. 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 (if any)
  - By responses to clarification questions raised by the Employer (if any)
  - Written feedback from referees (if taken up).
14. The initial score will be based on the evaluators' review of the tenderer's 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.
15. There is a possibility that during the verification process uncertainties in what tenderers have stated in their submissions may arise. 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.
16. 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.
17. 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.
18. 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.
19. Tenders are advised that any contractor's submission for which an overall score of less than 12 points is scored or scoring 2 or less for any single method statement may be rejected by the Employer on the basis of poor quality.

**Stage Three - Price**

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

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

21. 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.

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

**Tender sum as shown on form of tender**

23. 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**

24. Rates inserted into the schedule of rates shall be multiplied by indicative quantities to arrive at a cost for comparison for the purpose of the evaluation of the schedule of rates.

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

**Abnormally Low tenders**

26. 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**

27. 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**

28. 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.