

London Borough of Southwark

Asbestos Consultancy Services
(Contract A) – surveying and bulk sampling
(Contract B) – air sampling and monitoring

Section 1.3

Evaluation Methodology document

Contents

EVALUATION OF TENDERS 3
THE EVALUATION PANEL 3
STAGE 1 - COMPLIANCE 3
STAGE 2 – PRICE EVALUATION 3
ABNORMALLY LOW TENDERS 4
DISCLAIMER 5
STAGE 3 – QUALITY EVALUATION 5
THRESHOLDS 9
FINAL SELECTION AND RECOMMENDATION 10
TIE BREAK 10

Evaluation Methodology

EVALUATION OF TENDERS

1. This section sets out the methodology that will be used to evaluate Tender submissions received in relation to the two contracts - Contract A – surveying and bulk sampling asbestos consultancy services and Contract B – air sampling and monitoring asbestos consultancy services.
2. Two (2) contracts (to different Consultants) will be awarded to the most economically advantageous Tenders evaluated as described in this methodology.
3. The evaluation criteria comprise of two elements: price and quality. The weightings to be applied are 70% price and 30% quality. The quality element contains sub-weightings which are set out in this schedule. The total score for quality will be added to the price score to give a total score out of 100. All Tenders will be ranked in accordance with their overall total score.
4. The evaluation comprises of 3 stages:
 - a. Stage 1 Compliance
 - b. Stage 2 Price Evaluation
 - c. Stage 3 Quality Submissions (Method Statements) Evaluation

THE EVALUATION PANEL

5. The Authority has set up a Tender Evaluation Panel to assess the Tender submissions received in relation to this procurement. This Panel consists of officers from across the Authority with understanding and working knowledge of the Services to be provided.

STAGE 1 - COMPLIANCE

6. Tenders will be checked initially for completeness and compliance with the ITT Documents. Whilst the Authority 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 Authority reserves the right to reject Tenders that are not complete and/or non-compliant. Tenderers are referred to 'Checklist of Documents to be returned' in Section 1.10 of the ITT Documents.
7. For tendering purposes, Tenderers are required to confirm as part of its 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 Authority 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 its Tender.
8. Tenderers are required to submit the Parent Company Guarantee Undertaking, if applicable, set out in the ITT Documents.
9. Tender submissions that pass this Stage 1 will be subject to a detailed evaluation in accordance with the criteria and weightings set out in this document.

STAGE 2 – PRICE EVALUATION

12. A price evaluation model (“the model”) has been designed to help the Authority carry out a robust evaluation of price. The model has been prepared using historical data in relation to the Services and predicted annual spend levels. The rates, prices and percentage

adjustments captured in the Form of Tenders for Contracts A&B will be used to populate the model.

13. The model has been produced in Microsoft Excel 2010.
14. Tenderers should note that all SORs are pre-priced and that their tendered percentage adjustments should include for all costs as detailed within the Specification and the ITT Documents. The total of each Annex will be calculated and carried to the summary page.
15. Where appropriate each Annex will be adjusted by the tendered percentage adjustments, inserted in the Form of Tender(s) as follows:

Contract A

- (i). Annex 1 – pre-priced SORs for surveying and bulk sampling surveys subject to percentage adjustment A1 and multiplied by indicative estimated quantities.
- (ii). Annex 2 - Schedule of Hourly Charges, associated - inserted in the Form of Tender and multiplied by estimated number of hours.

Contract B

- (i). Annex 1 – Tenderer's rates inserted in the Form of Tender multiplied by indicative estimated quantities.
- (ii). Annex 2 - Schedule of Hourly Charges, associated - inserted in the Form of Tender and multiplied by estimated number of hours.

16. As noted, the Authority 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.
17. 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 Tenderers 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 £1,000,000. Awarded 70 points

Next lowest tender £1,200,000.

$\frac{£1,000,000}{£1,200,000} \times 70\% =$ Awarded 58 points

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

18. 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 Employer reserves the right to reject any Tender Submission that is abnormally low.

DISCLAIMER

19. The price will be evaluated by applying the figures in the Tenderer's completed pricing evaluation model to the assumed volumes of Services. These assumed volumes are made by the Authority purely for the purpose of evaluating Tenders and for no other purpose and are not an indication or prediction of the quantities of Services which the Authority will require or which the Consultant will provide under any awarded contract.
20. Save for the purpose of comparing Tenders, the quantities inserted in the pricing evaluation model by the Authority, shall not bind the Authority in any way and does not constitute any warranty, representation, indication, estimate or prediction of the volumes and quantities of any Services which the Authority may require or the Consultant will provide under any awarded contract.

STAGE 3 – QUALITY EVALUATION

21. Tenderers will be required to submit:

Contract A - Four (4) method statement proposals answering the questions contained within the Quality Submission Schedule attached

Contract B - Four (4) method statement proposals answering the questions contained within the Quality Submission Schedule attached.

These method statements, once approved by the Authority, will be incorporated into the contract as the Consultant's planned way of working/operating throughout the Term.

22. All submissions will be scored against the same criteria/ sub criteria and sub-weightings as set out in this schedule.
23. The weighting for each method statement proposal is set out in the following tables for Contracts A&B:

Contract A

<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. Resource Structure	2	4
	B. Roles and Responsibilities	2	
Service delivery Method Statement 2	A. Plans for updating and maintaining the Authority's Asbestos Register	3	15
	B. The management and methods of communications with the Authority, Residents and Contractors	6	
	C. The resources the Tenderer will deploy on the contract to deliver the Service and achieve the KPIs	3	
	D. Provide an example of a monthly report on the results of internal quality audit control	3	
Compliance Method Statement 3	A. Asbestos Bulk Sampling	3	9
	B. Asbestos Refurbishment and Demolition Survey	6	
London Living Wage Method Statement 4	A. Administer and Monitor	1	2
	B. Identification of Productivity Gains	1	
Total Quality Score			30

Contract B

<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. Resource Structure	2	4
	B. Roles and Responsibilities	2	
Service delivery Method Statement 2	A. Plans for updating and maintaining the Authority's Asbestos Asset Register	4	15
	B. The management and methods of communications with the Authority, Contractors and Residents	4	
	C. The resources the Tenderer will deploy on this contract to deliver the Services and achieve the KPIs	4	
	D. Provide an example of a monthly report on the results of internal quality audit control	3	
Compliance Method Statement 3	A. Emergency Responses	3	9
	B. Air Sampling and Monitoring	6	
London Living Wage Method Statement 4	A. Administer and Monitor	1	2
	B. Identification of Productivity Gains	1	
Total Quality Score			30

24. The scoring of a Tenderer's method statement 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.

25. 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

26. 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:
 - By responses to clarification questions raised by the Authority
 - Written feedback from referees
27. Tenderers will not be able to address any omissions in their Tender Submission during any clarification process.
28. The initial score will be based on the evaluators' review of the Tenderer's tender submission and be updated based on 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.
29. 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.

THRESHOLDS

30. The scoring table is set out at paragraph 24. Each response to the method statement questions will be marked out of a possible score of 10. The scoring will be based on the general principles and descriptions shown in the table at paragraph 24.
31. Tenderer's should note that for method statements two (2), three (3) and four (4) a Tenderer must score 5 (satisfactory) for each of the sub-criteria otherwise it may be rejected.

FINAL SELECTION AND RECOMMENDATION

32. 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.
33. Contract A will be completed first. If the successful tenderer for contract A has tendered for contract B, it will be removed from consideration of contract B.
34. The overall top scoring Tenderer for Contract A will be awarded Contract A.

35. Tenderer's will only be awarded one contract to ensure the separation of duties.

TIE BREAK

36. 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 Authority shall select from amongst those Tenderers the submission of the Tender with the highest weighted score for method statement. In the event that this still results in a tie break, the Authority shall select from amongst those Tenderers the submission with the highest weighted score for price.