

Schedule 3 - Tender Evaluation Method

For the provision of Care and Support Service at Reardon Court

Reference: DN626366

This Schedule 3, Tender Evaluation Method, sets out the scoring and evaluation methodology to be used by the Authority in evaluating Tender responses. The methodology is designed to ensure that each Bidder receives equal and non-discriminatory treatment which is proportionate to the Contract and Service provision.

The maximum achievable weighted score is 100.00; please note that percentages used in the evaluation are always rounded to 2 decimal places.

Quality Evaluation

Please complete Schedule 7 (Method Statements, (Q1 to Q9)) and upload these written responses under the appropriate section of the e-Tendering system.

The Quality Evaluation, which comprises written responses to Method Statements Q1 to Q9, and Bidder Presentations (Q10) will be scored in accordance with the relevant Tables in this Schedule 3, Annex A.

For this evaluation, a single points score will be provided by each individual evaluator separately. Subsequently, these scores will then be moderated to form an agreed single consensus score for each question/element accordingly. These scores will then be converted into a weighted score using the following percentage calculation.

Percentage Calculation Scored sections (Method Statements (Quality Questions))

The following points system will be used to score Method Statements (Q1 to Q9).

Points scored will then be inputted in line with the methodology below to calculate the resulting scores for each question, respectively.

For the Scored elements:

(Actual points score awarded / element maximum points) * Weighting * 100

So, if a bidder scored 3 out of 4 in an element:

Sum would be as follows in this instance: $(3 / 4) * 0.20 * 100 = 15.00\%$

This score is then added to the other scores to give the overall score for Quality, with the same calculation methodology also being used for Bidder Presentations (Q10).

Note: *the above example is for illustrative purposes*

Details of the weighting allocated to each method statement question can be found under at Table 1 and Table 2, respectively.

Minimum Quality Threshold

In line with Invitation to Tender (Introductory Document, 'Minimum Quality Threshold'), Bidders must score a minimum of 2 points or more for each written Method Statement question (Q1 to Q9), and is also required in order for the Price elements of the Tender to be considered. **Bidders who fail to meet the Minimum Quality Threshold shall not be considered further.**

A strict word limit has been imposed for each method statement. Any information given outside of this limit will not be factored into the evaluation to enable responses to be as concise and relevant as possible. For the absence of doubt, this means that evaluators will read up to the maximum word limit stipulated for each question answered and disregard anything beyond that limit. Unless requested, attachments should not be included as they will not be read or considered as part of the evaluation. This includes any policy and procedures that are referenced in the responses unless these have been explicitly requested in the relevant question to be presented at the point of submission. Bidders are to use font style Arial, size 12pt.

Evaluation of Price

Please complete in full Schedule 6 (Pricing Schedule) and upload under the appropriate section of the e-Tendering system.

All prices are to be exclusive of Value Added Tax (VAT) and inclusive of all other costs; i.e. travel and expenses.

The mechanism for establishing Price scores is that the lowest price Bidder is awarded the maximum percentage score available; all other Bidder's are awarded using the following formula:

$$(Lowest Bidder Annual Price / Bidder's Annual Price) \times 30\%$$

Scores will be rounded to 2 decimal points.

Note: *example is for illustrative purposes:*

	Total Annual Contract Price submitted	Formula	Weighting 30%
Bidder A	£917,000	$£810,000/£917,000 \times 30\%$	26.50%
Bidder B	£900,000	$£810,000/900,000 \times 30\%$	27.00%
Bidder C	£850,000	$£810,000/£850,000 \times 30\%$	28.59%
Bidder D	£810,000	$£810,000/£810,000 \times 30\%$	30.00%

Maximum Hourly Rate requirement - Notes for Bidders

The Maximum Hourly Rate for the Extra Care Service at Reardon Court is **£18.00**

Bidders must not exceed the Maximum Hourly Rate specified in these procurement documents. **If a Bidder exceeds this Maximum Hourly Rate (£18.00), they shall not be considered further in the procurement process and deemed non-compliant. Schedule 6 (Pricing Schedule) refers.**

Annex A

Responses to Schedule 7, Method Statements (Q1 to Q9), will be awarded scores on the basis of the matrix below (Table 1), and the description which most closely fits the relevant responses.

Table 1

Score	Grade	Criteria Description
4	Very Good	Response/solution is very clear and of a high standard with no reservations at all about acceptability; provides very good evidence on how the Bidder will make significant progress to the way the service is delivered/fulfil the requirements.
3	Good	Good response/solution to that aspect of our requirements; provides more evidence than that of an acceptable response to deliver/fulfil the requirements.
2	Adequate	Acceptable response/solution; all basic requirements are met; provides evidence given of skill/knowledge sought to deliver/fulfil the requirements.
1	Poor	Less than acceptable response/solution; lacks convincing evidence of skills/experience sought; lack of real understanding of the requirement or evidence of ability to deliver/fulfil the requirements.
0	Unacceptable	Non-compliant response. Fails to address the question/issue or a detrimental response/solution; limited or poor evidence of skill/knowledge sought to deliver/fulfil the requirements.

For the avoidance of doubt, Bidder Presentations under Schedule 7, Method Statements (Q10), will be awarded scores on the basis of the matrix below (Table 2), and the description which most closely fits the relevant responses.

Table 2

Score	Grade	Criteria Description
5	Excellent	Presentation performs strongly against the question showing substantial evidence of capability and capacity to deliver the requirements which is completely relevant and excellent overall. The Presentation is comprehensive, unambiguous and demonstrates a thorough understanding of the requirements and provides full and well considered details of how the requirements will be met.
4	Very Good	Presentation performs very well against the question showing considerable capacity and capability to deliver the requirements. The presentation is highly detailed and demonstrates a very good understanding and provides full details on how the requirements will be fulfilled.
3	Good	Presentation performs well against the question showing a good level of their understanding/evidence to deliver the requirements and is perceived as a sufficiently tailored approach to fulfilling the Council's requirements.
2	Adequate	Presentation meets the basic requirements of the question and is relevant and acceptable. The presentation provides sufficient evidence of required capability and capacity to deliver the requirements but may lack details/explanation on how the requirements will be fulfilled in certain areas.
1	Poor	Presentation is partially relevant but generally poor. The presentation addresses some elements of the requirements but contains insufficient/limited explanation of their understanding of the Council's particular requirements and is perceived as a generic offer rather than a tailored offer to fulfilling the requirements.
0	Unacceptable	Nil or inadequate presentation. Fails to demonstrate an ability to meet the requirements.

Evaluation (Award) Criteria & Weightings

Award Criteria	Weighting	Element Max. Score
Maximum Hourly Rate requirement Bidder's Hourly Rate submitted does not/does exceed the maximum budget	N/A	Pass/Fail
Quality (Method Statements) 70%		
Q1: Aims and Outcomes	10%	4
Q2: Management and Staffing	5%	4
Q3: Mobilisation of the Contract	5%	4
Q4: Equalities and Diversity	5%	4
Q5: Service Development and Service Scope	7%	4
Q6: Service Provision	7%	4
Q7: Partnerships and Communication	7%	4
Q8: Performance and Quality Assurance	7%	4
Q9: Social Value, Sustainability and Ethical Practices	7%	4
Q10: Bidder Presentation - Personalising the Council's Extra Care Service	10%	5
Price 30%		
Total Annual Contract Price	30%	N/A
Total	100%	