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### Standard Selection Questionnaire and Tender Evaluation

* 1. For the purposes of this procurement the Council will be operating an open tender process.
  2. The evaluation of your submission will be based upon two stages:
* Selection criteria; and
* Award criteria  
  1. The Council will first evaluate the responses it receives to the Standard Selection Questionnaire (SSQ) in respect of “selection criteria”. If your organisation has successfully passed the “selection criteria” in the table below you will then be evaluated against the award criteria set out in this document.

|  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- |
| **SSQ Reference** | **Selection Criteria** | **Assessment** |
| Section 2 | Grounds for Mandatory exclusion | Pass / Fail |
| Section 3 | Grounds for Discretionary exclusion | Pass / Fail |
| Section 4 | Economic and Financial Standing | Pass / Fail |
| Section 6.1 | Technical and Professional Ability | Pass / Fail |

* 1. Failure to meet the “selection criteria” requirements will automatically exclude you from the second stage of the evaluation process.

### Standard Selection Questionnaire (SSQ) Assessment

* 1. The section numbering and criteria listed in the table below refers to the sections in Document 6 – Standard Selection Questionnaire.

|  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- |
| **Section** | **Contents** | **Selection Criteria** | **Criteria** |
|  | Lot selection | Please select which Lot you are applying for and that you are willing to work in. | Not scored |
| 1 | General information | Please complete providing as much detail as possible. When giving contact details please ensure the person listed is able to discuss the content of this submission. | Not scored |
| 2 | **Grounds for mandatory exclusion** | You will be excluded from the procurement process if there is evidence of convictions relating to specific criminal offences including, but not limited to, bribery, corruption, conspiracy, terrorism, fraud and money laundering, or if you have been the subject of a binding legal decision which found a breach of legal obligations to pay tax or social security obligations (except where this is disproportionate e.g. only minor amounts involved). | Pass/Fail |

|  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- |
| 3 | **Grounds for discretionary exclusion** | The Council will exclude any Provider who answers ‘Yes’ in any of this section. | Pass/Fail |
| 4 | **Economic and financial standing** | Minimum Requirements:  The following minimum requirements are mandatory. Failure to meet any two or more of these requirements will automatically exclude you from the next stage of this procurement. Failure to meet one of the requirements will not result in automatic exclusion, but may be considered as grounds for discretionary exclusion:   * **An annual turnover for Lot 1 School Meals and Lot 2 Shire Hall Catering must be greater than twice the anticipated minimum annual value of the contract (£7,159,995) i.e. £14,319,990** * **An annual turnover for Lot 2 Shire Hall Catering must be greater than twice the anticipated minimum annual value of the contract (£141,375) i.e. £282,750** * **A Creditsafe score of at least 30 or more** * **A copy of 2 years statement of accounts**   If you have ticked the box to say that a Parent Company Guarantee (or letter of credit) can be provided then we will make the assessment using this financial information only if the subsidiary financial information does not meet the robustness criteria.  Financial solvency and strength criteria  Each organisation will be assessed through consideration of the responses within the SSQ (document 6) submitted, along with the organisation’s submitted financial information. Therefore please consider the financial robustness assessment criteria when considering the organisation providing the guarantee.  If you are providing some other form of assurance (other than a Parent Company Guarantee) please advise of the nature of this guarantee.  Searches of news information sources, Creditsafe reports and credit ratings will be undertaken to highlight any issues that should have been brought to the attention of the Council by the organisation’s responses to the SSQ.  The successful Provider will be required to provide a written bank reference, confirming that you are in a satisfactory financial position to deliver the Service.  If your parent company is providing a guarantee please provide the financial information for the parent company as set out in the SSQ (Document 6, section 5.3) in accordance with the guidance set out in this document section 5) above, “Minimum Requirement”. Please also provide an organisation structure chart for the entire organisation, including the ultimate parent company. | Pass/Fail |
| 6. 1 | **Technical and professional ability** | **A minimum of 3 relevant references are mandatory.**  The Council will exclude any Provider / Contractor who does not meet the requirement. | Pass/Fail |
| 6.2 | Sub Contract | Do you intend to sub contract any of the work  Please provide as much detail as possible. | Yes/No |
| 6.3 |  | If you cannot provide at least one example for questions 6.1, in no more than 500 words please provide an explanation for this e.g. your organisation is a new start-up or you have provided services in the past but not under a contract. | Pass/Fail |
| 7. | Modern Slavery Act 2015: Requirements under Modern Slavery Act 2015 | The Council may exclude any Provider who does not meet the requirements | Pass/Fail |
| 8.1 | Insurance | Provider/Contractor must be able to demonstrate they have, or if awarded the contract, be able to obtain the levels of insurance requested:  **Employers Liability - £5 Million**  **Public Liability - £10 Million** | Pass/Fail |
| 8.2, 8.3 & 8.4 | Not Used | Not Applicable |  |
| 8.5 | Compliance with equality legislation | The Council may exclude any Provider/Contractor who has had a complaint upheld in the last 3 years and is unable to demonstrate to the Council’s satisfaction that appropriate remedial action has been taken to prevent similar unlawful discrimination reoccurring. | Pass/Fail |
| 8.6 | Environmental Management | The Council will not select Provider/Contractor(s) that have been prosecuted or served notice under environmental legislation in the last 3 years, unless the Council is satisfied that appropriate remedial action has been taken to prevent future occurrences/breaches. | Pass/Fail |
| 8.7 | Health and Safety | The Council will exclude Provider/Contractor(s) that have been in receipt of enforcement / remedial action orders unless the Provider/Contractor(s) can demonstrate to the Council’s satisfaction that appropriate remedial action has been taken to prevent future occurrences or breaches. | Pass/Fail |
| 8.8 | Safeguarding | Provider/Contractor(s) must confirm they agree to be bound by the Council’s policies.  Please confirm whether either yourself of any of your staff have an Enhanced DBS Check (Disclosure and Barring Service)  The Council will not select Provider/Contractor(s) that have finding of unlawful acts against them in the last 3 years, unless the Council is satisfied that appropriate remedial action has been taken to prevent future occurrences/breaches. | Yes/ No  Yes/No  Pass/Fail |
| 8.9 | Information Management | The Council will not select Provider/Contractor(s) that have been prosecuted or served notice under environmental legislation in the last 3 years, unless the Council is satisfied that appropriate remedial action has been taken to prevent future occurrences/breaches. | Pass/Fail |
| Annex C |  | This section is for your information. It provides details of Mandatory Exclusion Grounds in Section 2. (Document 6 – Standard Selection Questionnaire). | Info only |

### Tender Evaluation Award Criteria

* 1. Any Contract (s) awarded as a result of this procurement will be awarded on the basis of the offer that is the most economically advantageous to the Council.
  2. The Award Criteria for a place on the Framework are:
* Quality: 45 %
* Price: 40 %
* Social Value: 15%
  1. Pricing will be evaluated and scored in accordance with the methodology provided in Section 7 on this document.
  2. Social Value - We will assess your social value responses via a third-party

website – Social Value Portal. You will be given a score that will be added to

your price and quality score. You must upload your responses to the Social

Value portal in order to be evaluated. Full instructions are provided in Document

7c

### Tender Evaluation Process

* 1. Providers/Contractors are required to submit an application/ Tender strictly in accordance with the requirements set out in this ITT, to ensure the Council has the correct information to make the evaluation. Evasive, unclear or hedged applications/Tenders may be discounted in evaluation and may, at the Council's discretion, be taken as a rejection by the Provider/Contractor of the terms set out in this ITT.
  2. There will be a clear focus in the evaluation of submissions on service delivery and quality alongside cost.
  3. Scores for Applications/Tenders are arrived at following the application of the evaluation criteria set out in this document.
  4. The Council reserves the right to carry out validation exercises to determine whether Providers/Contractors can substantiate the evidence supplied to support their submission. In validating the evidence, the Council will use any practical means and may approach any person or Provider/Contractor named in the highest scoring Provider/Contractor’s Application/Tender as part of the validation.
  5. Validation of any Provider/Contractor’s Tender must not be taken as inferring acceptance of any tender. The Council may reduce the marks if the evidence provided in support of the Application/Tender is not supported by the validation exercise. If lower mark(s) are awarded then the overall score will be re-calculated.
  6. The Council may seek independent financial and market advice to verify information provided by Providers/Contractors.

### Quality Evaluation Criteria

* 1. The following table summarises the scoring of your Quality Submission.

**School Meals Method Statements (Weighting 100%)**

|  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| Method Statement Number | Method Statements | Weighting % | Maximum Points available | Maximum Quality Score  (weighting x points achieved) |
| 1 | Menus and Food Service | 22 | 5 | 110 |
| 2 | Marketing | 5 | 5 | 25 |
| 3 | Framework Support | 9 | 5 | 45 |
| 4 | Human Resources and Training | 13 | 5 | 65 |
| 5 | Quality | 17 | 5 | 85 |
| 6 | Health, Safety and Hygiene | 17 | 5 | 85 |
| 7 | Framework Mobilisation | 2 | 5 | 10 |
| 8 | Purchasing | 8 | 5 | 40 |
| 9 | Online Payment System | 7 | 5 | 35 |
| Total Method Statement Weighting Score | | 100 | Total Maximum Method Statement Score | 500 |

**Shire Hall Catering Services Method Statements (Weighting 100%)**

|  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| Method Statement Number | Method Statements | Weighting % | Maximum Points available | Maximum Quality Score  (weighting x points achieved) |
| 1 | Menus and Food Service | 25 | 5 | 125 |
| 2 | Sales and Marketing | 8 | 5 | 40 |
| 3 | Contract Support | 10 | 5 | 50 |
| 4 | Human Resources and Training | 13 | 5 | 65 |
| 5 | Quality Control | 17 | 5 | 85 |
| 6 | Health, Safety and Hygiene | 17 | 5 | 85 |
| 7 | Contract Mobilisation | 2 | 5 | 10 |
| 8 | Purchasing | 8 | 5 | 40 |
| Total Method Statement Weighting Score | | 100 | Total Maximum Method Statement Score | **500** |

* 1. Your Total score will then be multiplied by the Quality weighting (45%)

Example: Providers Total score = 450, Maximum possible score = 500

450/500 x 45 = 40.50 (Total weighted quality score)

* 1. Provider’s Quality submissions will be scored using the following classification:

|  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- |
| Classification | Definition | Score |
| Exceptional | Proposal meets the required standard in all material respects and exceeds some or all of the major requirements. | 5 |
| Satisfactory | Proposal meets the required standard in all material respects. | 4 |
| Acceptable | Proposal meets the required standard in most material respects, but is lacking or inconsistent in others. | 3 |
| Marginal | Proposal falls short of achieving expected standard in a number of identifiable respects. | 2 |
| Poor | Proposal significantly fails to meet the standards required, contains significant shortcomings or is inconsistent with other proposals. | 1 |
| Unacceptable | Completely fails to meet required standard or does not provide a proposal. | 0 |

\*For more details, please refer to Appendix C - School Meals Evaluation Criteria and Appendix D – Shire Hall Evaluation Criteria

1. **Quality Scoring and Moderation**
   1. Provider’s quality responses will be scored by a panel of evaluators who will score the responses independently. The panel will then meet to moderate the scores with an independent moderator. The panel and moderator will then agree on a moderated score for each question of Quality response. These will be the final scores.

### Price evaluation

* 1. The Total Cost for evaluation purposes will be scored on a comparative basis with the lowest bid receiving the maximum available points (40).
  2. Worked example:

(Lowest Provider’s Price £s / Provider Price £s) x 40 = Score to 2 decimal places

Provider A: £1,800,000 (1,200,000/1,800,000) x 40 = 26.66

Provider B: £1,500,000 (1,200,000/1,500,000) x 40 = 32.00

Provider C: £1,200,000 (1,200,000/1,200,000) x 40 = 40.00

## Social Value Evaluation

* 1. Social Value has been allocated a total weight of 15% for this procurement, which will be evaluated using sub-weightings on the following basis:

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
| **Social Value** | **% Weighting** |
| Quantitative offer | 7.5% |
| Qualitative offer | 7.5% |
| Total Social Value | 15% |

### Social value is measured and monitored by Social Value Portal - an independent third-party organisation. You must register and complete your submission here:

Lot 1: <https://socialvalueportal.force.com/supplieraccountregistration?svpprojectid=8e0-0000-1NTBA>

Lot 2: <https://socialvalueportal.force.com/supplieraccountregistration?svpprojectid=8e0-0000-1NTBK>

### How to complete Section 7c – social value response

* + Read Document 5b carefully it contains full information on scoring and submission details
  + Complete both quantitative and qualitative assessments. If either section is not completed then your bid be will non-compliant and may be disqualified
  + Quantitative assessment requires selection and completion of data relating to National Themes, Outcomes and Measures (TOMS)
  + Qualitative assessment will require a delivery plan that evidences how these measures will be delivered
  + Ensure that your proposals for social value apply to this contract only, ie additional to any other offerings that you are delivering on another contract.
  + As this contract has a range of potential spend, proposals should be based on an estimated contract value of £45 Million but actual social value delivered will be based on the volume of actual contract spend.
  + Proposals are for the contract duration only (i.e excluding any extension periods)
  + Your quantitative measures will be used to calculate a Social Value Additionality Percentage (SVA%) which will indicate the monetary value of your proposal, to be used if you are the winning bidder.
  + Please note that you are free to complete any measures you wish, however priority weighting has been given to the following measures

|  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- |
| TOMs Reference | Measure | weighting |
|
| NT2 | Percentage of local employees (FTE) on contract | X 2 |
| NT13 | No. of weeks of meaningful paid work placements (6+ weeks, paid) | X 2 |
| NT20 | No. employees provided access to multidimensional wellbeing programmes | X 2 |
| NT23 | Percentage of supply chain contracts with social value commitments, measurement & monitoring | X 2 |
| NT31 | Savings in CO2 emissions on contract achieved through de-carbonisation | X 2 |
| NT50 | Innovative measures to promote local skills and employment | X 2 |

### For the purposes of evaluation, the measures above will have a value which is twice the normal proxy value of 1. This recognises commitments made in areas of high importance to GCC .

### Social Value Evaluation Process- This is how we will evaluate your submission:

Quantitative assessment - The bidder submitting the highest Social Value offer will be scored the maximum mark of 7.5%

Qualitative assessment – the bidder evidence will be marked an awarded a total score.

Part 1 quantitative (numerical) = Bidders social value offer X 7.5%

Highest social value offer

Part 2 qualitative (evidence) = Bidders social value score X 7.5%

Maximum social value score

The Total Social Value score will be derived from the following calculation:-

Total Social Value Score = (Quantitative score (%) + Qualitative score (%)

**Please note:** The total amount of Social Value offered will be divided by the assumed contract value of £45m to calculate the Social Value Additionality Percentage (SVA%) calculation. Please see worked example for the calculation of the SVA% below: -

Worked example: Calculation of SVA%

Assumed contract value: £45 Million

Bidder’s Quantified Social Value Proposal Submitted £11 Million

SVA% = (£11m/£45m) \*100 = 24.44%

1. **Abnormal Tenders**
   1. Any tender that is considered too low to be credible will be excluded from further consideration.  In this instance, the Authority will initially clarify with the tenderer whether the pricing is correct and has been interpreted correctly.  As part of the clarification, evidence will be required to demonstrate that the charges are accurate, achievable and sustainable.  If following the clarification, any charge is found to be abnormally low, that tender may be rejected in accordance with the Public Contract Regulations 2006 regardless of how many points it scores in all other aspects.
   2. Any tender which is found to be too high to be acceptable may be excluded from further consideration. In this instance, the Authority will initially clarify with the tenderer concerned whether the pricing is correct and has been interpreted correctly.  If following the clarification, any charge is found to be too high to be acceptable, that tender may be rejected in accordance with the Public Contract Regulations 2006 regardless of how many points it scores in all other aspects.
   3. Any tender where a price is 25% below or above the median of all responses we would consider to be abnormal.