

KEY:

1. EVALUATION CRITERIA AND METHODOLOGY

1.1 An Evaluation will determine the most economically advantageous offer by means of applying the following main criteria:

1. Quality
- 2 Price

2. EVALUATION CRITERIA AND TENDER ASSESSMENT

2.1 Tenderers will be evaluated based on their submission based on their qualitative submission and their pricing of the tender documents. This evaluation will determine the most economically advantageous offer by means of applying the following criteria:

1. Quality **40 %**
2. Price **60 %**

2.2 The quality submission and priced return will be evaluated against the above criteria. This section of the Tender Documents details the basis on which the Tenders will be assessed.

2.3 The Client intends its approach to be equitable, auditable and transparent.

2.4 Tenderers should ensure that they understand the evaluation criteria fully, as the submitted documentation will be assessed against pre-determined scores and weightings. If the Tenderer is unclear as to the operation of the evaluation criteria a query should be raised in accordance with the Tender Query procedure set out in the Instructions for Tendering.

2.5 The tenderer must ensure that all documentation detailed in the Tender Checklist is returned with the tender in the format requested in that document. Tenders submitted without all the information required in this document will be considered incomplete and may be rejected. No further information will be accepted after the deadline for submission of tenders has closed (with the exception of clarification information required for interview).

3. EVALUATION OF THE QUALITATIVE RESPONSE

3.1 Each Tenderer will be assessed on how its written Qualitative Response responds to the requirements of the Qualitative Response including all the criteria and sub-criteria set out in Qualitative Response. The Client reserves the right to request additional information which may be required as a result of the answers and information provided in the tender.

3.2 Each weighted sub-criterion set out in the Qualitative Response will be evaluated/assessed and marked in accordance with the following scoring chart:

Table 1

Score	Rating	Criteria for awarding score
5	Excellent	Excellent response to the requirements which provides detailed evidence that is clear and complete.
4	Good	Good response to the requirements which provides evidence that is clear.
3	Satisfactory	Satisfactory response to the requirements which provides adequate evidence.
2	Fair	The information submitted is limited, and/or insufficient supporting documentation has been provided.
1	Poor	The information submitted is very limited, and/or no supporting documentation has been provided.
0	Unacceptable	Unanswered or failed to adequately address the requirements.

- 3.3 Marks will be adjusted accordingly based on the allocated scoring for each question.
- 3.4 Each of the Qualitative Delivery Proposals will be marked separately, by members of the Evaluation Panel (EP) if applicable. The score will be computed and transferred onto the Quality Assessment - Evaluation Matrix to add to the pricing to obtain a final score. The weightings have been included in the Qualitative Delivery Proposals.
- 4. PRICE ASSESSMENT**
- 4.1 Refer to Schedule 2 - Part A - Framework Pricing Principles for details of how the tender price is built up.
- 4.2 The tender figure will be inserted into the Form of Tender from the Pricing Document by the Tenderer.
- 4.3 The tender figure will be interrogated by the Client and further clarification may be sought, if no satisfactory clarification is provided, the tender may be rejected.
- 4.4 The Price Assessment evaluation will be based on the Lowest Price Option on a Quality/Price Tender **(60/40% in favour of pricing)**.

MERTON COUNCIL
PERSEID LOWER SCHOOL - VENTILATION WORKS
TENDER EVALUATION

4.5 The basis of the price evaluation is the use of the lowest price option on a quality/price tender where the lowest tender price receives the highest percentage for price.

4.6 The lowest priced tender will receive the highest percentage for price.

For example:

The Tenderer with the lowest submitted total price will receive the maximum price score **40%**.

Using **40%** price and **60%** Quality, prices of the other Tenderers will score based on the following formula:

$$\frac{\text{Lowest submitted total price}}{\text{enderer's submitted total price}} \times \text{40 \%}$$

Example: Tender A total price = £600,000; Tender B total price = £580,000; Tender C total price = £560,000; Tender D total price = £550,000.

Therefore the lowest submitted total price = £550,000. Tender D would receive **40%**.

Tender A would receive a score of $(£550,000 \div £600,000) \times \text{40\%} = \text{36.67\%}$

Tender B would receive a score of $(£550,000 \div £580,000) \times \text{40\%} = \text{37.93\%}$

Tender C would receive a score of $(£550,000 \div £560,000) \times \text{40\%} = \text{39.29\%}$

These pricing scores are then added to the Quality scores to obtain the final quality/price scores.

4.7 Any tender, which save for arithmetical errors following preliminary evaluation by the Client is in the reasonable opinion of the Client is unrealistically low, may be rejected.

5. EVALUATION

The evaluation of tenders submitted will be undertaken by McBains, the Client consultant. They will report their assessments and the recommendation on the appointment of Tenderer to the Client's reporting process.

6. SUMMARY OF QUALITY AND PRICE

The pricing scores are then added to the quality scores to obtain the final quality/price summary. The resultant list collated by the aggregation of the quality/price scores will be assess and the highest scoring tenderer will be considered to be the Most Economically Advantageous Tender (MEAT) and will recommended to proceed to appointment.