**Evaluation of Offers**

**Appendix 4**

**Introduction**

Evaluation of tenders for work will be carried out by a panel of officers of the Council, to ensure an appropriate breadth of experience and understanding of the issues covered by the tender submission.

1. **Award Criteria/Evaluation**

The Award Criteria/Evaluation are made up of two elements

1. The Quality section, which will be assessed by the evaluation of a tenderer’s response to the Method Statement and supporting information. This accounts for 60% of the marks.
2. The Price section. This accounts for 40% of the marks. Bidders are required to complete a separate pricing schedule for each Lot they bid for.
3. **Marking of Quality (non-price) elements of the tender (60% of the final score)**

Quality will be measured by an assessment of a tenderer’s response to the Method Statement questions for each (Lot), (with supporting information) set out in **Section 1** (Method Statement) below. The responses to the Method Statements submitted by the tenderers will be assessed by an evaluation panel of suitably experienced officers of the Council. The individuals on the evaluation panel will award scores for the Method Statements reflecting their reasoned professional judgement as to the merits of each response. Overall, Method Statement evaluation will account for 60% of the total tender score.

**The method statement questions shall cover all 6 of the Lots.**

Each response to the Method Statement questions will be awarded a separate score out of 5, with 0 being the lowest and 5 being the highest score. The definitions of each level of scoring are as follows:

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
| **0** | **Non-Compliant response:**  The tenderer fails to meet the requirement and / or tenderer response has not provided relevant information to answer or indicate a solution to the required contract requirements. |
| **1** | **Unacceptable response:**  The tenderer response is partially compliant, but with serious deficiencies in the solution offered. This indicates there would be serious difficulties or inability in delivering the contract requirements. |
| **2** | **Unsatisfactory response:**  The tenderer response is partially compliant, with shortfalls in the solution offered. This indicates that not all the requirements of the contract would be met and there would be difficulty in delivering the contract requirements. |
| **3** | **Acceptable response:**  The tenderer response is compliant. This indicates that all the basic contractual requirements are met, but not exceeded and the contract would be delivered. |
| **4** | **Good Response:**  The tenderer response is compliant clearly indicating that the tenderer can deliver the entire contract requirement and solution offers some limited benefits beyond the stated requirements. |
| **5** | **Excellent Response:**  The tenderer response is compliant indicating that the tenderer has a comprehensive understanding of the contract requirements and the proposed solution will meet the contract standard and provide significant additional benefits beyond the stated requirement. |

**Section 1**

**Method Statement**

The summary table below details the relative importance/weighting of each quality (non-price) aspect of the tender that will be evaluated (those aspects are defined in column A below). Each quality aspect will be assessed by evaluating the tenderer’s responses to the method statement questions (the method statement questions headings are listed in column B. There are four questions within the method statement). The maximum percentage mark available for each individual method statement question is in column B, and these will be scored using the 0-5 scale defined above.

Bidders are requested to answer the method statement questions as below. Bidders are reminded that one fully completed method statement shall be submitted for each Lot.

Marks will be adjusted accordingly based on the allocated scoring for each question.

**Example 1**: Question 1 has a maximum score of 12 marks.   
A score of good would give a score of 4.   
The score would then be adjusted to mark out of 12, i.e. 4 x (12/5) = 9.6.

**Example 2:** Question 5 (a) has a maximum score of 8 marks.   
A score of minimum / satisfactory would give a score of 3.   
The score of 3 would then be adjusted to a mark out of 8, i.e. 3 x (8/5) =4.8.

The quality score is divided by 100 and multiplied by the actual quality percentage:

**Example**: if the tenderers quality score is 50; and the quality is 60% (60% quality/40% price) then the formula would be:

50/100 \* 60%

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
| **Quality Criteria**  **Column A** | **Questions and % score available** Column B |
| Experience | Please explain your organisation’s/consortium’s relevant experience and understanding of providing services within this outcome domain in terms of staff mix, sensitivities, service models, ensuring accessibility, innovation, maintaining quality and how you will utilise this expertise to deliver services in this area.  **(15%)** |
| Delivery | Managing Mobilisation, Implementation, Transition and Service Continuity (where relevant).  This contract involves working together with Enfield Council in managing significant change and transition from existing services. Please detail your Organisation’s/consortium’s experience of and key priorities for managing customer and staff transition, including accommodation for services. In addition to your written response, please include a proposed transition plan which includes all relevant tasks and key milestones.  **(15%)** |
| Management | Please outline your proposed operational structure and model for managing and running the new service. Please include an organisation chart showing reporting lines, duties and responsibilities of management, supervisory staff, volunteer staff and relevant qualifications.  How would you embed and maintain the existing high level of professionalism, commitment and dedication from staff and ensure low staff turnover?  Please detail how you would ensure that staff receive ongoing support, encouragement and access to training opportunities to promote their development.  **(15%)** |
| Innovation | Please outline your proposed service delivery models, how you will ensure these remain sustainable (including accessing external funding sources) and how these will contribute to enabling people to do more for themselves and reduce the demand for Tier 4 health and social care services.  We are open to ideas that demonstrate further understanding of local need by building upon the basic specification providing, for instance, innovation, additionally, flexibility and continuous improvement.  **(20%)** |
| Quality | Please demonstrate how your organisation/consortium will assess the quality of services delivered and ensure its commitment to safeguarding adults and keeping people safe (please include a copy of your safeguarding, complaints/compliments policies)- 20% (policies do not contribute towards the word count)  **(20%)** |
| Engagement | Please outline your experience and commitment to engaging and accessing available community resources in order to promote positive working partnerships and achieve the required outcomes for individuals. Your response should consider but not be limited to:  - local communities  - local universal services  - local council services  - local health services  - Local Schools and Colleges  - Promoting Social Networks  **(15%)** |

**Section 2**

**Award Criteria/Evaluation**

**Marking of Price element (financial) of the tender (40% of the final score)**

(Example) Price scores will be evaluated by a calculation based upon the lowest of all the prices submitted by the tenderers for each Lot. The Tenderer with the lowest price will be awarded the full score of 40%, with the remaining bidders gaining pro-rated scores in relation to how much higher their prices are compared to the lowest price. A worked example is given below.

|  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- |
| **Name of Bidder** | Tender Value | **Formulas**  **= Lowest Price received/**  **Bidder’s Price x Price Score** | **Score out of 40** |
| Bidder A | £43,000 | £41,000/ £43,000 X 40 | 38.1 |
| Bidder B | £47,000 | £41,000/£47,000 X 40 | 34.9 |
| Bidder C | £41,000 | £41,000/£41,000 X 40 | 40 |
| Bidder D | £56,000 | £41,000/£56,000 X 40 | 29.3 |

Tenderers should note that in the event that a bid is considered to be fundamentally unacceptable on any issue, then regardless of its other merits, that bid will be rejected. Throughout the evaluation process the right is reserved to seek clarifications from tenderers, where considered necessary to achieve a complete understanding of the proposals received.

The winning tender response shall be the tender response scoring the highest percentage out of 100 when applying the above methodology.

**Awarding the Contract**

Following the initial evaluation of offers, tenderers may be invited to meet with officers of the Council to explore their bid in more detail, this may include an invitation to make a presentation in support of the bid.

Once bid evaluation is complete, tenderers will be notified simultaneously and as soon as possible of any decision made by the Council about its intention to award the contract.

Following notification of the award decision, the successful tenderer will be required to execute a written contract. The Council will provide instructions for the completion of that contract to the successful tenderer.

Tenderers must not undertake work or enter into any commitments for the subject matter of this tender in advance of the written contract being properly completed.