

**General Science Award and Evaluation Criteria**

1. **Scoring Matrix**

This Request for Proposal will consist of a two-stage evaluation process;

1. An initial evaluation of all Proposals submitted, using the evaluation scoring criteria detailed below; and
2. A Microsoft Teams interview with those shortlisted, scheduled to take place on Tuesday 16th November 2021.

The evaluation of the Proposal will be based on scored criteria. The scored criteria will be weighted as follows:

* 80% for Quality
* 20% for Value for Money

If the Proposal receives a score of one (1) or less in either of the above criteria, the Proposal will not be evaluated any further. The Met Office's decision in this regard shall be final and if the Proposal receives such a score, the Proposal will be excluded from the remainder of the evaluation process and the bidder will be notified.

The proposal must provide sufficient detail to give the confidence that the bidder has the experience and capability to meet each requirement set out in the Request for Proposal.

The Met Office may seek further clarification from regarding the Proposal at any time up to the award of any subsequent Contract for Service.

The Proposal will be assessed for both Quality and Value for Money and marked on a 5-point scale against the pre-defined matrix below.

|  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- |
| **Score** | **Description** | **Scoring Methodology** |
| **0 Points** | **Unacceptable** | Overall, the Met Office has no confidence in the Proposal because one or more of the following applies:   * no response was provided; or * the response fails to address the Requirement(s) at all and/or provide any evidence; or * a response is provided but it raises one or more unacceptable concerns in relation to the quality of the Proposal and/or the Bidder's ability successfully to deliver the Requirement(s) and/or represents a serious risk to the Met Office |
| **1 Point** | **Major Concerns** | Overall, the Met Office has very low confidence in the Proposal because one or more of the following applies:   * the response fails to address a substantial part of the Requirement(s); or * the response gives rise to one or more major concerns in relation to the quality of the response and/or the Bidder's ability successfully to deliver the Requirement(s); or * the Proposal gives greater confidence than "Unacceptable" but is not sufficiently comprehensive to warrant "Concerns" |
| **2 Points** | **Concerns** | Overall, the Met Office has low confidence in the Proposal because one or more of the following applies:   * the Proposal addresses all elements of the Requirement(s) but at least one of the elements is not adequately addressed or adequately evidenced; or * the Proposal gives rise to one or more concerns in relation to the quality of the Proposal and/or the Bidder's ability successfully to deliver the Requirement(s); or * the Proposal gives greater confidence than "Major Concerns" but is not sufficiently comprehensive to warrant "Minor concerns" |
| **3 Points** | **Minor Concerns** | Overall, the Met Office has moderate confidence in the Proposal because one or more of the following applies:   * the response addresses all elements of the Requirement(s) in a satisfactory manner, but parts of the response lack sufficient detail and/or evidence to warrant "Good Confidence"; or * the Proposal gives rise to one or more minor concerns in relation to the quality of the response and/or the Bidder's ability successfully to deliver the Requirement(s); or * the Proposal gives greater confidence than "Concerns" but is not sufficiently comprehensive to warrant "Good confidence" |
| **4 Points** | **Good Confidence** | Overall, the Met Office has good confidence in the Proposal because one or more of the following applies:   * the Proposal addresses all elements of the Requirement(s) well and/or provides good evidence of where the proposed approach/solution has been used effectively in the past and/or why it will work well within the research; or * the Proposal addresses all elements of the Requirement(s) well and includes innovative and/or other good quality ideas that meet these Requirement(s) and provides good evidence of where such ideas have been used effectively in the past and/or why they will work well within the research; or * the Proposal gives greater confidence than "Minor concerns" but is not sufficiently comprehensive to warrant "Very Good confidence". |
| **5 Points** | **Very Good Confidence** | Overall, the Met Office has very good confidence in the Proposal because one or more of the following applies:   * the Proposal addresses all elements of the Requirement(s) very well, in a robust and comprehensively evidenced manner; or * the response addresses all elements of the Requirement(s) very well and includes innovative and/or other good quality ideas that meet these Requirement(s) and provides good evidence of where such ideas have been used effectively in the past and why they will work well within the research. |

**2. Evaluation Criteria**

A total overall score of equal to or above 50% must be achieved for the Proposal to be eligible for award of this funding. Proposals scoring less than 50% may be disqualified or further clarification sought (at the Met Office’s sole discretion).

The Proposal will be evaluated against the criteria set out below (“Evaluation Criteria”).

* 80% for Quality
* 20% for Value for Money

**Requirement(s)** shall mean the Met Office’s need as outlined in the Request for Proposal “Section three: Specification of requirements”, including any guidance notes and table templates to be completed.

|  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- |
|  | **Criteria** | **Scoring** | **Weighting** |
|  | **Quality** |  | **80%** |
| **80% QUALITY** | * Plan and Approach to meeting the Deliverables as outlined in section 3.1 of the RFP. | 0 to 5 | 30% |
| * Alignment to the Essential Qualifications and Skills of the individual(s) delivering the work. | 0 to 5 | 25% |
| * Relevant experience as demonstrated in proposal statement and with relevant CV’s attached. | 0 to 5 | 25% |
|  | **Value for Money** |  | **20%** |
| **20% VFM** | Value for money is exceptionally important to all Scientific Research and Development funding.    In this section, the Proposal needs to demonstrate efficiencies and value-added activities considering time, quality and cost.  (Financial costs/breakdown to be included as part of the Proposal) | 0 to 5 | 20% |