

SECTION 6 – EVALUATION CRITERIA

Contract Title: Synthetic Test and Unified Demonstration System

Contract Reference: ORE/20/69

1. Award of Contract

Award of Contract will be based upon the Most Economically Advantageous Tender ("MEAT") received.

The evaluation of tenders received shall be in two (2) stages:

- Stage 1: General Due Diligence
- Stage 2: Contract Award

Please ensure you include your responses to the Stage 2, ITT submission which includes your Technical & Commercial submission. This will not be asked for at a later date.

Failure to provide this information will result in your submission being deemed non compliant and being eliminated from further evaluation.

Stage 1 – General Due Diligence Process

This stage 1 of the evaluation will be based on responses to appropriately completed Selection Questionnaire, Due Diligence Questionnaire and completed and signed Forms as per Section 5 of this ITP. If a Tenderer does not satisfy the required criteria, they may be eliminated from further competition. Tenderers may automatically fail for not submitting appropriately completed and signed forms.

Only those tenderers meeting the stage 1, General Due Diligence criteria, shall progress to Stage 2 of the evaluation.

Stage 2 - ITT Submission

The stage 2 evaluation will be based upon the undernoted Award criteria:

(i) Initial Checks

- | | |
|---|-------------|
| • Completeness of proposal; | Pass / Fail |
| • Compliance with the minimum requirements as per Section 4, Scope of Work; | Pass / Fail |

(ii) Technical Approach (80%)

Technical Understanding of the Brief – 5%

Your proposal should set out your technical understanding of the project, its objectives and desired outcomes and the service requirements to deliver the project.

Management Structure – 10%

Your proposal should set out your information in respect of the assembled professional team as follows:

- Composition and structure of the design and implementation teams, including an organogram of delivery team;
- Details of all key professional staff who would be responsible for the delivering the Contract, including a copy of their CV's setting out their skills, experience and competencies, and how they will be utilised on the Contract. CVs should include but not limited to:
 - Director responsible
 - Project Manager
 - Design Team Lead
 - Design Engineer/s

The Tenderer shall confirm the availability of those key personnel to be assigned to the project for the duration of the project.

Design Works – 10%

Your proposal should set out your information and demonstrate how you will influence the development stage on issues relating to design, development and value for money throughout each phase to ensure the project programme and costs are achieved.

You should also provide sufficient information to demonstrate your system for reviewing and sharing design and delivery information with ORE Catapult so that a functioning and usable end product is achieved.

Functionality & Performance – 35%

It is envisaged that proposals will consist predominantly of modified off the shelf solutions or components. As such, your proposal should set out information to explain the initial solution concept, intended functionality and performance of the system and any of its subsystems as a basic requirement. The proposal should cover the following considerations providing alternative approaches where deemed necessary:

- stipulation as to what degree the STUDS could perform the technical functions and features indicated in the scope of work;
- indication of the performance specification including all necessary supporting information;
- provision of notable technical data of the proposed system. Include a schedule showing system design and other information relevant to the simulation platform to be prepared during the contract period;
- detail on the functional and operational scenarios you expect to simulate within the project timescale and budget, and the capability/configurability for including additional scenarios;
- the complexity of the physics-based modelling, the repeatability of scenarios and the level of representation of a real-world testing environment;
- the I/O variables the STUDS will be able to process, the format for presenting system data and the capability to report and extract system outputs for results comparison;
- a method for connecting the STUDS to a visualisation system for live demonstrations;
- the processing performance of the STUDS and the restrictions of the time-based simulation environment;
- information on how hardware-in-the-loop could interface with the STUDS
- the programming language from which the STUDS will be created and how it will be hosted on physical hardware; if relevant, provide a list of all long lead items and critical items (including expected lead time).
- Methodology regarding the enabling of subsequent development by third parties or the ORE Catapult.

- Tenderers who are able to provide a system that can be developed and expanded with more detailed physics simulations and more components, will score more points in this part of the evaluation, as this will prove better value for money for ORE Catapult in the longer term.

Methodology & Proposed Approach – 25%

Your proposal should set out information to explain your methodology and proposed approach to this Contract, including:

- provide a project plans showing your understanding of the project constraints, and the coordination to be implemented to overcome such constraints. Method Statements need to describe your proposed methods, equipment and other resources to be used, including open source software material to be utilised throughout the development phase of the Contract.
- Your proposal should set out a project work schedule which should incorporate all of the critical and main aspects of the project. The project work schedule should also identify key milestones, critical dates, durations, critical path analysis, together with appropriate savings, for the design, develop, build, implement stage should you be able to improve on the timelines given at Condition 5.2.1 of Section 4, Scope of Work;
- demonstrate how you will manage the significant number of subsystem interfaces with the STUDS;
- provide a statement of how you propose to control the quality of the works and that of any sub-contractors on this project. The statement must include the number of actual employees responsible for quality control for this project, with details of their qualifications and duties;
- details of how the components, systems and assemblies associated with the STUDS are to be delivered to ORE Catapult;
- examples of relevant case studies or previous projects that would similarly align with the requirements of the STUDS.

Test, Commissioning, Acceptance and Training – 15%

- Your proposal should set out the detail of your process for installation, testing, commissioning and acceptance of the STUDS including involvement in final MIMRee project demonstration. The final version shall be agreed during the detailed design phase;
- provide details of how you will train key Users and what supporting documentation will be provided to Users and developers, including details of the trainer, including cv's, handouts, training objectives, duration, location etc.

Added Value - 5% (this element will not be treated as a "fail" criteria at 10.2).

(ii) Commercial (20%)

Your offer worksheet needs to be on a fixed cost basis and inclusive of ALL costs associated in delivering the Service, but shall be exclusive of vat.

Tenderers are to note that there will be no benefit to tenderers submitting offers under the budgeted price, as the critical factor in this tender process is delivery of a robust fully functioning system.

Any bids submissions over the budgeted cost will be evaluated based on "budgeted" price receiving 100 points and tenderer submissions receive points based on 100 minus 1 point for

every 2 percent higher than the budgeted price. Any bids more than 100 percent higher than the budgeted price receive no points.

Any obvious arithmetical errors will be rectified by the appropriate officer checking the tenders and the amount of tender shall be held to be the amount of the documents so rectified and the tenderer informed in writing of the corrected amount.

Where there is an obvious and genuine error in rates occurring, the tenderer will be given the opportunity of either confirming that they agree to their tender being considered with the error remaining or withdrawing their tender. Should the tenderer decide to withdraw their tender, it will not be considered for acceptance.

4. Evaluation Criteria

The technical proposal will be evaluated against the following evaluation criteria. A scoring of less than four (4) will result in the response being rejected in its entirety.

MARKING SCHEME	SCORE
<i>Fails to meet the requirement</i> - Either no response or a very poor response has been provided with major deficiencies or submitted relevant detail proposed. Indicates a weakness of the tenderer in understanding the requirement or simply failing to make an effort. Proposal not acceptable.	0 – 1 (Fail)
<i>Partially meets the requirements</i> - Poor response only partially satisfies requirement/standard, with SIGNIFICANT deficiencies apparent and / or is inconsistent with other proposals. Response may be fairly generic, with evidence of having being used for other tenders. The scope of work may simply have been repeated back without addressing the specific requirement. Elements in the answer may be considered impractical, unbelievable or unworkable. Low probability of success. Proposal not acceptable.	2 - 3 (Fail)
<i>Almost meets the requirement</i> - Response meets minimum requirement but remains basic and MINOR reservations still exist about the quality or the extent of the evidence provided which could have been expanded upon. Response is sufficient but does not inspire. Reasonable probability of success, with minor weaknesses being relatively easy to correct.	4 - 5
<i>Meets the requirement</i> - Response is relevant and good, but stops short of being truly exceptional. It is sufficiently detailed to demonstrate a good understanding of the requirement, including a level of detail, which adds meaning to the Qualitative. Good probability of success.	6 - 7
<i>Fully meets the requirement</i> - Comprehensive and useful information provided which is beneficial to the ORE Catapult and significantly better than other responses. Response is supported by relevant and clear commitments. Proposals are realistic, workable, practical and believable. High probability of success; no weakness noted. The response is innovative and includes a full description of techniques and measurements that will be employed in the final solution.	8

5. Combined Scores

The technical and commercial scores will be combined (Technical 80% / Commercial 20%) to determine the tender which provides the most appropriate combination of quality and value for money.

6. Abnormally Low Tenders

6.1 Where the overall tendered amount appears to be abnormally low, the tenderer will be required to provide further written details of the constituent elements of the overall tendered amount or the tendered rates or any other information considered to be relevant.

6.2 Any failure to provide such information, where requested, may exclude the tender from further consideration. If, having considered the information provided, ORE Catapult is of the view that either the tendered total of the prices is abnormally low or any tendered amounts are abnormally low, the tender may be rejected in accordance with PCR2015 Regulation 69 (4) to 6).