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**The Housing and Regeneration Agency**

**The Housing and Regeneration Agency**

Introduction

The purpose of this Further Competition Invitation to Tender (ITT) is to award the call-off contract for the above commission*.*

We ask you to respond to the questions detailed in Part 2, Section 6 (Evaluation Criteria) using the [Response Form](#_RESPONSE_FORM) and to return the Response Form and Resource and Pricing Schedule in Part 3 with your tender.

This Further Competition ITT is divided into 3 parts:

**Part 1 – Commission Requirement**

* Details the commission requirements.
* Details additional terms and conditions for the Further Competition. The successful Supplier will be subject to both the terms and conditions of this Further Competition and the Framework Contract. Unless otherwise defined in these instructions, terms used shall have the meaning given to them in the Framework Contract.

**Part 2 – Instructions for Submitting a Response**

* Contains important information and instructions on preparing and submitting a tender response. Please read these instructions carefully prior to submitting your tender response.
* Outlines the evaluation criteria which will be used for assessment. It is important that Suppliers familiarise themselves with the criteria and ensure they are considered when compiling their tender response.

**Part 3 – Standard Forms**

* Contains the standard forms required to be completed and returned by the Supplier when submitting a tender response.

Part 1 - Commission Requirements

1. **Commission Background**

The North Prospect estate in Plymouth is located just 2 miles north of Plymouth city centre and since 2009 has been undergoing significant regeneration with long term commitment from partners including Plymouth Community Homes, Plymouth City Council, and Homes England (through affordable housing grant).



Originally, North Prospect was farmland, and formed part of the Swilly country estate. After the First World War, it was developed by the City Council as Plymouth’s first garden suburb, with over 1,000 family houses. At the time, the local newspaper described it as ‘paradise for 12 shillings a week’. Its fortunes soon began to wane, and the pace of that decline accelerated in the 1950s and the 1960s. In 1973, the City Council changed its name to North Prospect from Swilly in an attempt to counter its bad image. The 2001 Census showed that North Prospect had become a place of concentrated and persistent deprivation. The area continued to experience major social and economic challenges, and at the time of the affordable housing stock transfer from Plymouth City Council to Plymouth Community Homes in 2009, it ranked as one of the most deprived communities in England. Housing conditions were particularly challenging with poor original build quality, structural defects, damp and 60% of the affordable housing failing the Decent Homes standard.

Since the start of the regeneration, in 2009, supported by Homes England, Plymouth City Council and Plymouth Community Homes have worked together with residents and others in the community to deliver a range of outputs, including:

* the demolition of just under 800 homes and building of 1,126 new homes in their place;
* refurbishment of a further 302 existing affordable homes to a standard that will give a minimum additional life of 30 years;
* a new community hub and enterprise centre;
* enlargement and improvement of neighbourhood green and play space (Cookworthy Green);
* delivery of and improvement of pedestrian and transport links;
* the upgrade of roads for the area.

The aims of the regeneration were much wider than just the physical buildings, and plans were put in place to reduce crime, increase the education and skills of the population and improve employment outcomes.

The overall aims of the project[[1]](#footnote-2) were that the regeneration should deliver a North Prospect where:

* children and adults are happy and healthy;
* the community know their rights and responsibilities;
* the community spirit is lively and proud;
* the housing and environment is high quality, safe and clean;
* crime and antisocial behaviour is not tolerated;
* the community can raise and fulfil their aspirations;
* the community lead fulfilled lives and have the skills they want;
* local services are effective, responsive and co-ordinated;
* Improved image across the city.

Annex A provides a fuller background on the regeneration of North Prospect for reference.

With the estate regeneration due to complete in 2024, Plymouth Community Homes, Plymouth City Council and Homes England are keen to complete an evaluation of the scheme, capturing both the impact of the regeneration and lessons learned from its delivery.

1. **Objectives**

This work is a joint commission between Plymouth City Council, Plymouth Community Homes and Homes England. The commission will be project managed by a Senior Economic Research Specialist in Homes England.

All partners are keen to understand how successful the project was at achieving its aims and whether it improved the lives of the residents, as well as learn lessons for delivering regeneration elsewhere. It will be important throughout the evaluation to reflect the context of the Plymouth housing market and economy.

This evaluation will need to answer a suite of research questions, set out below. All questions must be answered. However, it is not necessary for all to be given equal weight in the research.

Research Questions

*Impact of the Regeneration*

1. Was the regeneration delivered consistent with the identified aims, as described above?
2. What has been the effect of the regeneration on housing in the area, including, number of houses, quality of housing stock, and change in tenure mix?
3. What has been the effect of the regeneration, on wider community amenities, e.g. the community hub and schools, including their delivery, maintenance and longevity?
4. What has been the effect of the regeneration of North Prospect on the residents of the immediate and wider area, including the original residents of the area e.g. in terms of health and wellbeing, crime (including anti-social behaviour), educational attainment, apprenticeships, employment, safety in and out of the home, access to homeownership and quality of life? What were the impacts by tenure, e.g. existing and former tenants of PCH, Right to Buy owners, homeowners as well as those who lived in North Prospect before and after? This question will need to consider to what extent the improvements have been driven by the changes in who lives in the area and whether improvements have been seen by the residents that remained.
5. What are satisfaction levels of the current population of the area? To what extent is the population confident about the future of this neighbourhood in the long term?
6. To what extent has the reputation/perceptions of the area been changed as a result of the regeneration of North Prospect?
7. Were there any other unintended effects of the regeneration, either positive or negative?

*Value for money of the scheme*

1. What is the additionality of the outputs, outcomes and impacts of the regeneration of North Prospect i.e. what would have been achieved without intervention?
2. What is the Value for Money of the regeneration of North Prospect? This should include at the UK level in line with HMT’s Green Book, but also any impacts at a local area level.
3. What factors influenced the success or otherwise of the regeneration? This should consider:
   1. External factors, such as the changing policy context, national economy and spending environment;
   2. Factors internal to PCH, PCC and Homes England, such as organisational ambition, culture, structure and focus;
   3. Factors specific to Plymouth as a location e.g. the city’s location, its housing market, North Prospect’s topography, the opinions of the local community (including those who have to move), as well as the local political context.

*Process and Lessons to be learnt*

1. What worked well and less well in the delivery of the regeneration of North Prospect, and why?
2. **The Services**

Bidders are required to consider and propose the exact method for answering the research questions set out above. The steering group does not prescribe a specific detailed approach to this, but requests that bidders include both qualitative and quantitative analysis as well as extensive engagement with stakeholders involved in or impacted by the regeneration of the area. This can include developers[[2]](#footnote-3), PCC, PCH, HE, Plymouth council leaders, residents of North Prospect, police, educationalists, estate agents, local businesses and healthcare professionals if available, to understand the full range of wider benefits derived from the scheme. The supplier should consider ways to maximise engagement; consultations with key stakeholders should be completed face to face wherever possible.

The evaluation will need to engage with beneficiaries. As contact details are only held for residents of PCH homes (and not those who purchased through the open market), the supplier is likely to need to consider surveys via post or alternative methods to reach these groups.

Bidders should explore how the evaluation can make use of ONS and other data sources in order to consider the wider impacts on the North Prospect community relative to other similar communities (in Plymouth or further afield as appropriate).

Bidders should be aware that the following data/documents are held by PCC & PCH and can be shared with the supplier on commission:

* engineers report on stock condition and options – which led to the regeneration;
* Savills report on potential regeneration – costs and income;
* Levitt Bernstein design brief for the estate;
* North Prospect Area Planning Statement;
* joint PCC-PCH regeneration summary case brochure – summary of project and anticipated benefits and objectives of regen – 2013;
* PCH North Prospect Rehousing 10-year summary report – basic details on number and timings of rehousing of residents across all phases including number who stayed on the estate. Internal PCH Report dated 2020;
* data on former PCH residents and where they move to etc.;
* PCH residents’ survey which was carried out 1 year after moving in;
* financial data on costs;
* 2024 Joint Plymouth City Council & Plymouth University health research study to be released shortly - ‘Using a series of ‘cradle-to-grave’ health and wellbeing indicators to measure the impacts of housing regeneration initiatives in Plymouth, UK: A comparative study of selected neighbourhoods.’

Plymouth City Council and Plymouth Community Homes will be happy to give consultants an on-site run through of all their data if the supplier would find that useful.

Plymouth City Council would welcome the use of local suppliers in the evaluation, if feasible.

**Key Deliverables**

Outputs for this commission include:

* a Project Initiation Document post-inception meeting, confirming the agreed workplan, information requirements, and timescales for the study;
* research tools, which **must be approved** by the study Steering Group before their use;
* a key findings presentation setting out progress, issues arising in the study process, to get feedback from the steering group ahead of the report writing;
* a draft report on the findings, that answers the research questions set out above. The draft report should be fully proof-read and checked before submission;
* final report that answers each of the research questions set out above. The main body of report should be no more than 70 pages, ideally shorter, being concise and impactful. The report should be accompanied by a max. 4 page Executive Summary, focused on key findings. Limited annexes may be included for further technical detail only, as deemed necessary by the supplier. The report should be based on the following template: Executive Summary; Introduction; Context and Background (including Rationale and Objectives); Inputs and Activities; Outputs, Outcomes and Impacts; Additionality and Value for Money; Process Perspectives; Conclusions and Recommendation; and Technical Annexes;
* a short video or recorded slideshow to summarise the findings of the project to be shared with the local community and wider stakeholders (for example for use on websites). The video should be a maximum of 5 minutes in length and should be in non-technical language.

The key steering group meetings will be face-to-face in Plymouth. These will need to be on the following dates:

* 27th June 2024 - Inception meeting including walk around of the North Prospect estate with members of the steering group led by Plymouth Community Homes;
* 14th November 2024 - key findings presentation, for feedback ahead of the report writing;
* 23rd January 2025 - final presentation to wider group of stakeholders.

Other steering groups if necessary (e.g. for report feedback) will be held on Teams, at dates to be decided with the supplier.

1. **Indicative Programme**

Suppliers should note the indicative programme dates when preparing their Programme information in the Response Form.

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
| Key Delivery Milestones | Anticipated Date |
| Commencement Date | 17th June 2024 |
| Inception Meeting | 27th June 2024 |
| Key Findings presentation | 14th November 2024 |
| Draft Report | 9th December 2024 |
| Final report | 15th January 2025 |
| Presentation | 23rd January 2025 |
| Completion Date | 24th January 2025 |

1. **Management**

The research is a joint commission by Plymouth City Council, Plymouth Community Homes and Homes England. The steering group will have representatives from all three organisations.

Day to day management will be undertaken by a Senior Economic Research specialist within Homes England.

The supplier will also need to work closely with Plymouth Community Homes and Plymouth City Council to gather the monitoring data and contact details needed for the study.

The supplier will submit a Project Initiation Document, early findings presentation, draft report and final report, as per the table above. In addition, the supplier must provide fortnightly verbal progress updates to Homes England’s Senior Economic Research Specialist, to ensure that any issues with progress are highlighted, and can be rectified, promptly.

**Meeting Requirements:**

**Start-up meeting**

The inception meeting for the study will be held in Plymouth on the 27/06/2024 followed by a walk around the North Prospect estate to familiarise the supplier with the scheme. It will be attended by the supplier and the full evaluation Steering Group, comprising the Senior Economic Research specialist at Homes England and representatives from Plymouth City Council and Plymouth Community Homes. The purpose of the meeting will be to discuss and confirm the approach to the study, including key dates and project management arrangements.

**Review meetings**

As outlined above, there will also be three further face to face meetings for the celebration event, the key findings and a final presentation. Other steering groups will take place virtually, for example feedback on the draft report and any others as necessary.

**Poor Performance Meeting**

These meetings will hopefully not be required. However, if poor performance is repeated following escalation to the Supplier’s Key Personnel to resolve the issue, as required in the Framework Management Schedule of the Framework Contract, the Framework Manager must be notified and Homes England may call for a Poor Performance Meeting. Beforehand, Homes England will present areas of concern so that the Supplier and Homes England can discuss what happened and why, what will be done to prevent it happening again and how matters will improve. The Supplier subject to such a meeting would be expected to outline in writing in a Rectification Plan afterwards what improvements/modifications they will be putting in place. There will be a maximum of two Poor Performance Meetings before termination of the commission.

1. **Key staff**

The role of all staff involved in the study must be included in the Resource and Pricing Schedule. CVs should also be included for all staff alongside other bid documents.

1. **Risks**

As set out in Section 6, bidders are required to set out any risks they identify with their approach, and their methods for mitigating them.

1. **Payment**

Payments will be made on: finalisation of the Project Initiation Document (10%); key findings presentation (35%); receipt of draft report (35%); and sign-off of the final report (20%).

1. **Budget**

The budget for this commission is £80,000 (excl. VAT). This is inclusive of expenses.

1. **Termination**

Should performance during the period of this appointment prove unsatisfactory following the Poor Performance meeting provisions set out in the Management section above, Homes England will exercise its right under the Termination and Suspension of the Contract clause in the Framework Contract to give notice to terminate the arrangement with immediate effect.

If the services are no longer required, for whatever reason, then Homes England reserves the right to terminate the appointment and pay for services completed at that point.

1. **Conflict of Interest**

Homes England will exclude the Supplier if there is a conflict of interest which cannot be effectively remedied. The concept of a conflict of interest includes any situation where relevant staff members have, directly or indirectly, a financial, economic or other personal interest which might be perceived to compromise their impartiality and independence in the context of the procurement procedure.

Where there is any indication that a conflict of interest exists or may arise then it is the responsibility of the Supplier to inform Homes England, detailing the conflict in a separate Appendix.

1. **Confidentiality**

This Further Competition ITT and associated information is confidential and shall not be disclosed to any third party without the prior written consent of Homes England. Copyright in this Further Competition ITT is vested in Homes England and may not be reproduced, copied or stored on any medium without Homes England's prior written consent.

Suppliers shall not undertake, cause or permit to be undertaken at any time any publicity in respect of this Further Competition process in any media without the prior written consent of Homes England.

**Annex A – Background documents on North Prospects**

* [North Prospect Area Planning Statement (plymouth.gov.uk)](https://www.plymouth.gov.uk/sites/default/files/NorthProspectAreaPlanningStatement_1.pdf) and consultation comments
* Time lapse videos phase 5

[North Prospect Regeneration Programme - Phase 5 (1) - YouTube](https://www.youtube.com/watch?v=fXKd_MveUAs&list=PLKeCjnklzKPgTCz-pU4Q22oyJqt402SFc)

* [Sustainable Neighbourhood Assessment: North Prospect | PLYMOUTH.GOV.UK](https://www.plymouth.gov.uk/sustainable-neighbourhood-assessment-north-prospect) – around 2005
* [NorthProspectWestonMillNeighbourhoodProfile.pdf (plymouth.gov.uk)](https://www.plymouth.gov.uk/sites/default/files/NorthProspectWestonMillNeighbourhoodProfile.pdf)
* Spatial Strategy by Levitt Bernstein - <https://planning.plymouth.gov.uk/online-applications/files/15A0B6C66994350E4DB8B3FABED67D37/pdf/10_02026_FUL-Spatial_Strategy_Report-63037.pdf>

Planning applications for the different phases are as follows and all related documents can be viewed online [Search and comment on a planning application | PLYMOUTH.GOV.UK](https://www.plymouth.gov.uk/search-and-comment-planning-application):

* Phase 1 10/02026/FUL | Redevelopment of site by erection of 148 new mixed tenure homes in the form of 117 houses, 23 flats and 8 coachhouses with associated parking and amenity areas (demolition of all existing buildings on site) | North Prospect Scheme, Woodhey Road Plymouth PL2 2QE – planning applications with Design and Access Statements
* Phase 2 - 12/01304/FUL | Redevelopment of site by erection of 347 new mixed tenure homes in the form of 60 flats and 287 houses with associated parking and improvements to Cookworthy Green | Woodville Road Plymouth PL2 2LJ
* Phase 3 - 15/01956/FUL | Demolition of the existing housing and construction of 159 residential units on the site, realignment of existing roadways, & construction of supporting infrastructure | North Prospect Phase 3, Wordsworth Road/Wordsworth Crescent Plymouth PL2 2NE
* Phase 4 - 19/00133/FUL | Demolition of 140 dwellings, Halcyon Methodist Church & Neighbourhood Centre to facilitate the erection of 196 dwellings (178 houses and 18 flats) and the creation of new roadways and associated supporting infrastructure | North Prospect Phase 4 Dingle Road, Laurel Road, Rosedown Avenue And Myrtleville Plymouth
* Phase 5 - 17/01701/FUL | Demolition of existing dwellings and construction of 143 residential dwellings on the site, consisting of 110 houses and 33 flats. Extinguishment of Woodville Road and creation of a new roadway and construction of supporting infrastructure | North Prospect Phase 5 Cookworthy Road, Foliot Road, Woodville Road And Briardale Road Plymouth

Part 2 - Instructions for Submitting a Response

1. **General**

1.1 The Further Competition deadline is **13:00 on 29/05/2024** and tender responses must be submitted on ProContract. Please regularly check ProContract for any amendments to the Further Competition deadline. For all ProContract portal issues please contact [ProContractSuppliers@proactis.com](mailto:ProContractSuppliers@proactis.com).

* 1. Suppliers must ensure that suitable provision is made to ensure that the submission is made on time. Any tender responses received after the Further Competition deadline shall not be opened or considered unless Homes England, exercising its absolute discretion, considers it reasonable to do so. Homes England, may, however, at its own absolute discretion extend the Further Competition deadline and shall notify all Suppliers of any change via ProContract.
  2. Please note all communications during the tender period will be via the ProContract website. All Suppliers that have registered their interest for the Procurement will receive a direct email notification from ProContract on any updates via the Suppliers registered email address. No approach of any kind should be made to any other person within, or associated with, Homes England. It is the Suppliers responsibility to check the ProContract website for any updates to the Procurement process. No claim on the grounds of lack of knowledge of the above mentioned item will be entertained.
  3. The Supplier should check the Further Competition ITT for obvious errors and missing information. Should any such errors or omissions be discovered the Supplier must send a message via the messaging function on ProContract. No alteration may be made to any of the documents attached thereto without the written authorisation of Homes England. If any alterations are made, or if these instructions are not fully complied with, the tender response may be rejected.
  4. All clarification requests must be sent using ProContract no later than 10 working days before the Further Competition deadline shown on ProContract. Any queries submitted after this may not be answered. Homes England will respond to clarifications as soon as practicable.
  5. Suppliers should specify in their clarification questions if they wish the clarification to be considered as confidential between themselves and Homes England. Homes England will consider any such request and will either respond on a confidential basis or give the Supplier the right to withdraw the clarification question. If the Supplier does not elect to withdraw the question and Homes England considers any clarification question to be of material significance, both the question and the answer will be communicated, in a suitably anonymous form, to all prospective Suppliers who have responded. If Suppliers consider that page limits set out in Section 20 (Evaluation Criteria) are insufficient to provide the information required by the question then a clarification request should be raised. No guarantee can be given that the page limit will be increased.
  6. Tender responses must not be accompanied by statements that could be construed as rendering the tender response equivocal and/or placing it on a different footing from other Suppliers. Only tender responses submitted without qualification strictly in accordance with the Further Competition ITT (or subsequently amended by Homes England) will be accepted for consideration. Homes England’s decision on whether or not a tender response is acceptable will be final.
  7. Tender responses must be written in English.
  8. By submitting a Tender, each Supplier undertakes that, in the event of its Tender being accepted by Homes England, it will deliver the services and each individual instruction in accordance with the Framework Agreement Terms and Conditions without variation. The Framework Agreement Terms and Conditions shall not be amended in any way and any document submitted as part of the Tender which purports to do so shall have no effect and shall be disqualified. Homes England shall not engage in any negotiations over the terms of the contract either before or after Tender close nor in relation to each individual instruction. By submitting a Tender, a supplier is accepting the terms of the Framework Agreement without variation other than to put into effect details relating to the supplier and Tender specific information and in respect of each individual instruction made under the Framework Agreement. Suppliers shall be aware that persistent failure to accept the Framework Terms and Conditions in respect of individual instruction may cause the supplier to be suspended or removed from the Framework.
  9. Under no circumstances shall Homes England incur any liability in respect of this Further Competition or any supporting documentation. Homes England will not reimburse the costs incurred by Suppliers in connection with the preparation and submission of their tender response to this Further Competition.
  10. Homes England reserves the right to cancel this Further Competition process at any time.

1. **Quality**
   1. A Response Form template has been provided in Part 2 to respond to the Quality questions detailed in Section 20 (Evaluation Criteria). The Response Form must be completed and returned as part of the tender response.
   2. Suppliers must provide information on proposed staff in the Response Form and Resource and Pricing Schedule provided in Part 2. If the Supplier is a consortium or intends to sub-contract the Services, in whole or in part, then it should specify precisely in the Resource and Pricing Schedule which economic operator shall perform the Services (or parts thereof).
2. **Pricing**
   1. A Resource and Pricing schedule has been provided with this Further Competition ITT which must be completed and returned as part of the tender response. The pricing approach for this Further Competition is lump sum fixed fee.
   2. The list of activities in the Resource and Pricing Schedule is not exhaustive and there may be additional duties/services required that will emerge as work is undertaken.  This commission may be extended on client instruction to cover such matters as arise, based on a time charged fee schedule completed in the tender response. The commission will only be extended if the services relate to the original objective of the overall call off contract.
   3. Suppliers are reminded that day rates for all individuals must be the agreed Framework Contract rates unless discounted rates are offered and will be used for all of the services.
3. **Evaluation**
   1. Tender responses will be evaluated on the basis of the overall most economically advantageous Tender (MEAT) submitted to Homes England. The evaluation criteria (and relative weightings) that Homes England will use to determine the most economically advantageous Tender are set out in Section 20 (Evaluation Criteria) below and the scoring approach is detailed in Section 25 (Worked Example). Scores will be rounded to two decimal places.
   2. Evaluators will initially work independently. Once they have completed their independent evaluation they will meet to discuss, understand and moderate any differences they have via a consensus meeting, where a single consensus score for each question will be agreed.
   3. Award decisions will be subject to the standstill period if over the FTS Services threshold. Unsuccessful Framework Suppliers will be provided with their scores and feedback to explain the award decision
4. **Documents to be Returned**

Suppliers are expected to provide the following information in response to this Further Competition ITT:

* Completed Response Form
* Completed Resource and Pricing Schedule
* Supporting CV’s for staff proposed to undertake this commission (no more than 2 pages each)

1. EVALUATION CRITERIA

|  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- |
| Quality will account for 70**%** of the Overall Score. The following scoring methodology will apply:  **5 – Excellent** Satisfies the requirement and demonstrates exceptional understanding and evidence in their ability/proposed methodology to deliver a solution for the required supplies/services. Response identifies factors that will offer potential added value, with evidence to support the response.  **4 – Good** Satisfies the requirement with minor additional benefits. Above average demonstration by the Supplier of the understanding and evidence in their ability/proposed methodology to deliver a solution for the required supplies/services. Response identifies factors that will offer potential added value, with evidence to support the response.  **3 – Acceptable** Satisfies the requirement. Demonstration by the Supplier of the understanding and evidence in their ability/proposed methodology to deliver a solution for the required supplies/services.  **2 - Minor Reservations** Some minor reservations of the Supplier’s understanding and proposed methodology, with limited evidence to support the response.  **1 – Major Reservations/Non-compliant** Major reservations of the Supplier’s understanding and proposed methodology, with little or no evidence to support the response.  **0 - Unacceptable/Non-compliant** Does not meet the requirement. Does not comply and/or insufficient information provided to demonstrate that the Supplier has the understanding or suitable methodology, with little or no evidence to support the response.  **PLEASE NOTE:**  If your response scores 0 or 1 for any one question your overall submission will be deemed as a fail.  Any text beyond the specified page limits below will be ignored and will not be evaluated.  Homes England will not cross-reference to other answers when assessing quality responses.  Evaluators will initially work independently. Once they have completed their independent evaluation they will meet to discuss, understand and moderate any differences they have via a consensus meeting, where a single consensus score for each question will be agreed.  Question 1 will be assessed on a pass/fail basis.  Yes = Pass  No = Fail | | | |
| **Number** | **Criteria** | **Demonstrated by** | **Weighting** |
| 1 | **Understanding of Project Requirements**  **PAGE LIMIT:**Maximum 4 A4 pages, 11-point Corbel font, 2,000 words | Set out your understanding of North Prospect regeneration and the issues it sought to address.  Set out your understanding of the local context that may have impacted on the ability to achieve the original objectives, e.g. the Plymouth construction sector, housing market and economy.  Set out any relevant wider context that may have influenced the ability of partners to achieve the original project objectives, and how these would be accounted for in the evaluation.  Set out the *challenges* of answering the research questions. **Note the methods used to address these will be in section 2**. | 15% |
| 2 | **Technical Merit of Proposal**  **PAGE LIMIT:**Maximum 6 A4 pages, 11-point Corbel font , 3,500 words | Explanation of how you would answer the research questions and what methodologies you think could be appropriate, and why you think this is the best methodology to adopt over alternatives.  Set out key information requirements to complete the evaluation and how these will be fulfilled.  Provide a sequential, step-by-step workplan, describing and explaining each task you will complete for the evaluation overall.  *Supported by project examples that demonstrate the ability of the supplier to successfully deliver a study of this nature – included* *within the 6-page limit.* | 35% |
| 3 | **Resourcing and management**  **PAGE LIMIT:**Maximum 4 A4 pages, 11-point Corbel font, 2,500 words | Who will undertake the study and why have they been chosen?  Identify key members of staff and allocation (including time) to tasks.  What experience/expertise will these team members bring to fulfilling these tasks?  How will the study, study team and any subcontractors be managed?  How will you ensure that the study remains within budget?  Who will be responsible for reporting to the Client and attend client meetings?  Identify risks to the study schedule, and to the study more generally, including its outcomes. What impact might each of these risks have, and how will these risks be mitigated? | 20% |

|  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- |
| Price will account for 30% of the Overall Score. The lowest price will gain the maximum marks with other prices expressed as a proportion of the best score using the maths explained in the worked example below. | | |
| **Criteria** | **Demonstrated by** | **Weighting** |
| Price | Completed Resource and Pricing Schedule | 30% |

1. **Worked Example**

**How your quality scoring will be used to give a weighted score**

**How your quality scoring will be used to give a weighted score**

|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| Bidder | Question | Score out of 5 | Weighting | Weighting Multiplier | Weighted Score | Total Weighted Score |
| Supplier A | 1 | 2 | 15% | 3 | 6 | 47 |
| 2 | 4 | 40% | 8 | 32 |
| 3 | 3 | 15% | 3 | 9 |
| Supplier B | 1 | 5 | 15% | 3 | 15 | 59 |
| 2 | 4 | 40% | 8 | 32 |
| 3 | 4 | 15% | 3 | 12 |
| Supplier C | 1 | 2 | 15% | 3 | 6 | n/a (fail)\* |
| 2 | 1 | 40% | 8 | n/a |
| 3 | 2 | 15% | 3 | 6 |

\* in the example above Supplier C’s pricing will not be scored

**Worked example of how your price will be used to calculate a score**

|  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- |
| Bidder | Form of Tender price | Lowest price/Supplier’s price (as %) | Price Score (out of 30) |
| Supplier A | 350 | 350/350 = 100% | 100%\*30 = 30 |
| Supplier B | 700 | 350/700 = 50% | 50%\*30 = 15 |
| Supplier C | 250 | n/a | n/a |

**Worked example of Overall Score and Ranking**

|  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| Bidder | Total Quality Score | Price Score | Total Score | Ranked Position |
| Supplier A | 47 | 30 | 77 | 1 |
| Supplier B | 59 | 15 | 74 | 2 |
| Supplier C | n/a | n/a | n/a | n/a |

Part 3

3.1 RESPONSE FORM

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
| **Framework:** | [insert] |
| **Project Title:** | [insert] |
| **ProContract Identification Number:** | DN [insert] |
| **Supplier:** | [insert] |
| **Date:** | [insert] |

1. As cited in North Prospect Area Planning statement [↑](#footnote-ref-2)
2. Three developers were involved in delivering the scheme. [↑](#footnote-ref-3)