**Small Format Advertising Opportunity (Digital 6-Sheet Concession) – London Borough of Southwark**

**Tender Evaluation Methodology (TEM)**

**Introduction**

1. This section details the methodology that will be used for assessing each Tender Submission responding to this Invitation to Tender (ITT).
2. The contract will be awarded to the most economically advantageous tender evaluated as described in this methodology.
3. The evaluation comprises of 3 stages:

* Stage one - Compliance
* Stage two - Quality and Social Value
* Stage three - Price

1. Stage one is based on Compliance which will be scored on a pass/fail basis. The compliance stage will consist of qualification questions on suppliers’ financial standing, Health & Safety, Social Value, Equality commitments.
2. Stages two and three shall be scored; the weightings to be applied are (40%) Quality, (60%) Price

**Evaluation of Tenders**

**Stage one - Compliance**

1. Tender Submissions will be subject to an initial compliance check to confirm that they
2. have been submitted on time,
3. are completed correctly and in full,
4. meet all the requirements of the Invitation to Tender
5. The Council may reject any Tender Submission that fails the initial compliance check and any rejected Tender Submissions will not be subject to the detailed Stage two and Stage three evaluation.

**Stage two – Quality**

**Quality criteria**

1. Tenderers will be required to submit method statements answering the questions contained in this section. These method statements, once approved by the Council, will be incorporated into the Contract as the Contractor has planned way of working throughout the Contract Period.
2. In submitting these method statements, Tenderers are requested to provide evidence of their experience, achievements and benefit outcomes.
3. Each method statement must not exceed the page limit using “Arial” 11 point font. Any part of the response in excess of the page allowance will be disregarded.
4. Note different questions may be evaluated by different people, and therefore they won’t be able to cross-reference answers within your submission. Please ensure your answers are as complete as possible.
5. The weighting for each method statement is set out in the following table:

|  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- |
| **Quality Question** | **Total Score** | **Percentage of the Quality Weighting** | **Overall Percentage Weighting** |
| Contract Mobilisation | 5 | 25% | 10% |
| Sustainability & Revenue Growth | 5 | 25% | 10% |
| Social Value | 5 | 50% | 20% |
| Presentation | N/A | To be used to refine or clarify quality response scores | To be used to refine or clarify quality response scores |
| **Total** |  | 100% | 40% |

**Tender Submissions scoring 1 point or less for any Social Value question may be rejected by the Council as the aspirations of this project in this area are very high.**

**Quality Scoring (Method Statements 1 and 2)**

1. Each quality question will be awarded appropriate marks based on the following basis:

Example;

|  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- |
| Cannot be scored | 0 points | No information provided or incapable of being taken forward either because the supplier does not demonstrate an understanding of our requirements or because the solution is incapable of meeting our requirements |
| Unsatisfactory | 1 point | Although the supplier does demonstrate an understanding of our requirements there are some major risks or omissions in relation to the proposed solution to deliver the service and we would not be confident of our requirements being met |
| Satisfactory | 2 points | A response which is capable of meeting our requirements but is unlikely to go beyond this |
| Good | 3 points | A response which shows that the supplier demonstrates an understanding of our requirements has a credible methodology to deliver the service and could evolve into additional benefits. |
| Very Good | 4 points | A response which shows that the supplier demonstrates an understanding of our requirements, has a credible methodology to deliver the service alongside a clear process and plan to deliver additional benefits and deliver value |
| Excellent | 5 points | A response which shows how the service can comprehensively be taken to the next level in terms of exceeding our requirements and/or offering significant added value to the council’s overall strategic requirements and objectives |

**Quality Social Value Scoring Qualitative (Method Statement 3)**

|  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- |
| 0 | Unacceptable | The information required is either omitted or fundamentally fails to demonstrate and evidence that Southwark’s requirements in the area being measured will be delivered in accordance with the tender/contract documents. |
| 1 | Poor | The information submitted has insufficient evidence to demonstrate assurance that Southwark's requirements in the area being measured will be delivered in accordance with the tender/contract documents |
| 2 | Fair | The information submitted provides some evidence to demonstrate how Southwark’s requirements in the area being measured will be delivered in accordance with the tender/contract documents but contains minor omissions |
| 3 | Good | The information submitted satisfactorily evidences and demonstrates how the requirements in the area being measured will be delivered in accordance with the tender/contract documents and is satisfactory in most respects and there are no major concerns |
| 4 | Very Good | The information submitted provides very good evidence to demonstrate how the requirements in the area being measured will be delivered in accordance with the tender/contract documents and any concerns are identified and addressed |
| 5 | Excellent | The information submitted provides excellent and strong evidence to demonstrate how the requirements in the area being measured will be delivered in accordance with the tender/contract documents, a full and robust response with no concerns |

1. Each question will be scored accordingly between scores 1 to 5. The criteria weighting will be applied to give a weighted score for quality question.
2. A Tenderer’s evaluation score will be based on the Tenderer’s written Tender Submission, but this may be clarified (and its veracity and accuracy verified) by the following methods:

* Clarification meetings / clarification presentations
* By responses to clarification questions raised by the Council
* Written feedback from referees

1. Tenderers will not be able to address any omissions in their Tender Submission during any clarification process.
2. The initial score will be based on the evaluators’ review of the Tenderer’s Tender Submission and be updated based on any further clarification. The final scores may differ from the initial scores to reflect the full evaluation process undertaken by the panel. Overall scores will be calculated to ascertain the Tenderer’s overall percentage score.
3. The evaluation panel will conduct a ‘consensus scoring process’ where moderation of the scores awarded during the exercise will take place. The moderation shall give regard to any variance in the scores between the evaluators. A consensus score will be agreed by the evaluators for each of the evaluation criteria.

**Stage Three - Price**

1. Priced documents will be examined in order to detect any computational errors. Where an examination reveals an error or discrepancy between these prices and the overall tender figure, this will be addressed and verified.

1. Price Evaluation criteria

|  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- |
| **Ref** | **Criteria** | **Maximum Points Available** |
| (1) | Tender sum | 60 |

1. The Tenderer with the lowest total percentage fee will receive the maximum percentage available. Each remaining Tenderers' price will be awarded a score based on the percentage difference between their total percentage fee and that of the most competitive total percentage fee.
2. An example of the methodology which will be applied is included below:-

*Lowest total percentage fee / Total percentage fee x 60 Points = Price Score*

**Note:** All scores achieved will be rounded up or down for each criterion.

**Abnormally low tenders**

1. The Council will scrutinise very carefully any Tender that contains a price which appears very low (having regard, amongst other things, to the prices submitted in the other Tender Submissions received). The Council reserves the right to reject any Tender Submission that is abnormally low.

**Final selection and recommendation**

1. The scores achieved for quality, social value and price will be added together to give an overall score. The overall scores will then be used to rank the Tender Submissions.

**Tie break**

1. In the event of a tie break (where two or more top scoring Tenderers have the same total weighted score including both Quality and Price), the Council shall select from amongst those Tender Submissions the Tender Submission with the highest weighted score for Quality and Social Value.