SECTION 4: TENDER SCORING MATRIX

This page gives an example of how each question may be scored.
All scored questions will be marked out of 5 points

Section	Question	Section Weighting	Individual Question Weighting % or Pass/Fail	Guidance	[Enter Supplier Name] Points out of 5 or PASS/FAIL	Weighted Score %
1	**Supplier Information**	n/a	n/a	Not scored but must be completed in full	n/a	n/a
2	**Grounds for Mandatory Exclusion**	n/a	Pass/Fail	Not scored but must be completed in full. Disqualify if answer YES to any question	Pass or Fail	n/a
3	**Grounds for Discretionary Exclusion**	n/a	Pass/Fail	Not scored but must be completed in full. Supplier may be disqualified if answer YES to any question. If disqualified, Banes must provide a statement to supplier explaining why evidence of self-cleaning is not accepted.	Pass or Fail	n/a
				PASS OR FAIL		

60% QUALITY

Section	Section Title	Section Weighting (out of 100%)	Individual Question Weighting (out of 100%)	Guidance	Points out of 5	Weighted Score %
4	**Economic and Financial Standing**	25				
	4.1 Provision of economic/financial information		100	Failure to provide sufficient information = 0 points or Score 5 points for provision of clear infromation relating to 4.1 (a)-(c), 3 points for 4.1 (a) & (b), 2 points for 4.1 (a) or (b) or (d) 1 point for 4.1 (d)	5	100
				Questions Total		**100**
				Economic & Financial Standing Weighted Score		**25**
5	**Technical & Professional Ability**	30				
	5.1 Details of up to 3 contracts		100	Full response with 3 contracts, details of dates and value and with relevant experience of delivering similar type of contract = 5 points Partial response with less than 3 contracts and/or some details of dates and value and with relevant experience of delivering similar type of contract = 4 points Limited response with less than 3 contracts and/or some details of dates and value and contract experience not a good match = 2 points No response or irrelevant experience = 0 points	5	100
				Questions Total		**100**
				Technical & Professional Ability Weighted Score		**30**
6	**Additional Project Specific questions**	30				
	6.1 Accreditation to ISO 2208		100	Full accreditation = 5 points, accreditation in time for contract = 3 points, no accreditation = 0 points	5	10
	6.2 Accreditation to ISO/IEC 17020			As above	5	10
	6.3 Accreditation to ISO/IEC 17025			As above	5	10
	6.4 Staff competence and accreditation to ISO/IEC 17024			As above	5	10
	6.5 Company Health and Safety Policy			As above	5	10
	6.6 Service Plan			As above	5	10
	6.7 Compliance proposals with HSG264			As above	5	10
	6.8 Survey Programme			As above	5	10
	6.9 Shine Asbestos compliance & implementation			As above	5	10
	6.10 Details of staff and training records			As above	5	10
				Questions Total		**100**
				Additional Project Specific Questions Weighted Score		**30**

	Terms & Conditions	15				
	Terms & Conditions agreement	[redacted]	100	DoesSupplier agree to B&NES' Terms & Conditions without any required amendments? If so, award 5 points. If not, amend scoring to reflect what proportion of the terms are to be amended	5	100
				Questions Total		**100**
				Terms & Conditions Weighted Score		**15**
				QUALITY Total Weighted Score (out of 100)		**100**
	Total	**100%**	**100%**	**GRAND TOTAL FOR QUALITY**		**60**

40% PRICE

Section	Question	Section Weighting (out of 100%)	Individual Question Weighting (out of 100%)	Guidance	Points out of 100	Weighted Score %
	Price	100				
	Cost (Submitted Spreadsheet)	[redacted]	100	see explanation in Overall Section Scoring of scoring on price	100	100
	Total	**100%**	**100%**	**GRAND TOTAL FOR PRICE**		**40**

OVERALL TOTAL (QUALITY + PRICE)	**100**

Scoring - Quality

Unless otherwise stated points shall be attributed as follows:-

5 points	5 – The standard of the response is very high and the relevance of the response and the supporting evidence is very comprehensive and provides the Council with a very high level of confidence in the Applicant's and/or, where applicable, the Associated Company's and/or Named Supplier's and/or consortium member's experience, capacity and capability to meet the Council's requirements.
4 points	4 – The response is comprehensive and supported by a good standard of relevant evidence and provides the Council with a good standard of confidence in the Applicant's and/or, where applicable, the Associated Company's and/or Named Supplier's and/or consortium member's experience, capacity and capability to meet its requirements.
3 points	3 – The response is satisfactory and supported by an acceptable standard of relevant evidence but with some reservations/issues not addressed. The Council is satisfied with the Applicant's and/or, where applicable, the Associated Company's and/or Named Supplier's and/or consortium member's experience, capacity and capability to meet its requirements
2 points	2 – Large portions of the response are not satisfactory and/or are not supported by a satisfactory level of evidence and the Council has limited confidence in the Applicant's and/or, where applicable, the Associated Company's and/or Named Supplier's and/or consortium member's experience, capacity and capability to meet its requirements.
1 point	1 – The response and/or the evidence are deficient (or not relevant) in the majority of areas and the Council has a low level of confidence in the Applicant's and/or, where applicable, the Associated Company's and/or Named Supplier's and/or consortium member's experience, capacity and capability to meet its requirements
0 points	0 – No response and/or evidence is unacceptable or non-existent, or there is a failure to properly address any issue. The Council does not have any confidence in the Applicant's and/or, where applicable, the Associated Company's and/or Named Supplier's and/or consortium member's experience, capacity and ability to meet its requirements.

Scoring – Price

The scoring is carried out within an Excel spread sheet outside of the e-tender system.

1. Maximum 40 points awarded to the lowest priced tender
2. Remaining Tenders scored = 40 points x lowest price/the tendere's price