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Appendix One - Explanation of Price Evaluation

# **SECTION 14 – APPENDICES**

**Home Based Reablement Service**

**PL.15.XXX**

Appendix Two - Evaluation Matrix showing Quality Criteria

Appendix Three - Details of Partners, Consortium Members or Sub-Contractors

Appendix Four - Meanings of Offences

Bids are scored out of a 100. These 100 points are split into two main criteria, which are quality and price. The amount of points available from the price and quality criteria is determined by the importance of these criteria to the goods, services or works being purchased and is dependent on the risk and value of the contract to be awarded.

# **APPENDIX ONE – EXPLANATION OF PRICE EVALUATION**

**Home Based Reablement Service**

**PL.15.XXX**

**Usual Price Evaluation Method**

In the example below price accounts for 40 points and therefore the quality aspect will be marked out of the remaining 60 points.

The maximum price score is given to the lowest submitted price (taking into account all of the costs submitted in the tender, further explanation regarding the pricing schedule may be needed e.g. if a complex whole life costing model is used), in this example this is 40. Scores, in relation to price, are given to the other tenders based on their relative position to the lowest priced bid. Scores are rounded to 1 decimal point.

Calculation: [1-((Supplier X’s price - Lowest Price) ÷ (Lowest Price))] x Price Points

|  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- |
| Supplier | Price | Calculation | Points |
| 1 | £125,000 | [1 – ((£125,000 - £100,000) ÷ (£100,000))] x 40 | 30 |
| 2 | £185,000 | [1 – ((£185,000 - £100,000) ÷ (£100,000))] x 40 | 6 |
| 3 | £100,000 | [1 – ((£100,000 - £100,000) ÷ (£100,000))] x 40 | 40 |
| 4 | £150,000 | [1 – ((£150,000 - £100,000) ÷ (£100,000))] x 40 | 20 |
| 5 | £225,000 | [1 – ((£225,000 - £100,000) ÷ (£100,000))] x 40 | 0\* |

Step by Step Guide (Supplier 1’s Price):

Subtract the lowest price from Supplier 1’s price e.g. £125,000 - £100,000 = £25,000; this gives the difference between the lowest price and Supplier 1’s price.

Divide the difference between the lowest price and Supplier 1’s price by the lowest price e.g. £25,000 ÷ £100,000 = 0.25; this shows the percentage difference between the lowest price and Supplier 1’s price.

Take this difference away from 1. 1 – 0.25 = 0.75; this gives the percentage of the marks that Supplier 1 will receive (75%). As Supplier 1 is 25% more expensive than the lowest price they should get 25% less marks.

The final stage allocated the points that Supplier 1 will earn. 0.75 x 40 = 30, to put it another way 75% of 40 is 30.

\*If a bid is more than twice the amount of the lowest price the equation will produce a negative number, in this case the bids score 0 points.

The winning tender is the one which scores the greatest overall mark once the Price and Quality scores have been combined. In this model the lowest price is clearly favoured as maximum marks are awarded to it. Therefore if quality is important to the tender then minimum quality thresholds may be set.

# **APPENDIX TWO – EVALUATION MATRIX SHOWING QUALITY CRITERIA**

**Home Based Reablement Service**

**PL.15.XXX**

A copy of the Quality evaluation Matrix is shown below. Each Lot will be evaluated separately. Please note columns D to H of table 1 below are replicated for each supplier submitting a bid.

|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| **A** | B | C | D | E | F | G | H |
|  |  |  | **Supplier 1** |
| **Question Number** | **Methodology Statement** | **Weighting (%)** | **Evaluation panel scores** | **Average Score**  | **Weighted Score**  |
| **J1** |  | 20% |   |   |   |  |  |
| **J2** |  | 30% |   |   |   |  |  |
| **J3** |  | 10% |   |   |   |  |  |
| **J4** |  | 10% |   |   |   |  |  |
|  |  |  |   |   |   |  |  |
|  |  |  |   |   |   |  |  |
|  |  |  |   |   |   |  |  |
|  |  |  |   |   |   |  |  |
|  |  |  |   |   |   |  |  |
|  |  |  |   |   |   |  |  |
| **Total Score** |   |  |

*Table 1*

Each method statement question number has a weighting % applied, as detailed Column C of Table 1 and Part J in Section 5, Supplier Responses – Working Methods.

Each evaluator will score the responses to the Method Statement questions of each tender using the scoring scale detailed below and referred to in Section One, paragraph 6.4.:

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
| **0** | **Completely unsatisfactory/unacceptable response** No response to the question or serious deficiencies in meeting the required standards. The risk to the Council is very high. |
| **1** | **Poor response** The proposals provide only limited evidence that the specified requirements will be met and / or demonstrate significant omissions and / or demonstrate only a limited level of quality. The risk to the Council is high. |
| **2** | **Acceptable response in some areas**The response is compliant in most areas, but in some areas falls short of the required standards.The proposals provide evidence that reasonable quality will be met where detailed, but with some material omissions. The risk to the Council is medium. |
| **3** | **Good response** The response is compliant and meets the contract standards.The proposals provide evidence that the specified requirements will be met, with no more than minor omissions and where any concerns are only of a minor nature, and demonstrate reasonable quality. The risk to the Council is low. |
| **4** | **Outstanding response** The response is fully compliant, with no omissions, and clearly indicates a full understanding of the contract. The proposals provide strong evidence that all of the specified requirements will be consistently delivered to a high level of quality. The risk to the Council is very low. |

*Table 2*

The average score for each question is then calculated by dividing the sum of the individual evaluator scores by the number of evaluators. For example, if there are 3 evaluators then the average score will be calculated as follows:

*(Evaluator 1 Score + Evaluator 2 Score + Evaluator 3 Score) / 3 = Average Score*

The weighted score for each question is then calculated by dividing the Average Score by the total available score. The total available score for each question is 4. This figure is then multiplied by the weighting available for the question, shown in column C in the above table.

*(Average Score / Maximum Available Score) x Weighting = Weighted Score*

The weighted score for each question is then totalled to create a total score for the quality element of each tender.

Following individual evaluation by each evaluator, a process of moderation is undertaken by the whole evaluation panel, the purpose being to gain consensus. This part of the process also ensures there is no significant variance between the scores of the individual evaluators. This process of moderation may result in individual evaluators revising their scores. Following the process of moderation the scores of the evaluation panel for the quality element of the evaluation will be finalised and represented as a percentage of the total points available for quality.

*(Total Weighted Score/100) x Available Quality Points = Total Quality Score*

This total quality score is then combined with the total score for the price element of the evaluation to create a total combined score for each tender.

# **APPENDIX THREE – DETAILS FOR PARTNERS, CONSORTIUM MEMBERS OR SUB-CONTRACTORS**

**Home Based Reablement Service**

**PL.15.XXX**

STATEMENT OF NAMES AND PRIVATE ADDRESSES OF PARTNERS WITHIN THE PARTNERSHIP

DETAILS OF CONSORTIUM MEMBERS OR SUB-CONTRACTORS WHERE DELIVERING A SIGNIFICANT PROPORTION OF THE CONTRACT

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
| 1 | Name:(Private) Address: Post Code: |
| 2 | Name:(Private) Address: Post Code: |
| 3 | Name:(Private) Address: Post Code: |
| 4 | Name:(Private) Address: Post Code: |
| 5 | Name:(Private) Address: Post Code: |

PLEASE ADD FURTHER BOXES IF REQUIRED

**APPENDIX FOUR – MEANINGS OF OFFENCES**

**Home Based Reablement Service**

**PL.15.XXX**

**Glossary of meanings in relation to offences as described in Section 4 – Professional Standing**

Conspiracy - within the meaning of Section 1 of the Criminal Law Act 1977 (where that conspiracy relates to participation in a criminal organisation as defined in Article 2(1) of the Council Joint Action 98/733.JHA.

Corruption - within the meaning of Section 1 of the Public Bodies Corrupt Practices Act 1889, Section 1 of the Prevention of Corruption Act 1906; corruption as defined in Article 3 of the Council Act of 26 May 1997 and Article 3(1) of Council Joint Action 98.742/JHA.

Bribery as defined by the Bribery Act 2010

Fraud - where the offence relates to fraud affecting the financial interests of the European Communities as defined by Article 1 of the Convention relating to the protection of the financial interests of the European Union, within the meaning of:

Fraud or theft - within the meaning of the Theft Act 1968 and the Theft Act 1978

Fraudulent trading - within the meaning of Section 458 of the Companies Act 1985

Defrauding HM Revenue & Customs - within the meaning of the Customs & Excise Management Act 1979 and the Value Added Tax Act 1994

An offence in connection with taxation in the European community - within the meaning of section 71 of the Criminal Justice Act 1968

Destroying defacing or concealing of documents or procuring the extension of a valuable security - within the meaning of Section 20 of the Theft Act 1968

Money laundering - within the meaning of the Money Laundering Regulations 2003 and as defined in Article 1 of Council Directive 91.308.EEC of 10 June 1991 on prevention of the use of the financial system for the purpose of money laundering

Any other offence - within the meaning of Article 45(1) of the Public Sector Directive