# Section 7 – Evaluation Criteria and tender response

On passing the minimum requirements of section 6, your tender submission will be evaluated as follows;

Provided in brackets is the percentage score allocated to that criteria and also the maximum number of sides of A4 pages or word count allowed for responding. Providers are to use font style Arial, size 12pt. Any information given outside of this limit will not be factored into the evaluation.

[Annex 1](#_Annex_1_–) (Evaluation Model) provides a detailed breakdown of the Evaluation Model. Bids will be evaluated based on:

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
| **Area of Evaluation** | **Weighting** |
| 1. [Price](#_Price_(25%_weighting)) | 25% |
| 1. [Quality](#_Quality_(40%_weighting)) | 40% |
| 1. [Social Value](#_Social_Value_(25%) | 25% |
| 1. [Presentation](#_Presentation_(10%_weighting)) | 10% |

### **Price** (25% weighting)

This section will be evaluated on:

1. Pricing Schedule: 10 Year Projections – 5% weighting

*(Section 8 – BECC Pricing Schedule)*

Please complete in full Section 8 (Pricing Schedule) and upload under the appropriate section of the online form within the ProContract portal.

All prices are to be exclusive of Value Added Tax (VAT) and inclusive of all other costs; i.e. travel and expenses.

1. Three Year Business Plan – 10% weighting

*(*[*Annex 2*](#_Annex_2_–) *– Business Plan Instructions)*

Instructions for the Three Year Business Plan can be found in [Annex 2](#_Annex_2_–) (Business Plan Instructions)

Please include a complementary section in your Three Year Business Plan, which outlines your methodology for achieving the estimated financial outputs provided in the Pricing Schedule.

1. Pricing Schedule: Funding for Additional Land – 10% weighting

*(Section 8 – BECC Pricing Schedule)*

This portion of the evaluation will be awarded based on your ability to develop the additional land, in the event of the borough being unsuccessful in securing external funding.

Please provide a detailed overview of how funds will be secured; along with estimated timelines.

The evaluation process may feature best and final offer from up to three providers.

### Quality (40% weighting)

This section will be evaluated on your Three Year Business Plan. Instructions for developing the Three Year Business Plan can be found in [Annex 2](#_Annex_2_–) – Business Plan Instructions.

### Social Value (25% weighting)

This section will be evaluated on:

1. Social Value Framework – 10% weighting

*(*[*Annex 4*](#_Annex_4_–) *– Social Value Framework and Social Value Reinvestment Offer)*

In this section you will be required to provide an overview of additional support systems and access to value added activity.

1. Learner Engagement Strategy – 10% weighting

*(*[*Annex 3*](#_Annex_3_–) *– Learner Engagement Strategy)*

In this section you will be required to provide an overview of your plans for marketing and engaging learning in Centre activity.

1. Social Value Reinvestment Offer – 5% weighting

*(*[*Annex 4*](#_Annex_4_–) *– Social Value Framework and Social Value Reinvestment Offer)*

In this section you will be required to provide an overview of how you will reinvest profit into Waltham Forest focused social value activity.

**Methodology for evaluating of Price (25%), Quality (40%) & Social Value (25%):**

Please use the ‘Evaluation Templates’ shown in the annex’s of Section 7, and either embed your document with your response into the relevant section or upload a separate document to ProContract to respond to all criteria stated. Providers must clearly identify the question number, being responded to and adhere to the appropriate page or word limitation set herein.

The evaluation panel will evaluate your compliant submitted tender response only; the evaluation panel will not use any prior knowledge of any organisation, if any, for the purpose of this tender. You should not assume that the evaluation panel will be familiar with your organisation. Nor should your response cross reference to other questions of your submission.

Unless otherwise stated in the tender documents, written responses will be assessed using the following scoring mechanism:

| **Score** | **Rating** | **Criteria for Awarding Score** |
| --- | --- | --- |
| 0 | Unacceptable | No response to the question or the response is highly inaccurate |
| 1 | Poor | Limited response provided or a response that is inadequate, substantially irrelevant, inaccurate or misleading |
| 2 | Below expectations | Response only partially addresses the question or contains negative indicators and inconsistencies |
| 3 | Good | A good response submitted in terms of level of detail, accuracy and relevance. The response is good; it meets all the requirements but lacks relevant evidence of innovation to obtain a higher score |
| 4 | Very Good | A comprehensive response submitted in terms of detail and relevance and clearly meets the project aims with no negative indicators or inconsistencies. Provides more evidence and innovation than a good response |
| 5 | Excellent | A more than comprehensive response submitted in terms of detail and relevance with no negative indications or inconsistencies. The supplier has demonstrated a significant improvement to the way the service is delivered that provides significant evidence of innovation |

The scores from the evaluation of the written submissions for both price and quality elements will be added together to calculate each Provider’s total score so far.  Only providers who could potentially achieve the highest overall score will be invited to attend the Presentation stage.

**Quality evaluation example**

The following example demonstrates the methodology applied to the quality evaluation of ITT, **the criteria and weightings shown in this example are for demonstration purposes only.**

|  |  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| **Section A:**  (Workforce and Training) | **Weighting**  (W) | **Scoring** | | | |
| **Bidder A**  Average panel raw score | **Bidder A**  Average panel weighted score | **Bidder B**  Average panel raw score | **Bidder B**  Average panel weighted score |
| Question A.1 | 6 | 4.00 | 6.00 | 3.75 | 5.63 |
| Question A.2 | 6 | 3.25 | 4.88 | 3.00 | 4.5 |
| Question A.3 | 8 | 3.00 | 6.00 | 3.75 | 7.5 |
| **Section Total** | **20** | **N/A** | **16.88** | **N/A** | **17.67** |

To calculate the average panel weighted score for each question: the average panel score awarded will be multiplied by the weighting of the question divided by 4 (the maximum achievable score). For example,

Bidder A’s average weighted score for Question A.1 is

4 x 6 / 4 = 6

This process is repeated for all of the scored sections to provide an overall score as illustrated in the table below.

|  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| **Section** | | **Weighting** | **Bidder A Average panel weighted**  **section score** | **Bidder B Average panel weighted**  **section score** |
| A | Workforce and Training | 20 | 16.88 | 17.67 |
| B | Service Responsiveness | 20 | 14.63 | 14.63 |
| C | Technical capability | 20 | 13.63 | 17.67 |
| **Total Quality Score** | | **60** | **45.14** | **49.97** |

The average panel weighted quality score and price evaluation scores are then added together to identify the most economically advantageous tender in line with the evaluation criteria set out within this document.

|  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- |
| **Section** | **Weighting** | **Bidder A Score** | **Bidder B Score** |
| **Total quality score** | **60%** | **45.14%** | **49.97%** |
| **Price/fee** | **40%** | **40.00%** | **36.40%** |
| **TOTAL** | **100%** | **85.14%** | **86.37%** |

In this example, Bidder B would be awarded the Contract as having provided the most economically advantageous tender. Please note this will be used only where the scoring mechanism is used, all other evaluation will be as stated in the tender documents.

### Presentation (10% weighting)

As part of the evaluation process, providers will be required to make available key members of their delivery team who will deliver part, or be responsible for the provision of the Contract to respond to the following points and allow the Authority an opportunity to clarify any aspect of the submission. The overall account manager assigned to the Contract should attend the presentation. Please explain the role of the team members present at the presentation.

We will consider the content of your presentation and response to questions and the way in which it is delivered.

* Delivery style, professionalism and ability to communicate complex information, visually and through verbal interaction and rapport with the evaluation panel, including non-subject matter experts
* Demonstrated grasp of the subject matter as it relates to our requirements including breadth and depth of understanding of the opportunities and constraints of this project

The presentation should last no longer than 60 minutes in line with the time schedule below. LBWF will confirm a time / date week commencing 6 August 2018.

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
| **Agenda** | **Minutes** |
| Introduction | 5 |
| Presentation | 40 |
| Q&A | 15 |
| **Total** | **60** |

Presentation scoring will be assessed using the following scoring mechanism:

| **Score** | **Description** | |
| --- | --- | --- |
| 12 | Excellent | Excellent response / answer / solution with suggestions (and sound justifications) that satisfies all the Authority’s requirements under the Contract. |
| 9 | Very Good | Very good response / answer / solution that satisfies the Authority’s requirements under the Contract; with no reservations at all. |
| 6 | Good | Good response / answer / solution to that aspect of the Authority’s requirements; provides more evidence than that of an ‘acceptable’ response. |
| 3 | Acceptable | Acceptable response / answer / solution; all the Authority’s requirements are met; provides evidence given of skill / knowledge sought. |
| 1 | Poor | Less than acceptable response / answer / solution; lacks convincing evidence of skills / experience sought; lack of real understanding of requirement or evidence of ability to deliver. |
| 0 | Non-  Compliant | Non-compliant – failed to address the Authority’s requirements or a detrimental response / answer / solution; limited or poor evidence of skill / knowledge sought. |
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