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**ITT Evaluation Process Guide.**
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FOR

**HAC5901 Sanctuary Scheme Project**

# 

1.1 This document outlines the ITT evaluation process the Authority will follow to determine the most economically advantageous tender which will be awarded the Contract.

1.2 Please **do not** include any information that is not expressly requested in the invitation to tender documentation, the online ITT Award Criteria and Compliance sections or subsequently in response to a clarification question. Do note that the inclusion of an executive summary, general marketing and company literature or a statement of reasons for award is not required and **will not** be considered in the evaluation of tenders.

1.3 Tender submissions must be answered in English

1.4 Evaluation of tenders received will be based on the following;

* + **Stage 1:** Completeness check including financial standing, including financial standing evaluation.
  + **Stage 2:** Price Evaluation
  + **Stage 3:** Quality/Tenderer’s Method Statements evaluation.

**2. Completeness Check**

* 1. Tenders will first be reviewed to ensure that:
     1. the Bid has been submitted on time
     2. the Bid has been submitted with all the documentation requested in order to enable the Authority to evaluate in accordance with the evaluation methodology.
     3. Bidder’s submissions will be checked to establish that they have signed the Form of Tender (Bid certificate), and other relevant documents and pages which require signatures. If the Bid submission does not have a signature in the relevant documents or pages, the Authority at its discretion, may write to the relevant supplier, and request signed documents to be submitted. The communication sent to the Bidder will state the deadline by which the signed documents should be submitted. Failure to meet those deadlines and the conditions set out in the communication issued by the Council, will result to, the Bidder’s submission being considered as non-compliant, therefore, it will be rejected.
     4. The Form of Contract (T&Cs) has been accepted.
     5. All the **compliance/Selection Questions** are assessed and passed. (Please refer to Document 12 - SQ Instruction & Evaluation Guide
     6. Submissions that do not pass the completeness checks stage will be considered to be non-compliant therefore it will be disqualified or excluded from the tendering process.

**3. Price Evaluation**

* 1. Bidders must provide their price on the format requested in
  2. Document 04 - Schedule 2 – Price
  3. For this tender, the maximum weighting allocated for Price is:

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
| Criteria | Weighting (%) |
| Cost (Price) | 30% |

* 1. Bidders should submit tender on a "Fixed Price" basis for each year of the contract. The total sum will be used for the purpose of evaluation as described above. If the tender is accepted the Service Provider will not be entitled to claim and the Authority will not allow any increase in the price of the materials and/or cost of or incidental to, the employment of labour, and the prices included in the Bid shall be the maximum payable by the Authority.
  2. The Tender must be based on rates/prices which exclude Value Added Tax. This tax, if applicable, will be paid by the Authority as an addition at the appropriate rate on the invoices related to the service when submitted.
  3. Bidders are strongly advised that before submitting this Tender all arithmetical calculations, transfers and cost summaries must be checked for accuracy, whilst also ensuring that forms have been fully completed and signed (by the authorised Officer) and all necessary information supplied.
  4. The Bidder will not be allowed to adjust their Initial or Final bid set out on the Form of Tender or Price schedule if that means an increase in the rates or price offered in this Tender Submission. Bidders should be aware that the Authority has a duty to investigate submitted Tenders where the price appears to be abnormally low. If the Bidder cannot provide substantial reasons for the low prices then the Authority may disqualify the Tender submission.
  5. Pricing assessment will be based on submitted pricing proposals and will be scored in accordance with the following formula:
     1. The price which is most advantageous to the Authority will be awarded the maximum weighting given to the lowest cost in the evaluation criteria. The remaining Potential Providers will receive marks on a pro rata basis.
     2. For **Example** where price has been assigned 30%, bidders price score will be calculated as follows:

Best Price

Bidder’s Price

**X**

30

|  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| **Bibber name** | **Price** | **Criteria weighting for cost** | **Formula for score** | **Final (weighted) score** |
| Bidder A | £181,000 | 30 | (£181,000/£181,000) x 30 | 30% |
| Bidder B | £219,000 | 30 | (£181,000/£219,000) x 30 | 25% |
| Bidder C | £223,000 | 30 | (£181,000/£223,000) x 30 | 24% |

* 1. Where the Authority considers that the proposed cost proposal is not sufficiently robust to deliver a sustainable service, it will seek further clarifications from the bidder. Bids that cannot demonstrate sustainability and deliverability will be rejected.

# Quality/Method Statement Assessment

* 1. Bidders must respond to each of the questions set out in the Quality Statement – **Document 05 - Schedule 3 - Quality Method statements.**
  2. The minimum pass mark for the quality question (method statement) is 60% of the total quality weighting. Any provider who score less than 60% of the total quality weighting will be eliminated from the process.
  3. For this tender, the maximum weighting allocated for Quality /Method statement is:

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
| Criteria | Weighting (%) |
| Quality including Social Value | 70% |

* 1. A strict word limit has been applied to each Quality Statement question, to enable responses to be as concise and relevant as possible. Submissions must be kept to the maximum word limits as detailed at the top of each section. Except where specifically requested, any information that exceeds the word limits stated will be excluded from evaluation. For the absence of doubt, this means, for example, that if the word limit for a question is stipulated on each question, evaluators will read the maximum word limit stipulated of the answer and disregard anything beyond that limit. Unless requested, attachments should not be included and they will not be read or considered as part of the evaluation. This includes any policy and procedures that are referenced in the responses unless these have been explicitly requested in the relevant question
  2. The quality element of Tenders will be evaluated using the following process and methodology:
     1. All the members of the panel will score each question individually and independently.
     2. The scored responses are assessed out of a maximum of 5 based on the methodology outlined in the table 4 below.

****Table 4 – Scoring Methodology****

| **Assessment** | **Score** | **Description** |
| --- | --- | --- |
| No submission | 0 points | **Failed** to submit an adequate answer or address the question. Does not meet the requirement. Does not comply. |
| Very Poor | 1 point | **Major Concerns.** Insufficient information provided to demonstrate that the Potential Provider has the ability, understanding, experience of staff assigned to performing the contract, skills, resource & quality measures required to provide the supplies / services/works, with little or no evidence to support the response. |
| Poor | 2 points | **Part or limited response** provided with shortcomings in evidence /information provided. Does not satisfies fully the requirement and some reservations about the Potential Provider’s relevant ability, understanding, experience of staff assigned to performing the contract, skills, resource & quality measures required to provide the supplies / services, with limited or no evidence to support the response. |
| Good | 3 points | **Satisfactory** detail and evidence. Sufficient demonstration by the Potential Provider of their ability, understanding, and experience of staff assigned to performing the contract, skills, resources & quality measures required. |
| Very Good | 4 points | Good response. Satisfies the requirements with additional benefits.  **Above average** demonstration by the Potential Provider of the relevant ability, understanding, experience of staff assigned to performing the contract, skills, resource & quality measures required to answer the brief. |
| Excellent | 5 points | Full response **exceeding requirement**, demonstrating well evidenced and relevant examples, where required. Exceptional demonstration by the Potential Provider of the relevant ability, understanding, and experience of staff assigned to performing the contract, skills, resources & quality measures required to provide the specified solution to the brief. Response highly relevant with comparable contract value. |

4.5 Quality criteria weighting for a question will be calculated in accordance with the following formula:

(Evaluators’ Final score / Maximum available score or points X Weighting Allocated to the question) ( this includes Social Value)

e.g. where the weighting of a question is set at 30% and the maximum mark is 5, we would calculate the weighted score by:

|  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| **Bidder name** | **Score** | **Criteria weighting** | **Formula for score** | **Final (weighted) score** |
| Bidder A | 3 | 70% | (3/5) x 70 | 42% |
| Bidder B | 5 | 70% | (5/5) x 70 | 70% |
| Bidder C | 4 | 70% | (4/5) x 70 | 56% |

* 1. Individual Scores will be moderated to arrive to the Final Score for each evaluation criterion.
  2. The score given to each question above will then be totalled to establish the tender overall score for Quality/method statement submission.

# 5.0 Conclusion

6.1 Following the completion of the 3 stages stage evaluation, the bid submission with the highest combined scores from the price and quality/method statement evaluation will be the winning bid.