

TENDER EVALUATION MODEL (final draft for JWRC)

DOCUMENT: *Tender Evaluation Model V0.10*

1 TENDER EVALUATION CRITERIA AND METHODOLOGY

1.1 This evaluation methodology is a three stage process comprising the following stages:

1. Compliance evaluation;
2. Detailed quality and financial evaluation, clarification and moderation;
3. Recommendation of award.

1.2 All Tenders will be evaluated against an agreed evaluation framework and criteria, as described in this document. The evaluation team is detailed in Table 1 below.

Table 1: Evaluation Team

	Team Member
Compliance	Partnership officers, as nominated by the Partnership Ricardo Energy & Environment; Advisor
Financial	Partnership officers, as nominated by the Partnership Ricardo Energy & Environment, Advisor Bevan Brittan, Legal Advisor (with reference to commercial risks)
Quality	Partnership officers, as nominated by the Partnership Ricardo Energy & Environment; Advisor

2 OVERVIEW: AWARD CRITERIA

2.1 The award of contract will be based on the Most Economically Advantageous Tender (MEAT) received. The Partnership has decided that the split between financial and quality matters will be 60%:40% respectively. A point-based scoring system has been adopted, with 1000 points available across all criteria; 400 points for the quality criteria and 600 points for the financial criteria. There are three tiers of criteria contributing to the scoring, as detailed in Table 2 below.

Table 2: Evaluation Criteria

Tier 1		Tier 2		Tier 3	
Criteria	Weighting	Criteria	Weighting	Criteria	Weighting
Financial	60%	Price	85%	N/A	N/A
		Commercial Risk	15%	N/A	N/A
Quality/Technical	40%	Contract and Business Management	39%	MS1: Approach to Contract Management	10%
				MS2: Social Value and Innovation	2%

Tier 1		Tier 2		Tier 3		
Criteria	Weighting	Criteria	Weighting	Criteria	Weighting	
				MS3: Mobilisation and Handback, including TUPE Transfer	8%	
				MS4: Monitoring, Management and Reporting, including Customer Care and ICT solution	8%	
				MS5: Business Continuity	5%	
				MS6: Health & Safety Management and Environmental & Quality Management	6%	
		Resourcing	24%		MS7: Staff Resources, including their Management, Training and Recruitment	10%
					MS8: Vehicle, Plant and Equipment Resources	10%
					MS9: Depot and Waste Transfer Station Management	4%
		Waste Services Delivery	22%		MS10: Provision of Waste Services	20%
					MS11: Food Waste Collection (optional service)	2%
		Street Cleansing Services Delivery	15%		MS12: Provision of Street and Beach Cleansing Services: WDC and RDC only	15%
					MS13: Provision of Street and Beach Cleansing Services: HBC only	0%

3 STAGE 1: COMPLIANCE EVALUATION

- 3.1 Stage 1 is the compliance evaluation stage, which will determine whether the bid has been submitted in accordance with the Partnership's Invitation to Tender, based on the checks set out in Table 3 below. This is a pass / fail evaluation and the Partnership reserves the right to eliminate Tenders from progressing to the 2nd Stage evaluation if the compliance requirements are not met.
- 3.2 The first stage compliance evaluation process involves assessing each submission against a number of general compliance criteria to ensure that the submission is compliant with the minimum requirements as detailed in the Invitation to Tender document.

Table 3: Compliance Checklist

	Yes	No	Comments
Was the submission received on the East Sussex Procurement Hub by [TIME AND DATE]			
Has the bidder submitted all the necessary Forms and Certificates, and are they appropriately signed?			
Has the bidder submitted a completed set of Method Statements and all requested enclosures?			
Has the bidder submitted completed Pricing Schedules and have all the items been priced?			

3.3 The outcome of Stage 1 shall be at the absolute discretion of the Partnership. Tenders satisfying the requirements of this stage will be subject to full Stage 2 quality and financial evaluation.

4 STAGE 2: QUALITY EVALUATION

4.1 Introduction

4.2 Failure to provide a response to any Method Statement question will result in a score of zero (0) for that question.

4.3 If a Tenderer scores zero (0) in any of the Stage 2 evaluation criteria, the Partnership may, at its discretion, disqualify the Tenderer. In exercising this discretion, the Partnership will seek clarifications and take into account the relative importance of the relevant criteria.

4.3.1 The second stage Quality Evaluation will entail the evaluation of the Method Statements (indicated in Table 4 below) for each submission by the Evaluation Team against the relevant criteria indicated in Table 5.

Table 4: Detailed Quality Evaluation Criteria and Weightings

Method Statements (40%)		Maximum Marks Available (percentage of overall score)	Score Awarded (see Table 2)	Quality Score ((score awarded / maximum possible score) x weighting)
Contract and Business Management	1	Approach to Contract Management	40 (10%)	
	2	Social Value and Innovation	8 (2%)	
	3	Mobilisation and Handback, including TUPE transfer	32 (8%)	
	3	Monitoring, Management and Reporting, including Customer Care and ICT solution	32 (8%)	
	4	Business Continuity	20 (5%)	
	5	Health & Safety Management and Environmental & Quality Management	24 (6%)	

Method Statements (40%)			Maximum Marks Available (percentage of overall score)	Score Awarded (see Table 2)	Quality Score ((score awarded / maximum possible score) x weighting)
Resourcing	7	Staff Resources, including their Management, Training and Recruitment	40 (10%)		
	8	Vehicle, Plant and Equipment Resources	40 (10%)		
	9	Depot and Waste Transfer Station Management	16 (4%)		
Waste Services Delivery	10	Provision of Waste Services	80 (20%)		
	11	Food waste collection (optional)	8 (2%)		
Street Cleansing Service Delivery	12	Provision of Street and Beach Cleansing Services: WDC and RDC only	60 (15%)		
	13	Provision of Street and Beach Cleansing Services: HBC	Not scored		

4.4 Initial Independent Scoring

4.4.1 Each Evaluation Team member will independently evaluate the elements of each submission that relates to their area of expertise and score them utilising the scoring system set out in **Table 5: Scoring System** below, scoring each method statement as a whole. Should a Method Statement be awarded a '5' as indicated in Table 5 below, then this will result in the maximum score possible awarded. For example, a score of '5' for Method Statement 1: Approach to Contract Management would result in all 40 marks awarded. Should this same Method Statement be awarded a '4' as per Table 5, then only 32 marks will be awarded, and so on. This approach will be taken with all Method Statements.

Table 5: Scoring System

Score	Definition
0	No answer
1	Well below expectations
2	Below expectations
3	Meets expectations
4	Above expectations
5	Significantly above expectations

4.4.2 The Quality Evaluation Team will not be made aware of the tendered prices until after the initial moderated process has concluded and quality scores have been agreed, pending the results of any clarification required. Individual evaluators will note issues that they believe require clarification from bidders and an initial batch of clarification questions will be compiled by the Partnership's procurement officer and sent to bidders via the Partnership's e-procurement portal early in the initial independent scoring process.

4.4.3 Where possible, in respect of method statements requiring clarification, the individual evaluator will either propose a conditional score, or where this is not possible, scoring will be postponed until the initial moderation stage and where necessary, only when clarification has been received from the relevant bidder.

4.5 Moderation

4.5.1 Following individual scoring, the quality evaluation team will meet at a series of moderation meetings and will arrive at a consensus as to the score for each element of each submission. Discussion will focus to a greater extent on the elements of each bid where greatest variation in scores has emerged from the individual scoring process. Where required, a further batch of clarification questions will be agreed and issued to bidders via the Partnership's e-procurement portal.

4.5.2 Where possible, in respect of method statements requiring clarification, the initial moderation process will either agree a conditional score, or where this is not possible, scoring will be postponed until clarification has been received from the relevant bidder. The final moderation process will entail meetings of the quality evaluation team during which final scores will be agreed following the clarification process.

4.6 Clarification

4.6.1 All clarification requests will be made by the Partnership's procurement officer using the Partnership's e-procurement portal. No evaluation team member will contact bidders directly. Following clarification, scores may be adjusted as necessary at a further moderation meeting, with the final scores being agreed following final clarification at the final moderation meeting. If necessary, all bidders will be invited to individual clarification meetings to address issues that cannot be adequately resolved through written clarification.

4.6.2 The Partnership's approach to clarification post Tender submission will be consistent with the principles of non-discrimination, transparency and equal treatment of all tenderers. The Partnership shall ensure that a tenderer does not receive an unfair advantage

4.6.3 Clarification will only be used to resolve ambiguities and to rectify errors and not to give a tenderer an opportunity to improve a poor answer

4.6.4 The Partnership will take a consistent and fair approach, with all Tenderers given an appropriate time to provide a response to the clarification asked. If no answer is returned by the deadline given, then the Partnership shall evaluate based on the tenderer's original Tender submission

4.7 Evaluation of Robustness and Consistency of Bids

4.7.1 Following the initial moderation process, members of the quality and financial evaluation teams will meet jointly to evaluate robustness and consistency of the bids. The aim of this stage of the evaluation will be to review the internal consistency and the arithmetic accuracy of the bids. Tenders that raise significant concerns will be subject to additional clarification.

4.8 Records of Evaluation

4.8.1 At each stage of the quality evaluation process, scores and notes relating to their rationale will be kept. At the initial independent scoring stage, each evaluator will complete their own set of scoring templates for each Method Statement for each bidder. At the moderation meetings, a single set of scoring templates will be completed for each bidder. Notes justifying the final agreed scores will be included, with particular priority given to Method Statements where a particularly high or low score is given or where individual evaluator's scores diverged significantly following the initial independent scoring stage.

4.8.2 The Partnership will retain all completed scoring templates from all stages of the process, as these will form a key part of the decision audit trail.

4.8.3 A weighting system will be used to derive an overall quality score based on the total evaluation points available for each Method Statement, as described in Table 4 above.

4.8.4 The following calculation will be used:

(Actual points / total possible points) x weighting

5 STAGE 3 - FINANCIAL EVALUATION

5.1.1 The financial evaluation will assess the Pricing Schedules submitted (85%) and commercial risk (15%). This will result in the award of evaluation points out of the total of 600 allocated to the financial criteria.

5.2 Price

5.2.1 In terms of cost, each Tender will be awarded points based on its relationship with the lowest tender. The tender with the lowest annual equivalent sum (AES) will be awarded 510 Points; Each of the remaining Tenders will be awarded points on a pro-rata basis in accordance with the following calculation (rounded to two decimal places);

(Lowest AES / Bidder's AES) x 510

5.3 Abnormally Low Tenders

5.3.1 A Tender may be rejected if it is too low to be credible, but only after the Tenderer has been given the opportunity to provide an explanation of the Tender or part of the Tender which the Partnership believes to be too low. The overall annual cost to the partnership be calculated, including the tender sum and any other allowable costs.

5.3.2 When evaluating the cost of the Tender to the partnership, the evaluation team will take into account any additional costs retained by the Partnership as a result of adopting a particular solution being proposed. The impact of the cost(s) will be estimated by the evaluation team and added to the unit cost of the original Tender.

As such, the score for the Tender may be adjusted to take account of the effect of additional costs for the Partnership or Partner Authority implied by a submission.

5.4 Commercial Risk

5.4.1 In terms of commercial risk, each Tender will be awarded points out of 90 Points based on an assessment. This is a qualitative assessment and will be subject to moderation. The assessment criteria and scoring is indicated in

5.4.2 Table 6 below.

Table 6: Commercial Risk

Commercial risk Position criteria			Marks (percentage of overall score)
0	Unacceptable	The submission includes significant amendments to the Contract which have an overall unacceptable adverse commercial impact on the Authorities as compared to the Authorities' presented risk position.	0 (0%)
1	Very Poor	The submission includes significant amendments to the Contract which have an overall material and adverse commercial impact on the Authorities as compared to the Authorities' presented risk position.	18 (20%)
2	Poor	The submission includes a number of amendments to the Contract which have an overall material and adverse commercial impact on the Authorities as compared to the Authorities' presented risk position.	36 (40%)
3	Marginal	The submission includes amendments to the Contract which have an overall adverse commercial impact on the Authorities as compared to the Authorities' presented risk position.	54 (60%)
4	Good	The submission includes amendments to the Contract which have no overall adverse commercial impact on the Authorities as compared to the Authorities' presented risk position.	72 (80%)
5	Outstanding	The submission includes no amendments.	90 (100%)

6 **STAGE 4: CONTRACT AWARD RECOMMENDATION**

6.1 The evaluation process described will be recorded through the evaluation report that will provide the basis of a recommendation to award the contract to the highest ranked Supplier.

6.2 The successful Supplier shall be the Supplier attaining the highest overall Weighted Score, i.e. the Supplier attaining highest combined Quality and Price score