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**V3; 20th May 2016**

The Council will award this contract to the Most Economically Advantageous Tender on the basis of Price and Quality, with 60% of the marks being awarded for quality and 40% for price.

Method Statements should be of up to 3000 words and should focus on addressing the matters raised in the method statement description.

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
| **Section 1 – Price** | |
| **40%** | **Price** |
| **Section 2 – Method Statements** | |
| 15% | Appreciation of the Brief**: -** In this method statement please demonstrate your understanding of the specific complex nature of this project, your understanding of current local, regional, national planning, conservation policy, and legislation in terms of how it will apply to this Project. How the themes of sustainability and urban design best practice can be used on this Project. Your response should demonstrate understanding of the mechanisms of the project funding and financial programming |
| 15% | Method & approach: Describe your ability to meet programme timescales. Your project management arrangements. Your allocation of Key Staff to meet objectives. Demonstrate how experience will be used. Your proposals based on experience of actual delivery. Your ability to innovate; proposed delivery structure including single point of contact. Experience of working together as a team. Balance of relevant skills. Allocation of Key Staff to meet objectives. How you would deliver work to the timescales in the brief. How you would maintain quality whilst working at pace. |
| 15% | Stakeholder Management: Experience of collaborative working process, Communication skills, liaison with Historic England. How the proposed team will work with the Council officers and elected members and other advisors including Finance and Legal .Your proposed communications protocol with the Council and key stakeholders. The extent to which the proposed communications protocol ensures proper communication and liaison with the Council and key stakeholders throughout the life of the Project. How would you involve the community? |
| 15% | Staffing Suitability of the proposed structure of your team, giving detailed explanation as to individual roles including specifically: The level of seniority of the team leader and the allocation of time to be spent on the project by team members (NB should cross refer to bid back financial costings, Show how the team demonstrates the range of skills and knowledge required to deliver the assignment |
| **60%** | **Quality** |

***TENDER PRICE EVALUATION***

The following methodology will be used in evaluating any tender price submission.

The evaluation of the tender price will be based on the scoring criteria as indicated below subject to the following parameters.

**Resource Schedule To be complete for each stage**

RIBA Stage 1, RIBA Stage 2, RIBA Stage 3 RIBA Stage 4, RIBA Stage 5

|  |  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| **Activity**  *(please list the activities required to meet this commission)* | **Resource**  *(please add the name of the person carrying out the activity}* | **Grade/Job Title** | **Daily Rate**  **(£)** | **No of days to complete activity** | **Total**  **(£)** |
|  |  |  |  |  |  |
|  |  |  |  |  |  |
|  |  |  |  |  |  |
|  |  |  |  |  |  |
|  |  |  |  |  |  |
|  |  |  |  |  |  |
|  |  |  |  |  |  |
|  |  |  |  |  |  |
|  |  |  |  |  |  |
|  |  |  |  |  |  |
|  |  |  |  |  |  |
|  |  |  |  |  |  |
| **Total Price as Bid Back for evaluation purposes** |  |  |  |  | **X** |

Your bid back price will be evaluated based on the following percentage weighting:-

Your total price as bid back will be evaluated as follows:

*Lowest submitted x40%*

*Your price*

These pricing scores will be added to give your total financial score

**SECTION 3 – Method Statements**

Please address the description of each method statement.

Each of the following method statements will be marked out of 5 as below. The score out of 5 will then be multiplied by the relevant percentage for each method statement

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
| **0** | **Unacceptable Response**  No response given, response not relevant or Method Statement not answered. |
| **1** | **Poor Response**  The response is partially compliant, but with serious deficiencies in meeting service requirements (any supporting evidence is minimal). |
| **2** | **Fair Response**  The response is partially compliant (some evidence may be provided which supports compliant elements) with shortfalls in meeting service requirements. |
| **3** | **Satisfactory Response**  The response is compliant with service requirements likely to be met, any concerns are of a minor nature. |
| **4** | **Good Response**  The response is compliant and offers relevant evidence to support their claims, clearly indicating that service requirements would be met. |
| **5** | **Excellent Response**  The response is compliant and offers relevant detailed evidence to support their claims, clearly demonstrating a comprehensive understanding of the service requirements. |