**MULTI-USE GAMES AREA (MUGA), THE WOODLANDS RECREATION GROUND, RUSTINGTON - REPLACEMENT OF EXISITING SURFACING AND PAINTED METAL FENCING - TENDER EVALUATION**

**1. INTRODUCTION**

The principal purpose of this tender evaluation is to determine the tender which best meets the requirements of Rustington Parish Council and delivers best value. It will be a rigorous examination and all submissions received will be assessed on an equal and consistent basis without bias.

**2. PRINCIPLES**

There are some guiding principles that relate to this evaluation exercise. These include:

* It is an absolute requirement of public sector competitions that all companies are given an equal opportunity to succeed.
* The criteria for evaluation has been established prior to Invitation to Tender and will remain consistent and objective throughout the process.
* The reasons for rejection will be documented and if challenged, backed up by full documentary evidence that will show that the evaluation has been properly conducted.

**3. AWARD CRITERIA**

The award criteria will be based on assessing the most economically advantageous tender (price/quality).

Stage 1 will assess whether the tender reaches a pre-determined quality threshold. Any tender that does not achieve 45% of the total score or receives a score of 0 in any quality will be rejected and will not be assessed for Stage 2.

|  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- |
| **Stage 1** | **Criteria** | **Marks** |
| A | A Very high standard with no reservations at all about acceptability | 5 |
| B | High standard but falls just short of A | 4 |
| C | Good standard | 3 |
| D | Generally of a good standard with some reservations | 2 |
| E | Basic compliance only | 1 |
| F | Fails to meet the minimum requirements (Tender rejected) | 0 |

**Tender Evaluation – Stage 1**

Tenderer:……………………………………………………………………………………

Assessor:…………………………………………………………………………………..

|  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- |
| **Quality Criteria**  | **Weightings** | **Marks out of 5** | **Weighted Score** |
| Functionality & compliance with work specification | 20 |  |  |
| Appearance | 20 |  |  |
| Value for Money | 15 |  |  |
| Materials/Warranties/Durability | 15 |  |  |
| Relevant Experience - Evidence of similar projects | 10 |  |  |
| Health & Safety Arrangements | 10 |  |  |
| References | 5 |  |  |
| Sustainability | 5 |  |  |
| **Total Score** | 100 |  |  |

The total score will be divided by 5 to provide the quality assessment mark

**Tender Evaluation - Stage 2**

**Ranking by price and quality score**

Bids will be discounted:

* That do not meet the predetermined quality threshold
* Which are unaffordable
* Where price is higher than tenders with a higher quality

The remaining tenders will be evaluated to determine which tender gives the most economically advantageous solution. In the event that the lowest price acceptable tender is not being recommended then the Parish Council will need to demonstrate that the additional quality being procured is good value against the lower priced acceptable tender.