

Commission 2: The Future of Our Employment Land

London Borough of Barking and Dagenham

Tender Evaluation Criteria and Scoring Matrix

1. Tender Evaluation Criteria

An Evaluation Panel will consider tender submissions in accordance with the following criteria and associated weightings:

Quality <i>Consisting of:</i>	70%
<ul style="list-style-type: none">Understanding the brief and its requirements	40%
<ul style="list-style-type: none">Organisational structure, management and supervisionAny relevant technical skills and resources to be made available for supplying the services	20%
<ul style="list-style-type: none">Examples of similar services/contracts undertaken with contact details for seeking references	20%
<ul style="list-style-type: none">Ability to deliver the contract in accordance with the timetable outlined	20%
Cost/Financial Proposals	30%

2. Scoring Matrix

The scoring matrix on page 3 will be used to mark the quality aspect of the tender submission (worth 70%). Tender submissions will be marked according to how well they meet each of the sub-categories on the quality evaluation criteria, with a maximum of five points available for each sub-category:

5 points	Excellent response, fully meets and expands upon the expected requirements
4 points	Good response, meets the expected requirements and requires no additional information
3 points	Satisfactory response and generally meets requirements, may require additional clarification or information
2 points	Does not meet the expected standard, would require significant further clarification or additional information
1 point	Unsatisfactory response, has not addressed the question / method statement, suggests the supplier would have difficulty meeting Council standards
0 points	No information provided

The quality evaluation of each tender submission will be marked and assessed by officers representing or linked with the London Borough of Barking and Dagenham Council. Each assessor will score the tender submission individually, before collectively agreeing on a mediated score for each sub-category. This will decide the overall quality score. The financial evidence will be marked separately to the quality aspect of the submission based on the most economically advantageous tender. This is explained in more detail on Page 7.

Please note that the sub-categories within each of the four quality criteria are subject to change or amendment by the evaluation panel. If any such changes or amendments occur before the submission deadline, all consultants on the framework panel will be notified and given suitable time to resubmit their tender or send any additional information, should they wish to do so. If any changes or amendments occur after the submission deadline, only consultants who have submitted a tender will be notified.

Quality (70%) Matrix

Name of person scoring:		
Name of tender:		
1. Understanding the brief and its requirements (40%)	Notes	Total Score 1-5
<p><u>The Development of vertical and horizontal typologies</u></p> <p>The bid clearly sets out an innovative approach to developing vertical and horizontal typologies at a range of densities (work stream 2). The bid should set out how the outputs of work stream 1 (which will provide a literature review) will influence the development of the typologies. Bids should also set out approach of how the local context will inform the development typologies.</p> <p>High marks will be awarded to those bids that set out a compelling vision as to how vertical and horizontal typologies could work in practice at a range of scales, sizes and densities. Bidders that demonstrate a good understanding of how integrated mixed use developments could help create genuine sustainable communities will also be awarded high marks. Those bids that set out an integrated approach between these tasks and the viability work (work stream 3) will also be awarded high marks.</p>		
<p><u>Testing the viability of vertical and horizontal typologies</u></p> <p>The bid sets out a clear and innovative approach to testing the commercial viability of both the vertical and horizontal typologies. Bids should set out the viability challenges of these typologies and appreciate the viability context of the release sites (Thames Road, Creekmouth, Chadwell Heath and Rippleside).</p> <p>High marks will be set out to those bids that set out comprehensive methodologies to testing viability and fully appreciate all the costs and values this typology are likely to generate.</p>		

<p><u>Intensifying our remaining employment sites</u></p> <p>The bid clearly sets out a good understanding of how retained employment sites could be intensified to support a more efficient use of space and maximise jobs (work stream 4). Bidders should set how they would approach the issue of multi-level industrial space set out in paragraph 2.19 of the tender brief.</p> <p>High marks will be set out to those bids that demonstrate an innovative approach to this component of the study.</p>		
<p><u>Future supply for employment land (across the borough)</u></p> <p>The bid clearly sets out a clear approach to how they would approach the quantum of employment space which could be generated through the; vertical, horizontal and multi-level approaches (work stream 5).</p> <p>High marks will be given to those bids that set out a convincing method of how they will work with the Council and the successful bidders of Commission 1 in undertaking this work stream.</p>		
<p><u>Developing conceptual masterplans and exploring the quantitative/ qualitative benefits of release</u></p> <p>Bidders should set out a clear approach to developing the conceptual masterplans. The masterplans should be relatively high level masterplans and provide an understanding of the requirements set out in paragraph 2.25 and 2.26 (work stream 6). Bids should also set out their approach to developing to understanding the quantitative and qualitative benefits of release.</p> <p>High marks will be given to those bids that set out innovative approaches to this part of the study. The conceptual masterplans should stay at a high level and not turn into expensive fully developed masterplans. They need to be sufficient to help understand the future requirements of the sites (see paragraph 2.25). High marks will also be awarded to those bids that set out a compelling approach to understanding the quantitative and qualitative benefits of release.</p>		

2. Organisational structure, management and supervision Any relevant technical skills and resources to be made available for supplying the services (20%)	Notes	Total Score 1-5
Identified an experienced and successful team relevant to the brief's requirements.		
Assigned experienced individuals to key project deliverables.		
3. Examples of similar services/contracts undertaken with contact details for seeking references (20%)	Notes	Total Score 1-5
Proven track record of successful, high quality characterisation studies or similar work.		
4. Ability to deliver the contract in accordance with the timetable outlined (20%)	Notes	Total Score 1-5
Outlined a clear, organised and realistic schedule of work in line with the brief's requirements.		
Identified how and when key outputs can be achieved, instilling confidence in the ability to deliver the project to a suitably high standard within a justifiable budget.		

- The scores for each aspect of the quality criteria will be multiplied as necessary to achieve their correct weightings. These will be added up to give a score out of 100:

Quality Criteria	Weighting	Tender Score	Multiplier (to achieve weighting)	Total
Understanding the brief and its requirements	40 %	/25	1.60	
Organisational structure, management and supervision Any relevant technical skills and resources to be made available for supplying the services	20%	/10	2	
Examples of similar services/contracts undertaken with contact details for seeking references	20%	/5	4	
Ability to deliver the contract in accordance with the timetable outlined	20%	/10	2	
TOTAL SCORE				/100

- The total score will be multiplied by 0.7 to achieve the 70% quality weighting attached to the overall tender evaluation. The maximum quality score available is therefore 70%.

3. Cost / Financial Proposal (30%)

- Please note that this section carries an evaluation score of 30% and will be the maximum value on offer to each submission.
- The submission with the lowest overall cost for the project will received the full 30%. The lowest cost will then be divided by each corresponding bidder's cost and multiplied by 30 to give a composite score. The example below is not indicative of any expected costs in the financial proposal.

e.g. Lowest score = £100 and therefore scores a maximum of 30%

The second lowest score = £125

$$100/125 = 0.8$$

$$0.8 \times 30\% = 24\%$$