

APPENDIX 2 TO ANNEX C – CLH-PS BIDDING SHEET AND TENDER EVALUATION CRITERIA

This Bidding Sheet is in response to Invitation to Compete (ITC) DFFS/5072/0013 and the Supplier acknowledges and agrees to abide by the Terms and Conditions of the ITC and Framework Agreement DFFS/5072 in compiling its bid.

Bidding Sheet Evaluation Guidance and Methodology is detailed below.

Framework Providers shall complete the boxes below as applicable:

CRITERIA	SUB-CRITERIA REFERENCE NUMBER	EVALUATION APPROACH	REQUIRED INFORMATION	SUPPLIER RESPONSE	REQUIRED RESPONSE
FRAMEWORK PROVIDER DETAILS	N/A	INFO	Framework Provider name		Framework Provider name has been provided.
	N/A	INFO	Framework Provider Representative name		Framework Provider Representative name has been provided.
FRAMEWORK PROVIDER DELIVERY INFORMATION MCC1	MCC1.1	PASS / FAIL	Nominated delivery location (this must be the / one of the delivery locations stated on the ITC)		Framework Provider has selected the / one of the delivery locations stated on the ITC.
COMPLIANCE WITH REQUIREMEN T MCC2	MCC2.1	PASS / FAIL	Framework Provider is to confirm that it can meet the specification of the Fuel Type detailed in the ITC		Framework Provider has confirmed that it can meet the full specification, as detailed in the StOR at Annex B, for the Fuel Type detailed on the ITC.
	MCC2.2	PASS / FAIL	Framework Provider is to confirm that it can meet the delivery period specified in the ITC.		Framework Provider has confirmed that it can meet the delivery period specified in the ITC.
	MCC2.3	PASS / FAIL	Framework Provider is to confirm the volume of Fuel it is bidding for.		Framework Provider has confirmed the volume of Fuel it is

					bidding for, which is in multiples of 5,000m ³ .
FRAMEWORK FIRM PROVIDER PREMIUM MCC3	MCC3.1	PASS / FAIL	Framework Provider is to provide its Firm Premium (+/-) US\$/m ³ for the total volume of Fuel it is bidding for.		Framework Provider has provided a Firm Premium.
	MCC3.2	PASS / FAIL	Will the Framework Provider offer a reduced Firm Premium if the Full Volumetric Requirement, as detailed in ITC, is awarded to that Framework Provider?	Please state: Yes / No	Framework Provider has stated yes or no.
	MCC3.3	PASS / FAIL	If Framework Provider has stated yes to MCC3.2, please enter reduced Firm Premium if Full Volumetric Requirement, as detailed in ITC, is awarded.		If Framework Provider has selected yes to MCC 3.2, revised Firm Premium has been provided.
ADDITIONAL INFORMATION		N/A			

BIDDING SHEET EVALUATION GUIDANCE AND METHODOLOGY (CLH-PS REQUIREMENTS)

1 INTRODUCTION

1.1 Framework Providers must fully complete the Bidding Sheet above in response to an ITC.

1.2 The information requested on the Bidding Sheet, under the column heading 'Required Information has been categorised according to its importance to the Authority, and will be used as follows:

INFO – Information Only. A response is required by the Authority for information purposes only and will not form part of the Bidding Sheet evaluation, however, failure to provide this information without a reasonable explanation may deem a Framework Provider's Bidding Sheet non-compliant.

PASS / FAIL – Mandatory Compliance Criteria. A response is mandatory and will be used in the Bidding Sheet evaluation in accordance with the evaluation guidance and methodology detailed at paragraph 3 below.

2 CLARIFICATIONS

2.1 Any clarifications relating to an ITC must be submitted in accordance with Clause 11 of the Framework Agreement.

3 EVALUATION METHODOLOGY AND GUIDANCE

Preliminary Check

3.1 The completed Bidding Sheet will initially be checked to determine that all information has been provided. The Authority will request any missing information from Framework Providers. If the information is not provided following the Authority's request, the Bidding Sheet may be deemed non-compliant.

Evaluation Strategy

3.2 Bidding Sheets will be evaluated to determine the most economically advantageous tender, or combination of tenders, to meet the Full Volumetric Requirement. The Authority may select the Full Volumetric Requirement from one Framework Provider, or smaller volumes (in 5,000m³ parcels) from more than one Framework Provider, which, when combined, make up the Full Volumetric Requirement.

3.3 The Authority reserves the right to award a Call-off Contract to one Framework Provider that can provide the Full Volumetric Requirement in the event that the Full Volumetric Requirement cannot be met by awarding Call-off Contracts to more than one Framework Provider.

3.4 The most economically advantageous tender, or combination of tenders, shall be the one(s) which:

(a) is/are compliant with all Mandatory Compliance Criteria (MCC) and sub-criteria as detailed at paragraph 3.5 – 3.8 below; and

(b) represents the lowest total cost to the Authority for the Full Volumetric Requirement, taking into account the Framework Providers' Firm Premium and Platts Price, as detailed at paragraph 3.9 – 3.12 and shown in the example below.

Mandatory Compliance Evaluation

3.5 The Mandatory Compliance Criteria (MCC) are referenced as MCC1, MCC2 etc. on the Bidding Sheet. The sub-criteria within each MCC are referenced MCC1.1, MCC1.2 etc. The MCC and sub-criteria will be evaluated on a PASS / FAIL basis.

3.6 The "Required Response" column on the Bidding Sheet specifies the response required from Framework Providers against each MCC to achieve a pass for the Mandatory Compliance Evaluation.

3.7 MCC and sub-criteria will be evaluated in accordance with the marking scheme below:

MCC1 FRAMEWORK PROVIDER DELIVERY INFORMATION

MCC1.1 Nominated delivery location	PASS	Framework Provider has selected the /one of the acceptable delivery locations stated on the ITC.
	FAIL	Framework Provider has not selected the / one of the acceptable delivery locations stated on the ITC.
MCC2 COMPLIANCE WITH REQUIREMENT		
MCC 2.1 Compliance with specification	PASS	Framework Provider can fully meet the relevant Fuel specification.
	FAIL	Framework Provider cannot fully meet the relevant Fuel specification.
MCC2.2 Compliance with delivery period	PASS	Framework Provider can deliver within the required delivery period.
	FAIL	Framework Provider cannot deliver within the required delivery period.
MCC2.3 Volume	PASS	Framework Provider is bidding for volumes in multiples of 5,000m ³ .
	FAIL	Framework Provider is not bidding for volumes in multiples of 5,000m ³ .
MCC3 FRAMEWORK PROVIDER FIRM PREMIUM		
MCC3.1 Framework Provider Firm Premium	PASS	Framework Provider has provided its Firm Premium for the total volume it is bidding for.
	FAIL	Framework Provider has not provided its Firm Premium for the total volume it is bidding for.
MCC3.2 Framework Provider Firm Premium	PASS	Framework Provider has confirmed whether or not it is offering a reduced Firm Premium if the Full Volumetric Requirement is awarded to that Framework Provider.
	FAIL	Framework Provider has not confirmed whether or not it is offering a reduced Firm Premium if the Full Volumetric Requirement is awarded to that Framework Provider.
MCC3.3 Framework Provider Firm Premium	PASS	If Framework Provider has selected yes to MCC3.2, it has provided its reduced Firm Premium for the Full Volumetric Requirement.
	FAIL	Framework Provider has selected yes to MCC3.2 but has not provided its reduced Firm Premium for the Full Volumetric Requirement.

3.8 Bidding Sheets which do not achieve a pass for each of the MCC and sub-criteria shall be excluded from the Mini-Competition.

Price Evaluation

3.9 All Bidding Sheets which achieve a pass for each of the MCC and sub-criteria shall be entered into the price evaluation.

3.10 The Authority will calculate an estimated Platts Price, based on the average of the 'mean' figures published by Platts Marketscan for the month prior to the ITC issue date, for the purpose of estimating the total value of the resultant Call-off Contract(s), and to confirm that the total value does not exceed the Authority's financial approval limit. In the event that the estimated total value of the resultant Call-off Contract(s) exceeds the Authority's financial

approval limit, the Authority reserves the right to cancel the Mini-Competition. The actual Platts Price which will be paid shall be calculated in accordance with Clause 22 – Pricing.

3.11 Framework Providers shall submit a Firm Premium (\$US/m³) for the volume of Fuel they are bidding for, which shall remain the same regardless of whether the Authority accepts one or more 5,000m³ parcels from that Framework Provider. For the avoidance of doubt, this means that a Framework Provider cannot offer one Firm Premium for (for example) 5,000m³ and a different Firm Premium for 10,000m³ and so forth. The exception to this is that Framework Providers can offer a reduced Firm Premium for the Full Volumetric Requirement, if the Authority were to award the Call-Off Contract to that Framework Provider for the Full Volumetric Requirement.

3.12 The Framework Providers' Firm Premium plus estimated Platts Price shall be used to determine the most economically advantageous tender(s).

3.13 The Framework Provider, or combination of Framework Providers, which can meet the Full Volumetric Requirement for the lowest cost to the Authority, shall be deemed the most economically advantageous tender(s) and be awarded a Call-off Contract. In order to evaluate the most economically advantageous tender(s), the Authority shall calculate the total cost of meeting the Full Volumetric Requirement for the 2 options detailed below and select the option which meets the Full Volumetric Requirement at the lowest total cost:

(a) Option 1: the total cost for selecting a combination of tenders offering the lowest Firm Premium which, together make up the Full Volumetric Requirement. The Authority will calculate the cost of selecting the maximum number of available parcels from the Framework Provider offering the lowest Firm Premium and so on until the Full Volumetric Requirement is met (see Table 2 below). If the Full Volumetric Requirement cannot be met by a combination of tenders, the Authority reserves the right to award a Call-off Contract to one Framework Provider which submits the most economically advantageous tender under Option 2; and

Option 2: the total cost for selecting one tender which offers the lowest Firm Premium for the Full Volumetric Requirement. The Authority will calculate the cost of selecting the Full Volumetric Requirement from the Framework Provider offering the lowest Firm Premium (see Table 3 below).

3.14 The tables below show an example of a price evaluation for CLH-PS requirements. The estimated Platts Price is not shown in the example because this will be a constant value for all Framework Providers:

Example - Full Volumetric Requirement: 35,000 m³ (7 x 5,000m³ parcels)

Table 1 - Framework Providers' Bids

Framework Providers (FP) which have submitted a bid	No of 5,000m ³ parcels each FP can supply	Vol (m ³) that each FP can supply	Firm Premium (\$/ m ³)	Total Cost (\$) for each 5,000m ³ parcel offered	Reduced Firm Premium (\$/ m ³) if Authority purchases FVR from FP	Total Cost (\$) for each 5,000m ³ parcel offered, after Reduced Firm Premium applied
A	7	35,000	3.0	15,000	0.5	2,500
B	3	15,000	2.0	10,000	N/A	10,000
C	2	10,000	-0.5	-2,500	N/A	-2,500
D	7	35,000	1.5	7,500	1.0	5,000

Table 2 - Option 1: combination of tenders to make up Full Volumetric Requirement (FVR)

FP	No of 5,000m ³ parcels to be taken per FP	Total \$/ 5,000m ³ parcel	Total \$/ FP
A	0	15,000	0
B	0	10,000	0
C	2 (under Option 1, the Authority would take the max no of parcels from FP C as it offers lowest Firm Premium)	-2,500	-5,000
D	5 (under Option 1, the Authority would make up the remaining required parcels from FP D as it offers the second lowest Firm Premium)	7,500	37,500
		Total \$ for requirement	32,500

Table 3 – Option 2: one tender to supply FVR

FP	No of 5,000m ³ parcels to be taken per FP	Total \$/ 5,000m ³ parcel	Total \$/ 5,000m ³ parcel (with reduced Firm Premium applied)	Total \$/ FP
A	7	15,000	2,500	17,500 (under Option 2, the Authority would take the FVR from FP A, as it offers the lowest reduced Firm Premium)
B	0	10,000	10,000	0
C	0	-2,500	-2,500	0
D	0	7,500	5,000	35,000
			Total \$ for requirement	17,500

Table 1 shows that:

- Framework Provider C offers the lowest Firm Premium for each 5,000m³ parcel, followed by Framework Provider D;
- Framework Providers A and D are able to provide the Full Volumetric Requirement, and both offer a reduced Firm Premium if the Full Volumetric Requirement is purchased from them; and
- Framework Provider A's reduced Firm Premium is lower than that of Framework Provider D.

3.14 Table 2 illustrates that the most economically advantageous combination of tenders under Option 1 is 2 parcels from Framework Provider C (-\$5,000) plus 5 parcels from Framework Provider D (\$37,500), resulting in a total cost for the Full Volumetric Requirement of \$32,500.

3.15 Table 3 illustrates that the most economically advantageous tender under Option 2 is Framework Provider A, which offers the lowest reduced Firm Premium for the Full Volume Requirement (\$17,000 for all 7 parcels).

3.16 Option 1 (\$32,500) and Option 2 (\$17,500) would then be evaluated to determine the most economically advantageous solution. In the example above, the most economically advantageous solution is awarding one Call-off Contract to Framework Provider A for the Full Volumetric Requirement at a cost of \$17,500.