



Schedule 6 – Quality (Technical Evaluation)

1. Documents for Completion

Tenderers must complete the Technical Envelope of the Jaggaer e-procurement portal.

2. Quality Evaluation Process

- 2.1 The questions asked within the Technical Envelope are designed to test a Tenderer's ability to deliver the requirements as set out in Schedule 2 (Requirements Specification) and against the Sub-Criteria set out at section 4 of this Schedule 6 (Quality). Tenderers must answer all questions.
- 2.2 Responses submitted to the Technical Envelope will be assessed in accordance with the process and criteria set out below.
- 2.3 Each response provided to each question within the Technical Envelope will be awarded a score in accordance with the Scoring Matrix set out below.
- 2.4 Each mark achieved will be multiplied by the corresponding weighting to provide an overall question score.
- 2.5 When the score for each question has been determined they will be added together to provide an overall score for the Quality Evaluation ("Quality Score").
- 2.6 **Consensus Marking Procedure-** The Consensus Marking Procedure is a two-step process, comprising of:
 - Independent evaluation; and
 - Group consensus marking.
- 2.7 During the independent evaluation process, each evaluator will separately (i.e., without conferring with other evaluators) scrutinise the quality of answers given by Tenderers in their Tender. Each evaluator will then allocate a mark for the answer in accordance with the Marking Scheme applicable to that question
- 2.8 During the meeting, the evaluators will discuss the independent marks until they reach a consensus regarding the marks that should be attributed to each Tenderer's answer to the questions.



Maritime & Coastguard Agency

Below-threshold ITT
Contract Reference: TCA 3/7/1462

- 2.9 Once all quality responses have been evaluated the individual scores attributed to each response will be added together to provide a 'Quality Score'.

3. Scoring Matrix

• QUESTION RESPONSES	• MARKS
• A score of 5 will be achieved by demonstrating a robust understanding and methodology that specifically meets the requirement. The response provided will have full and comprehensive supporting evidence and examples.	• 5
• A score of 3 will be achieved where the proposed approach meets the basic requirement with the exception that the supporting commentary and/or evidence does not fully explain, justify or provide a fully comprehensive response or examples..	• 3
• A score of 1 will be achieved as per the criteria for achieving a 3 with the exception the supporting commentary/evidence doesn't fully explain/justify the approach, experience of allocated resource and only some aspects of the MCA's requirements.	• 1
• A score of 0 will be achieved for any answer that does not meet the level required to score a 1 or above.	• 0

4. Quality Factors

Mandatory Evaluation Criteria

Primary Criteria	Primary Criteria Weighting (%)
Programme of Works	80
Certification/qualification details	10
Social Value	10
Total	100