

Tender Scoring Matrix - BSC maintenance and validation service contract					Tender 1 - ABC			Tender 2 - LMN			Tenderer 3 - XYZ		
Category	Category percentage	Subcategory	% of category %	Overall % available	Total cost / Score	%	Notes	Total cost / Score	%	Notes	Total cost / Score	%	Notes
Commercial aspects	30%	Contract Cost (Inverse Proportion): <i>Cheapest tender gets 100% of the overall available. Remaining proposals get a proportion of the 30% available based on comparison to cheapest proposal.</i>	85%	25.5%	£ 40	25.50%		£ 50	20.40%		£ 60	17.00%	
		Payment terms: <i>0 - Not acceptable. 1 - Acceptable in part but some amendments required. 2 - Acceptable but not as envisaged in ITT document 3 - As envisaged in ITT document.</i>	5%	1.5%	3.00	2%		2.00	1%		1.00	1%	
		Insurance requirements at acceptable levels (Public, Employers, Contractors All Risks) <i>0 - No details 1 - Requires uplift / more details 2 - Acceptable 3 - Exceeds minimum levels</i>	5%	1.5%	3.00	2%		2.00	1%		1.00	1%	
		Pirbright T&Cs: <i>0 - Not Accepted by the Tenderer 1 - Accepted with major changes requested by the Tenderer 2 - Accepted with minor changes requested by the Tenderer 3 - Fully Accepted by Tenderer</i>	5%	1.5%	3.00	2%		2.00	1%		1.00	1%	
Quality of Tender	70%	Quality of Proposal (how specification will be met): <i>0 - Very poor quality proposal. 1 - Proposal / presentation of proposal is disjointed/difficult to understand. 2 - Proposal is clear but technical content is limited. 3 - Proposal is clear and technical content is high.</i>	30%	21.00%	3.00	21%		2.00	14%		1.00	7%	
		Tender documents completed: <i>0 - Not offered. 1 - 50% completed. 2 - 80% completed. 3 - 100% completed.</i>	5%	3.50%	3.00	4%		2.00	2%		1.00	1%	
		Team & Training Records: <i>0 - No details offered. 1 - Limited details given. 2 - Full details given, but experience not fully relevant. 3 - Full details given and experience fully relevant.</i>	5%	3.50%	3.00	4%		2.00	2%		1.00	1%	
		Case study 1: <i>0 - Not offered 1 - Project not relevant 2 - Relevant project in a dissimilar industry 3- Relevant project in a similar industry</i>	5%	3.50%	3.00	4%		2.00	2%		1.00	1%	
		Case study 2: <i>0 - Not offered 1 - Project not relevant 2 - Relevant project in a dissimilar industry 3- Relevant project in a similar industry</i>	5%	3.50%	3.00	4%		2.00	2%		1.00	1%	
		Case study 3: <i>0 - Not offered 1 - Project not relevant 2 - Relevant project in a dissimilar industry 3- Relevant project in a similar industry</i>	5%	3.50%	3.00	4%		2.00	2%		1.00	1%	
		References offered: <i>0 - Not offered. 1 - Offered, but not directly relevant. 2 - Offered and relevant. But not on envisaged date. 3 - Offered and relevant and on proposed date.</i>	5%	3.50%	3.00	4%		2.00	2%		1.00	1%	
		ISO 45001 / BS18001 Accreditation (Safety): <i>0 - None / not offered / alternative system not fully relevant 1 - Alternative system but not fully relevant 2 - ISO 45001 but not fully relevant or fully relevant alternative system 3 - ISO 45001 fully relevant</i>	10%	7.00%	3.00	7%		2.00	5%		1.00	2%	
		ISO9001 Accreditation (Quality): <i>0 - None / not offered / alternative system not fully relevant 1 - Alternative system 2 - ISO9001 but not fully relevant or fully relevant alternative system 3 - ISO9001 fully relevant</i>	10%	7.00%	3.00	7%		2.00	5%		1.00	2%	
		ISO14001 Accreditation (Environment): <i>0 - None / not offered / alternative system not fully relevant 1 - Alternative system 2 - ISO 14001 but not fully relevant or fully relevant alternative system 3 - ISO14001 fully relevant</i>	10%	7.00%	3.00	7%		2.00	5%		1.00	2%	
		Example RAMS <i>0 - not offered. 1 - Poor 2 - Acceptable 3 - Good</i>	10%	7.00%	3.00	7%		2.00	5%		1.00	2%	
	100.0%			100.0%		100.00%			70.07%			41.83%	