**Annex C – Technical Requirements of Response & Social Value Requirements of response**

a. There are 3 questions which form the technical envelope – 1 social value questions and 2 technical question. These questions have a combined maximum score of 30. There is a maximum of 100 marks (unweighted) available for each question

Questions will be evaluated and scored 100/70/30/0 according to the evidence requirement and assessor guidance laid out in each question below.

**Questions**

|  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- |
| **TABLE 1: Technical Envelope Questions** | | |
| **DSP Question Number** | **Subject** | **Maximum Score** |
|
|
| 1 | Social Values Theme 5 Wellbeing for policy outcome: Improving health and Wellbeing | 100 |
| 2 | Understanding the Requirement | 100 |
| 3 | Programme | 100 |
|  | **Total** | **300** |
|  |  |  |

|  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- |
| **Question 1 Social Values Theme 5 Wellbeing for policy outcome: Improving health and Wellbeing** | | |
| Theme 5: Wellbeing | Policy Outcome: Improve health and wellbeing | |
| **Model Evaluation Question**  Using a maximum of 2, 000 words in Arial Font size 11, (No appendices are to be included in the response) describe the commitment your organisation will make to ensure that opportunities under the contract deliver supporting health and wellbeing in the workforce the Policy Outcome and Award Criteria. Please include:  Your ‘Method Statement’, stating how you will achieve this and how your commitment meets the Award Criteria  A timed project plan and process, including how you will implement your commitment and by when. Also, how you will monitor, measure and report on your commitments/the impact of your proposals. You should include but not be limited to:   * Timed action plan * Use of metrics * Tools/processes used to gather data * Reporting * Feedback and improvement * Transparency | **Model Award Criteria (MAC)**  Effective measures to deliver all of the following benefits through the contract:   * MAC 7.1: Demonstrate action to support health and wellbeing, including physical and mental health, in the contract workforce.   The potential providers response will be scored in line with the Criteria for awarding a score for social values Question.  **Minimum score of 30 is required.** | **Model Response Guidance for tenderers and evaluators**  The award criteria (left) and sub-criteria (below) will be used to evaluate the response  Sub-criteria for MAC 7.1: Support health and wellbeing in the workforce  Activities that demonstrate and describe the tenderer’s existing or planned:   * Understanding of issues relating to health and wellbeing, including physical and mental health, in the contract workforce. * Actions to invest in the physical and mental health and wellbeing of the contract workforce. Illustrative examples:   + Implementing the 6 standards in the [Mental Health at Work commitment](https://www.mentalhealthatwork.org.uk/commitment/).   + Public reporting by the tenderer and its supply chain on the health and wellbeing of staff comprising the contract workforce, following the recommendations in the [Voluntary Reporting Framework](https://www.gov.uk/government/publications/voluntary-reporting-on-disability-mental-health-and-wellbeing/voluntary-reporting-on-disability-mental-health-and-wellbeing-a-framework-to-support-employers-to-voluntarily-report-on-disability-mental-health-an).   + Engagement plans to engage the contract workforce in deciding the most important issues to address. * Methods to measure staff engagement over time and adapt to any changes in the results. * Processes for acting on issues identified. |

**WEIGHTING/SCORING**

|  |
| --- |
| **Minimum Compliant Score** |
| **30** |

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
| **Criteria for awarding a score for both Social Values Questions.** | **Score** |
| **Excellent Response -** (exceeds all the Model Award Criteria).  The response exceeds what is expected for the criteria. Leaves no doubt as to the  capability and commitment to deliver what is required. The response therefore shows:   * Very good understanding of the requirements. * Excellent proposals demonstrated through relevant evidence. * Considerable insight into the relevant issues. * The response is also likely to propose additional value in several respects above that expected. * The response addresses the social value policy outcome and can show in-depth market experience. | **100** |
| **Good response: -** (exceeds some of the Award Criteria)  The response meets the required standard in all material respects. There are no significant areas of concern, although there may be limited minor issues. The response therefore shows:   * Good understanding of the requirements. * Sufficient competence demonstrated through relevant evidence. * Some insight demonstrated into the relevant issues. * The response addresses the social value policy outcome and can show good market experience. | **70** |
| **Acceptable Response -** (meets all the Award Criteria)  The response broadly meets what is expected for the criteria. There are no significant areas of concern, although there may be limited minor issues. The response therefore shows:   * Good understanding of the requirements. * Sufficient competence demonstrated through relevant evidence. * Some insight demonstrated into the relevant issues. * The response addresses most of the social value policy outcome and can show general market experience. | **30** |
| **Poor Response** (meets some of the Award Criteria) **/ Unanswered or totally Inadequate Response** (fails to meet any of the criteria)**:**  The response meets elements of the requirement but gives concern in a number of significant areas. There are reservations because of one or all of the following:   * There is at least one significant issue needing considerable attention. * Proposals do not demonstrate competence or understanding. * The response is light on detail and unconvincing. * The response makes no reference to the applicable sector but shows some general market experience. * The response makes limited reference (naming only) to the social value policy outcome set out within the invitation. * The response completely fails to meet the required standard or does not provide a proposal. | **0** |
| (Maximum possible unweighted mark 100) | |

[**Voluntary Reporting Framework**](https://www.gov.uk/government/publications/voluntary-reporting-on-disability-mental-health-and-wellbeing/voluntary-reporting-on-disability-mental-health-and-wellbeing-a-framework-to-support-employers-to-voluntarily-report-on-disability-mental-health-an) **Link:**

<https://www.gov.uk/government/publications/voluntary-reporting-on-disability-mental-health-and-wellbeing/voluntary-reporting-on-disability-mental-health-and-wellbeing-a-framework-to-support-employers-to-voluntarily-report-on-disability-mental-health-an>

[**Mental Health at Work Commitment**](https://www.mentalhealthatwork.org.uk/commitment/) **Link:**

<https://www.mentalhealthatwork.org.uk/commitment/>

**Question 2 - Understanding the Requirement**

The Client Specification at Section 1 sets out the project requirements as encapsulated within the User Requirement Documents Annex F.

The TSP should provide an illustration as to their understanding of these specific project requirements set against 3 specific areas listed below.

1. General understanding and your intended approach with respect to the delivery of this project in Europe now that the UK is no longer part of the EU including any additional constraints that now may exist.
2. General understanding and your approach to MOD overseas Estate Infra restrictions, limitations and opportunities within Italy and especially the Naples/Lago Patria area.
3. General understanding and your approach to ensuring compliance with UK/MoD mandated standards and any additional more onerous Italian standards.

Your response should not exceed 1,500 words in Arial 11 Font.

|  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- |
| **Score** | **Grading** | **Definition** |
| 0 | Inadequate Response | Unacceptable/insufficient information provided.  The response fails to demonstrate a fundamental understanding of the requirement.  The responses fails to demonstrate that the TSP has an understanding regarding either the project requirement of the delivery of it in Naples.  Does not provide any or very little detail regarding an understanding of the constraints and challenges in delivering the project in Naples in line with the areas noted above.  Provides only a limited understanding of the constraints and challenges of delivering the project in Naples.  The response does not provide the client with the level of confidence that the TSP has an understanding of the actual requirement or an approach to the delivery of the requirements.  The response fails to cover in sufficient detail the key areas i.e what are the constraints to the project now that the UK has left the EU and the impact that this is likely to have on the project.  Does not explain what restrictions and limitations may exist in delivering infrastructure within Italy. What are the opportunities ?  Does not provide details/response regarding an understanding of the possible differences between UK/MOD standards and any friction between these and Italian standards. |
| 30 | Acceptable Response | The response provides limited details regarding the areas required but only provides a satisfactory confidence level of the consultants understanding both the requirement and delivery of the project in Italy and approach to the requirement and the statements and information provided in the response are to the acceptable standard.  Some but not all of the areas required under the section response provided.  Provides partially detailed responses and demonstrates a partially developed understanding of the constraints and challenges of delivering the project in Italy and Naples.  The response provides limited information regarding the key areas i.e what are the constraints to the project now that the UK has left the EU and the impact that this is likely to have on the project.  Provides a limited explanation regarding the restrictions and limitations that may exist in delivering infrastructure within Italy. Identifies opportunities ?  Provides limited details regarding an understanding of the possible differences between UK/MOD standards and any friction between these and Italian standards. |
| 70 | Good Response | Detailed response that provides details regarding **all** of the areas required and provides a good confidence level of the consultants understanding and approach to the requirement and a statement has been provided relating to the approach to delivery.  Most of the information provided in the response is of a good standard.  Provides detailed responses and demonstrates a reasonably developed understanding of the constraints and challenges of delivering the project in Italy and Naples  The response provides good and detailed information regarding the key areas i.e what are the constraints to the project now that the UK has left the EU and the impact that this is likely to have on the project.  Provides a detailed explanation regarding the restrictions and limitations that may exist in delivering infrastructure within Italy. Identifies opportunities ?  Provides details regarding an understanding of the possible differences between UK/MOD standards and any friction/contradiction between these and Italian standards. |
| 100 | Excellent Response | Highly detailed response that provides a specific details regarding all of the areas required and provides a high confidence level that the TSP has comprehensive understanding and approach to the requirement and fully understands the specific project requirements that need to be delivered in Italy and in particular the Naples area of Italy .  All information provided within the response is of an excellent standard.  Provides highly detailed responses and demonstrates a highly developed understanding of the constraints and challenges of delivering the project in Italy and Naples.  Has identified the constraints of delivering the project in Italy following Brexit and the MoD mandated standards.  The response provides highly information regarding the key areas i.e what are the constraints to the project now that the UK has left the EU and the impact that this is likely to have on the project.  Provides a highly detailed explanation regarding the restrictions and limitations that may exist in delivering infrastructure within Italy. Identifies opportunities  Provides extensive details regarding an understanding of the possible differences between UK/MOD standards and any friction between these and Italian standards.  Response demonstrates a thorough and detailed understanding of the requirement. |

**WEIGHTING/SCORING**

|  |
| --- |
| **Minimum Compliant Score** |
| **30** |

**ROR Question 3 – Programme**

The programme is a significant factor with the current condition of the existing British Forces School and the fact that it is in part uninhabitable due to the conditions and temporary school facilities are having to be provided in a nearby Villa. It is also unclear regarding what seismic standards that the Villa was constructed to.

With an In-Service Date requirement before the end of March 2026, the Authority’s aspiration is for Phase 1 (RIBA stages 1 and 2) commissions to be delivered by no later than March 23 (RIBA 1 by December 22) in order to submit the respective Outline Business Case in Apr 2023 with an FBC submission of Jan 2024. The TSP’s programme for completion of Phase 1, with full supporting detail of key milestones, submitted as part of the Requirements of Response to this Client Specification, will be evaluated accordingly.

1. Provide a programme through Phase 1 (RIBA stages 1 & 2) and up to completion and the identified contract break point.

1. For credibility, if there is significant divergence from the indicative Authority timetable noted in this brief, the bidder is to provide detailed reasoning behind divergence.
2. The detail should include the following:
3. Detail to include key Delivery Activities, Project Milestones and Criticalities
4. RIBA Stages
5. Planning approvals, Implementation of Preventive/corrective measures, Monitoring progress against baseline etc
6. Any Gateway Processes or Planning Approvals
7. Internal Authority approvals
8. Commentary on Approach to the commission and any key areas of risk/concern
9. Commentary/justification as to why the programme goes beyond specified dates.

It must be noted that due to critical importance of the programme in relation to this project that the minimum technical compliant score for this section has been set at 70.

|  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- |
| **Score** | **Grading** | **Definition** |
| 0 | Inadequate Response | Unacceptable/insufficient information provided in their response. Evidence presented fails to cover any of the areas noted in the question.  Demonstrates a limited and basic understanding of the issues and concerns but the response does not provide the Client with an acceptable level of confidence.  Evidence is limited in that it either fails to cover all of the areas noted in question above or that the evidence in any of the areas noted above is below standard and does not demonstrate any understanding how critical the programme is, especially fails to demonstrate an understanding the approval and Gateway processes and their impact on programme.  Does not demonstrate completion to programme and explanation if not possible. |
| 30 | Acceptable Response | The response demonstrates an acceptable understanding of the issues and concerns.  The information in the response meets the minimum standard and the Client is reasonably confident that the Consultant has assessed the issues and concerns in sufficient detail that his proposals to address them are satisfactory or acceptable.  The evidence presented covers the majority of the requirements under the questions noted above and provides the detail that demonstrates an acceptable understanding of the key areas, does not provide information to all of the areas.  The programme presented is feasible and achievable but is lacking in detail.  Identifies any areas where the authorities programme requirements cannot be achieved.  Timescales provided but not feasible especially with regards to the GWR process or the approval process.  RIBA stages identified through out the life of the project through to end RIBA stage 6 but lacking detail.  Some but not all project milestones identified.  Key risk/areas of concern identified not detailed |
| 70 | Good Response | The response demonstrates a good understanding of the issues and concerns.  The majority of the information provided in the response is of a good standard and provides the Client with the confidence that the Consultant has considered the issues and concerns in sufficient detail and has plans in place to address them.  The evidence presented covers all of the areas noted in the questions in good detail, demonstrates a good understanding of the programme requirements especially the approval and gateway processes.  Details both the areas where the Authorities programme requirements are unachievable or can be accelerated and how this would be achieved.  The programme presented is feasible and achievable and detail is provided.  Identifies any areas where the authorities programme requirements cannot be achieved and provides detail as to why.  Timescales provided and are feasible especially with regards to the GWR process or the approval process, detail provided.  RIBA stages identified throughout the life of the project through to end RIBA stage 6 and is detailed.  All project milestones identified.  Key risk/areas of concern identified detailed.  Provides detailed information regarding how progress will be monitored against programme. |
| 100 | Excellent Response | Fully detailed response demonstrating a comprehensive understanding of issues and concerns for a programme.  All information provided in the response is of a high standard and clearly demonstrates that the Consultant has considered the issues and concerns and has robust plans in place to address them.  The evidence presented covers all of the areas noted in the questions in a high level of detail, demonstrates a high degree of understanding of the programme requirements especially the approvals and gateway processes.  Identifies all of the areas where the Authorities programme requirements are unachievable or can be accelerated and how this would be achieved in a high level of detail.  Provides detail regarding any innovative way that the whole programme could be completed earlier.  Timescales provided and are feasible especially with regards to the GWR process or the approval process, high level detail provided covering all the areas of the GWR process demonstrating an excellent understanding of the process.  RIBA stages identified throughout the life of the project through to end RIBA stage 6 and is highly detailed demonstrating an excellent understanding of the project life cycle.  All project milestones identified and highly detailed identifying milestones that could be brought forwards.  Key risk/areas of concern identified and highly detailed providing impact statements regarding the key risk area.  Provides highly detailed information regarding how progress will be monitored against programme. |

**WEIGHTING/SCORING**

|  |
| --- |
| **Minimum Compliant Score** |
| **70** |