**Assessment Criteria**

**Summary**

The Council has four major categories of criteria which it will apply to potential suppliers.

* Financial and Technical capacity – Pass / fail
* Ethical and Social – Scored 1-10
* Design – Weighted scores 1-10
* Value for money – Total quality scores and life cycle costs

The first of these, the Financial and Technical capacity assessment, will be assessed independently through a pre-qualification questionnaire. This is a pass / fail assessment i.e. any proposals that do not meet these requirements will not proceed to the next stage of invitation to tender. Please note that, following the submission of the final tenders, the preferred bidder will be subject to a more in depth financial analysis as part of the Council’s due diligence process, before a contract is confirmed.

The second and third categories, Ethical and Social and Design issues, will be scored on a scale of one to ten. It will be for those wishing to tender for the work to demonstrate how their particular proposals meet these criteria, which are given in more detail below. Ethical and Social issues includes climate change, Design issues, includes visual impact, play value and design coherence between equipment, fencing and furniture.

Experience has shown that providing guidance on specific elements, for example, a hierarchy of play activities, tends to give these elements an undue emphasis, at the expense of other factors. The Council does not propose to list any specific criteria that may distort a tender’s ability to design a set of rounded proposals that meet the Council’s overall requirements.

The forth category, Value for money / Whole life cost, will bring together the scoring from Ethical and Social and Design as described in detail below. As this is a fixed cost tender, Value for Money is important and this will be judged using overall scores achieved from these assessments i.e. there will be no competitive advantage in submitting a tender below the advised tender sum.

The Council is looking for a balanced proposal that meets its broader priorities and which is value for money. In this respect, it will not be possible for a high score in one of these categories to eclipse the requirement to meet another.

**Financial and Technical assessment**

The Council has decided to employ the relevant sections of PAS 91:2013+A1:2017 for the Prequalification Questionnaire Assessment and will use an outside organisation to undertake the assessment.

**Ethical and Social Responsibility assessment**

The Council has declared a climate emergency, and so will apply Regulation 68(2) which adds that the costs mentioned in Regulation 68(1) (b) may include the cost of emissions of greenhouse gases and of other pollutant emissions and other climate change mitigation costs.

Potential Tenderers will be asked to provide evidence of their carbon Footprint and level of pollutants associated with the manufacture of their equipment.

This will include a requirement for tenderers to provide the following;

i) An environmental impact assessment on the specific proposals set forward.

ii) An assessment of how the proposal will lead to a net gain in biodiversity

iii) An assessment of the whole life carbon footprint of the proposal.

The Council accepts that contractors will have differing ways of demonstrating the above, and it is not therefore specifying that the evidence for these should be presented in a particular way. A high score in ethical and social responsibility issues will not be sufficient, of itself, to secure the tender. However contractors, who fail to provide any meaningful evidence at all, will not be considered for further stages in the assessment of their proposals.

**Design Issues assessment**

The Council will use a points system to assess the specific design proposals from each tenderer. Points will be awarded on a scale of 1-10 and will be subject to a percentage loading to reflect the relative priority given to each aspect of the design proposals.

The Council’s ambition is to create opportunities for children to build/explore/create.

The following elements must be contained within proposals, which will include for the retention/enhancement of some of the exiting equipment.

* Safety and avoidance of exposure to harm - loading 30%
* Play value – loading 25%
* Aesthetics and design coherence – loading 20%
* Educational value – loading 10%
* Inclusivity – loading 10%
* Sustainability

Proposals must include a narrative showing how each of the above requirements has been met.

Please note – The Council believe that Inclusivity is a central tenant for every aspect of design. Proposals that attempt to address this issue in part, rather than as a fundamental element of every aspect of provision, will not score well in the assessment of proposals.

As the overall visual impact is dependent on aesthetic and design coherence, tenderers should be aware that the Council does not view surfacing, fencing and furniture as being separate design elements, but requires these to be considered and presented as an integral part of the overall package.

Design principles should include a recognisable “sense of place” and identity. It is suggested that tenderers may wish to consider theming as a means of achieving this.

**Value for money / Whole life cost**

The Council will apply the “Most Economically Advantageous Tender” (MEAT) approach. The Council will use the scoring from the above as a starting point, and will then take into account life cycle costing as an additional factor in the award criteria to evaluate the cost-effectiveness of tenders. This will be done through a best price-quality ratio (BPQR) assessment.

In order to minimise the wider societal costs impacted by this work the Council will apply Life Cycle Costing (LCC), i.e. as set out in Regulation 68(1), LCC will cover the following costs over the life cycle of the product, service or works, (to the extent that they are relevant):

(a) Costs, borne by the contracting authority or other users.

(i) costs relating to acquisition,

(ii) costs of use, such as consumption of energy and other resources,

(iii) maintenance costs,

(iv) end of life costs, such as collection and recycling costs;

(b) costs imputed to environmental externalities linked to the product, service or

works during its life cycle.

Tenderers will be required to provide estimates for the above; the council will then use these estimates as evidence when undertaking their own costing assessment.

Please note that the first of these, costs relating to acquisition, is the contract tendered sum. This must be within the narrow range of costs set out by the Council. Tendered amounts outside this range will render the bid invalid.

The Council proposes to employ a small panel to assess the proposals and intendeds to make the deliberations and scoring of the panel known to any tenderer wishing to see the assessment of their own proposal.