**Method Statement and Pricing Documents**

3.1 Evaluation Methodology

The standard ratio that will be used to evaluate the tenders is as follows:

Price – 70%

Quality – 30%

**4 EVALUATION OF QUALITY**

* 1. The Method Statement questions, along with; the minimum acceptable score, maximum score available, maximum number of words for each question and weighting are set out below:

|  |  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| **ITEM** | **QUESTIONS** | **Weighting (%)** | **Evaluation Panel Score - Max score 5** | **Max Score available** | **Minimum Acceptable Score** |
| Management and Methodology | Please provide a detailed Methodology for the following: a) Prepartory worksb) Selection and management of site teamc) Risk identification and management C19d) The management of the resurfacing of the facility e) FA approved surface quality standardsf) How you ensure value for money. | 5 | **5** | **25** | **3** |
| Project Team Experience  | a) Give details of specific related expertise and levels of experience of all key site and design personnel in delivering similar projectsb) Provide details that you are a SAPCA approved contractor or equivalent | 5 | **5** | **25** | **3** |
| Delivery Programme -  | Please provide a detailed programme including lead-in-times, start and end dates | 4 | **5** | **20** | **3** |
| Health & Safety | Please provide details of your Health and Safety Plan including how you comply with CDM Regulations  | 4 | **5** | **20** | **3** |
| Social Value | Detail any opportunities within your proposal to offer wider social benefits to the Lambeth Community, including how you ethically deal with waste. | 2 | **5** | **10** | **3** |
|  |  | **Quality Evaluation Mark** | **100** |  |
|  |  | **Quality** | **30%** |  |
|  |  | **Quality Score**  |  |  |

* 1. The questions which are indicated with appropriate weightings will be evaluated by the panel and the appropriate score will be agreed and added to form the total Quality Evaluation Mark. The score achieved for this section, Quality Evaluation Mark, will be weighted at 30% to give the final score for quality (Quality Score)
	2. The Authority reserves the right to challenge any information provided in response to the Tender and request further information in support of any statements made therein.
	3. The Method Statement is designed to test Potential Providers’ ability to deliver the requirement. Potential Providers MUST answer all questions in full and to the best of their knowledge
	4. Potential Providers must achieve the minimum acceptable score, as described, for each of the questions in Table1 above. Only those responses which achieve the minimum acceptable Quality Score will be included in the Price Evaluation Process.
	5. Where only one (1) submission is received which does not meet the minimum acceptable score, the Authority reserves the right to enter into dialogue and seek assurances regarding the delivery of the requirement.
	6. Potential Providers’ responses must clearly demonstrate how they propose to meet the requirements set out in the question and address each element in the order they are asked.
	7. Potential Providers’ responses should be limited to, and focused on each of the component parts of the question posed. They should refrain from making generalised statements and providing information not relevant to the topic.
	8. Whilst there will be no marks given to layout, spelling, punctuation and grammar, it will assist evaluators if attention is paid to these areas including identifying key sections within responses.
	9. Potential providers will be marked in accordance with the marking scheme

**5 MARKING SCHEME**

The scoring matrix:

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
| 0 | Failed to address the question/issue. |
| 1 | An unfavourable response/answer/solution. There is limited or poor evidence of skill/experience sought; a high risk that relevant skills will not be available. |
| 2 | Less than acceptable. The response/answer/solution/information lacks convincing evidence of skill/experience sought; lack of real understanding of requirement or evidence of ability to deliver; medium risk that relevant skills or requirement will not be available.  |
| 3 | Acceptable response/answer/solution/information to the particular aspect of the requirement; evidence has been given of skill/experience sought.  |
| 4 | Above acceptable – response/answer/solution/information demonstrates real understanding of the requirement and evidence of ability to meet it (based on good experience of the specific provision required or relevant experience of comparable service or supply. |
| 5 | Excellent – response/answer/solution provides real confidence based on experience of the service or supply provision required. Response indicates that the supplier will add real value to the organisation with excellent skills and a deep understanding of the service or supply requested. |

The weighting of each criterion is based on a scale of 1 – 5; 1 being low importance and 5 being highest in importance:

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
| 1 | Low Importance |
| 2 | Not Very Important |
| 3 | Important |
| 4 | Very Important |
| 5 | Extremely Important |

**7** **Price Evaluation**

**Price:**

For price, each submission will be assessed on the total cost of delivering the programme, using the following equation:



**For example:**

|  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- |
| **Price 70%** |  |  |
| Method 1 - Standard Lambeth Pricing mechanism |   |   |
| A= Tendered price |   |   |
| B= lowest price = | 110000 |   |
|   |   |   |
| **Price Score = (100% -(A-B)/B)\*70 - Lambeth Standard Pricing mechanism** |   |   |
|   |   |   |
| Bidder name | Tendered Price | Price Score |
| 1 | 110000 | 70 |
| 2 | 130000 | 57.27 |
| 3 | 145000 | 47.73 |
| 4 | 112000 | 68.73 |
| 5 | 115000 | 66.82 |
| 6 | 150000 | 44.55 |
| 7 | 168000 | 33.09 |

The Price Score (70% weighting applied), is added to the overall Quality Score (30% weighting applied), to give a final score for each Potential Provider (Final Score)

The contract will be awarded to the supplier with the highest Final Score. Feedback will be supplied to unsuccessful bidders.