

Tender Evaluation Criteria

The following principles laid out below will be applied to each tender received within the timeframe described by the Tender Pack. The primary and auditable objectives of the evaluation process are:

- To ensure Tenders meet the compliance requirements of the ITT.
- To fully understand the proposals both from a quality and cost perspective.
- To identify areas where clarification is required.
- To identify any significant shortcomings and or risks in the Tenders.
- To provide a moderation and audit process to ensure fairness and transparency of marking.
- To provide an outcome which recommends a winning tender.

Stage 1 – Crowthorne Parish Council will evaluate all essential requirements on a ‘pass’ or ‘fail’ basis. Tenders failing any of the essential criteria will be rejected at this stage of the evaluation.

Essential requirements of all documents included in return pack:

1	Form of Tender (Appendix A)	P / F
2	Tendering Declaration	P / F
3	Freedom of Information Exclusion Schedule	P / F
4	Priced Works Schedule	P / F
5	Priced Section 5 (Contingency Sums)	P / F
6	Priced Section 6 (Final Summary)	P / F
7	Delivery Programme	P / F

Stage 2 –Price and Quality evaluation

Tenders will be evaluated to determine the *most economically advantageous bid* using the following criteria and weighting and will be assessed entirely on your response submitted. The price to quality ratio is 40:60

	Percentage
Quality Quality will be evaluated based on the responses in the Tenderers Proposal	60%
Price Pricing will be evaluated in accordance with your response in the Form of Tender and Pricing Schedule	40%

Quality criteria (60%)

The quality of the proposal overall against the following measures:

- | | |
|--|-----|
| ➤ Compliance with the specification and overall understanding of the work required | 35% |
| ➤ Ability to deliver the contract | 35% |
| ➤ Quality Assurance | 15% |
| ➤ References | 15% |

The quality aspects of the quotation will be assessed by answering questions which will be scored based on whether the bidder has shown that it can meet the evaluation criteria. A score will be awarded on a system of 0-5 as follows:

Score	Criteria for Award
0	Unacceptable - Response does not meet requirements or no response is provided. <u>Explanation:</u> The response raises major concerns about understanding and/or approach which are potentially highly detrimental to satisfactory service delivery or contract performance.
1	Unsatisfactory - Response partially meets requirements but contains significant weaknesses, issues or omissions. <u>Explanation:</u> The response suggests significant shortcomings of understanding or approach which is likely to impact on service delivery or contract performance.
2	Weak – Response partially meets requirements but contains some weaknesses, issues or omissions <u>Explanation:</u> The response suggests shortcomings of understanding or approach which is likely to impact on service delivery or contract performance.
3	Acceptable - Response meets requirements to an acceptable standard but contains some weaknesses, issues or omissions. <u>Explanation:</u> The response raises no concerns about understanding or approach to service delivery or contract performance.
4	Good - Response meets requirements with moderate levels of assurance. <u>Explanation:</u> Response is above expectations in terms of understanding or approach to service delivery or contract performance in terms of understanding or approach to service delivery or contract performance
5	Outstanding - Response meets requirements to a high standard with high levels of assurance. Robust and detailed in all respects. <u>Explanation:</u> Response is significantly above expectations in terms of understanding or approach to service delivery or contract performance in terms of understanding or approach to service delivery or contract performance

Quality criteria will be assessed on the answers to the following 4 Quality Criteria and questions:

Quality Criteria	Level 1 Weighting	Level 2 Weighting
Quality Criteria 1 – Compliance with the specification and overall understanding of the work required?	35%	
Question 1: The presentation score will be assessed by evaluation of the itemised quotations, plan scale drawing and design artwork submitted. Added Value will also be evaluated in this section, e.g. free parts, maintenance etc. offered in the proposal		40%
Question 2: What resources do you have or have access to, to ensure that you can meet all the requirements set out in the specification?		40%
Question 3: What is your understanding of the timescales and constraints during construction?		20%
Quality Criteria 2 – Ability to Deliver the Contract	35%	
Questions 1: What experience and expertise do you have in the industry?		30%
Question 2: What experience do you have of construction of a MUGA during the COVID pandemic?		30%
Question 3: What contingency provisions are in place if delivery difficulties arise?		40%
Quality Criteria 3 – Quality Assurance	30%	
Question 1: What arrangements do you have in place for the disposal of construction waste?		20%
Question 2: What accreditations do you hold? (provide copies) e.g. SAPCA member, CHAS, Constructionline, Association of Play Industries		40%
Question 3: Do you have a risk management policy and if so, how is it implemented?		10%
Question 4: The warranties & guarantees supplied with the works?		30%
Quality Criteria 4 - References	15%	
Provide 3 references from customers within the last two years		100%

Tenderers should also make sure that their answers inform not just what they will do, but how they will do it, and what their proposed timescales are (as relevant). It is useful to give examples and/or provide evidence to support your responses. The purpose should be to include as much relevant detail as required, so that the evaluation panel gets the fullest possible picture.

Each Tender's Proposal will be evaluated individually, one by one in order. When scoring each statement, no consideration is given to information included in other answers so please do not cross refer to responses or information provided elsewhere in your tender.

Stage 3 - Summary Table for Each Tenderer

EVALUATION AREA FOR TENDERER X								
Quality								SUB TOTAL
	Quality Criteria 1	35%				Double Weighted Scores		
			Score	Weight	Weighted score			
		Question 1		40%		X 0.35		
		Question 2		40%				
		Question 3		20%				
	Quality Criteria 2	35%						
		Question 1		30%		X 0.35		
		Question 2		30%				
		Question 3		40%				
	Quality Criteria 3	15%						
		Question 1		20%		X 0.15		
		Question 2		40%				
		Question 3		10%				
		Question 4		30%				
	Quality Criteria 4	15%						
		Question 1		100%		X 0.15		

TOTAL SCORE TABLE

				TENDERER 1	TENDERER 2	TENDERER 3	TENDERER 4
Quality 60%		Double Weighted Scores					
	Criteria 1		X 0.6				
	Criteria 2		X 0.6				
	Criteria 3		X 0.6				
	Criteria 4		X 0.6				
Price 40%							
	Cost		X 0.4				
Totals	100%						