

## 1 INTRODUCTION

- 1.1 This document provides an overview of the methodology which will be adopted by the Authority to evaluate Potential Provider responses to each question set out within the ITT. This document also sets out the marking scheme which will apply.
- 1.2 The following information has been provided in relation to each question (where applicable):
- 1.2.1 Weighting – highlights the relative importance of the question
  - 1.2.2 Guidance – sets out information for the Potential Providers to consider
  - 1.2.3 Marking Scheme – details the marks available during evaluation
- 1.3 The defined terms used in the ITT document shall apply to this document.

## 2 OVERVIEW

- 2.1 This event is broken down into the following documents:

Document Reference	Document Title
1	KEY PARTICIPATION REQUIREMENTS
2	CONFLICTS OF INTEREST
3	TECHNICAL PRE-REQUISITES
4	INFORMATION ONLY
5	PRICE
6	QUALITY - TEAM AND SKILLS
7	QUALITY - PROJECT DELIVERY
8	QUALITY - QUALITY ASSURANCE

- 2.2 Quality Evaluation Process

- 2.2.1 Each response to questions within the Quality/Service Delivery Questionnaires will be marked in accordance with the table below:

Mark	Comment
<b>0</b> <i>Unsuitable</i>	Failed to provide confidence that the proposal will meet the requirements. An unacceptable response with serious reservations.
<b>25</b> <i>Nonacceptable; major concerns</i>	A Poor response with reservations. The response lacks convincing detail with risk that the proposal will not be successful in meeting all the requirements.

<b>50</b> <i>Nonacceptable; minor concerns</i>	Partially meets the requirements – the response generally meets the requirements but lacks sufficient detail/some elements to warrant a higher mark.
<b>66</b> <i>Acceptable</i>	Meets the requirements – the response meets the requirements but lacks sufficient detail to warrant a higher mark.
<b>75</b> <i>Good</i>	A Good response that meets the requirements with good supporting evidence. Demonstrates good understanding.
<b>100</b> <i>Excellent</i>	An Excellent comprehensive response that meets the requirements. Indicates an excellent response with detailed supporting evidence and no weaknesses resulting in a high level of confidence.

2.2.2 Each mark achieved will be multiplied by the corresponding weighting to provide an overall question score. Scores will be rounded to one decimal place (1DP) where necessary.

2.2.3 When the score for each question has been determined they will be added together to provide an overall score for the Quality Evaluation (“Quality Score”).

2.2.4 The evaluation of each response to the Quality/Service Delivery Questionnaire(s) will be conducted and consensus checked in accordance with the Consensus Marking Procedure set out in paragraph 2.3 below.

### 2.3 Consensus Marking Procedure

2.3.1 Tenders will be evaluated in accordance with the procedure described in this paragraph.

2.3.2 The Consensus Marking Procedure is a two-step process, comprising of:

2.3.2.1 Independent evaluation; and

2.3.2.2 Group consensus marking.

2.3.3 During the independent evaluation process, each evaluator will separately (i.e. without conferring with other evaluators) scrutinise the quality of answers given by Potential Providers in their Tender. Each evaluator will then allocate a mark for the answer in accordance with the Marking Scheme applicable to that question.

2.3.4 The Authority will review the marks allocated by the individual evaluators before facilitating a group consensus marking meeting.

2.3.5 During the marking meeting, evaluators will discuss their independent marks until they reach a consensus regarding the marks that should be attributed to each Potential Providers’ answer to the questions.

2.3.6 Once all quality responses have been evaluated in accordance with Section 8 of the Invitation to Tender the individual scores attributed to each response will be added together to provide a ‘Quality Score’.

### 2.4 Price Evaluation Process

2.4.1 Prices submitted by Potential Providers' will be evaluated in accordance with the following process.

2.4.2 Potential Providers' are required to provide a completed pricing schedule (Appendix E) against the 'Price' Questionnaire.

2.4.3 The Potential Provider with the lowest price shall be awarded the Maximum Score Available. The remaining Potential Providers shall be awarded a percentage of the Maximum Score Available equal to their price, relative to the lowest price submitted. Scores will be rounded to one decimal place (1DP) where necessary.

2.4.4 The calculation used is the following:

$$\frac{\text{Lowest Price Tendered} \times \text{Maximum Score Available}}{\text{Tender price}}$$

Example:

Potential Provider	Price Submitted	Score Calculation	Maximum Score Available	Score Awarded
Potential Provider A	£1,000	£1,000 / £1,000 x 100	100	100
Potential Provider B	£2,000	£1,000 / £2,000 x 100	100	50
Potential Provider C	£2,500	£1,000 / £2,500 x 100	100	40

## 2.5 Final score

2.5.1 The Quality Score will be added to the Price Score to determine the final score for each Potential Provider ("Final Score"). Scores will be rounded to one decimal place (1DP) where necessary to give the Final Score.

## 3 EVALUATION CRITERIA

3.1 A summary of all the questions, along with; the minimum acceptable score, maximum score available and weighting (where applicable) are set out below:

3.2 Questionnaires 1, 2 and 3 contain 'Pass/Fail' questions and act as a doorway for progression to the following stages of the evaluation. Potential Providers are strongly advised to read and understand the specific guidance provided before responding to these questionnaires.

3.3 Questionnaire 4 is for information only. Although this questionnaire does not form part of the evaluation process, Potential Providers are advised to complete it in full as any omissions could affect the award process.

3.4 The Authority reserves the right to challenge any information provided in response to Questionnaire 4 and request further information in support of any statements made therein.

<b>QUESTIONNAIRE 1 – KEY PARTICIPATION REQUIREMENTS</b>			
<b>GUIDANCE</b>	The following questions are 'Pass/Fail' questions. If Potential Providers are unwilling or unable to answer "Yes", their submission will be deemed non-compliant and shall be rejected. Potential Providers should confirm their answer by selecting the appropriate option from the drop-down menu.		
<b>Question Number</b>	<b>Question</b>	<b>Max Score</b>	<b>Weighting (%)</b>
[1.1]	Have you read, understood and agree with Appendix A, Terms of Participation? By answering "Yes", you are confirming your 'Declaration of Compliance' at Annex 1 of Appendix A, Terms of Participation.	Pass/Fail	N/A
[1.2]	Have you read, understood and accepted the Invitation to Tender and all associated appendices, specifically Appendix B, Statement of Requirement?	Pass/Fail	N/A
[1.3]	Do you agree, without caveats or limitations, that in the event that you are successful the Crown Commercial Service's Terms and Conditions within Appendix C, Draft Contract Document OR Terms and Conditions of Management Consultancy – RM3745 will govern the provision of this contract?	Pass/Fail	N/A
<b>QUESTIONNAIRE 2 – CONFLICTS OF INTEREST</b>			
<b>GUIDANCE</b>	Question 2.1 is a 'Yes/No' question and will dictate whether or not question 2.2 needs to be answered. Question 2.2 is a Pass / Fail question. Potential Providers are required to provide details of how the identified conflict will be mitigated. The Contracting Authority will review the mitigation in line with the perceived conflict of interest, to determine what level of risk this poses to them. Therefore, if Potential Providers cannot or are unwilling to suitably demonstrate that they have suitable safeguards to mitigate any risk then their Tender will be deemed non-compliant and may be rejected.		
<b>Question Number</b>	<b>Question</b>	<b>Max Score</b>	<b>Weighting (%)</b>
[2.1]	Please confirm whether you have any potential, actual or perceived conflicts of interest that may be relevant to this requirement.	None	N/A
[2.2]	We require that any potential, actual or perceived conflicts of interest in respect of this ITT are identified in writing and that companies outline what safeguards would be put in place to mitigate the risk of actual or perceived conflicts arising during the delivery of these services.	Pass/Fail	N/A

<b>QUESTIONNAIRE 3 – TECHNICAL PRE-REQUISITES</b>			
<b>GUIDANCE</b>	The following questions are ‘Pass/Fail’ questions. If Potential Providers are unwilling or unable to answer “Yes”, their submission will be deemed non-compliant and shall be rejected. Potential Providers should confirm their answer by selecting the appropriate option from the drop-down menu.		
Question Number	Question	Max Score	Weighting (%)
[3.1]	REDACTED	Pass/Fail	N/A
[3.2]	The Potential Provider has evidenced the ability to meet an expected mobilisation date of January 2021.	Pass/Fail	N/A
<b>QUESTIONNAIRE 4 – INFORMATION ONLY</b>			
<b>GUIDANCE</b>	The following questions are for information only and do not form part of the evaluation. Information provided in response to these questions may be used in preparation of any Contract Award and any omissions may delay completion of this Tender exercise.		
Question Number	Question	Max Score	Weighting (%)
[4.1]	Please provide the name, office address, telephone number and email address for your organisations Tender point of contract.	None	N/A
[4.2]	Please provide details of any sub-contractors you propose to use in order to meet your obligations should you be awarded a Contract. Your response must include their: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Registered name</li> <li>• Company registration number</li> <li>• Registered Address(es) and contact details</li> <li>• Services to be provided</li> </ul>	None	N/A

3.5 The following Quality / Service Delivery Questionnaires are designed to test Potential Providers’ ability to deliver the requirement as set out in Appendix B, Statement of Requirements.

Potential Providers *MUST* answer all Quality / Service Delivery questions.

3.6 Potential Providers must achieve the minimum acceptable Quality Score, as described, for each of the questions below. Only those Potential Providers responses which achieve the minimum acceptable Quality Score will be included in the Price Evaluation Process.

- 3.7 Where only one (1) submission is received which does not meet the minimum acceptable Quality Score, the Authority reserves the right to enter into dialogue and seek assurances regarding the delivery of the requirement.
- 3.8 Potential Providers are able to provide attachments against each question. Question fields must be populated with detailed references to relevant attachments or sections within their attachments.
- 3.9 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 detailed.
- 3.10 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.
- 3.11 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.
- 3.12 Potential Providers Tender will be marked in accordance with the marking scheme at Section 2.
- 3.13 The maximum character count within a text field within the CCS eSourcing Suite is 4096 characters including spaces and punctuation. This character count cannot be exceeded within the e-Sourcing Suite. Responses must include spaces between words.
- 3.14 The page limit on attachments is outlined within each question below. Attachments may be submitted in Microsoft Word, Excel or PDF format and should be in Arial font size 11.

<b>QUESTIONNAIRE 5 – PRICE</b>		<b>Overall Weighting – 30%</b>
<b>GUIDANCE</b>	<p>Potential Providers must ensure that the Pricing Schedule (Appendix E) has been completed in full and upload the price schedule at the question level on the e-Sourcing event.</p> <p>Prices should be submitted in pounds Sterling and exclusive of VAT.</p> <p>Potential Providers will be marked in accordance with the marking scheme at Section 2.</p>	
Question Number	Question	Max Score

[5.1]	Please confirm, by selecting 'YES' that you have attached a completed Price Schedule to the response to this question. In so doing, you are also confirming that prices are offered exclusive of VAT and firm for a period of 90 days following the Deadline for Submission.	100
-------	--	-----

<b>QUESTIONNAIRE 6 – Quality: Team and Skills</b>				<b>Overall Weighting – 10%</b>
<b>All Potential Providers MUST answer ALL the following questions</b>				
Question Number	Question	Minimum Acceptable Score	Maximum Available Score	Weighting [X]%
6.1	Please provide details of those individuals that will make up your team; their relevant skills, experience, and indicate why this would make them suitable for conducting this work. <i>Responses to 5.1 should be through provision of CVs (max 9). Each CV should not exceed 1 side of A4.</i>	66	100	50%
6.2	Please provide details of those specific tasks which your team members have been previously involved in and how those skills at 5.1 have been applied. Please indicate (i) the sector (public, private, voluntary) and (ii) the industry  <i>Responses to 5.2 should be through provision of CVs (max 9). Each CV should not exceed 1 side of A4.</i>	66	100	50%

<b>QUESTIONNAIRE 7 – Quality: Project Delivery</b>				<b>Overall Weighting – 56%</b>
<b>All Potential Providers MUST answer ALL the following questions</b>				

Question Number	Question	Minimum Acceptable Score	Maximum Available Score	Weighting [X]%
7.1	<p><b><u>Work package 1: Strategy and planning:</u> supporting the REDACTED workstream lead in REDACTED</b></p> <p>Describe how you would use best practice P3M techniques to support REDACTED</p> <p>Describe how you would use best practice P3M techniques to support REDACTED PMO to develop REDACTED</p> <p>Explain how you would support REDACTED PMO to REDACTED</p> <p>Your response should not exceed 1 side of A4.</p>	66	100	17.5%
7.2	<p><b><u>Work package 2: Change control:</u> supporting the REDACTED workstream lead to develop, roll out and deliver REDACTED.</b></p> <p>Describe how you would use best in class P3M techniques to support REDACTED</p> <p>Set out how you would develop REDACTED</p> <p>Your response should not exceed 1 side of A4.</p>	66	100	16.5%
7.3	<p><b><u>Work package 3: Reporting and delivery analysis:</u> supporting the REDACTED workstream lead in REDACTED</b></p> <p>Demonstrate how you would support REDACTED PMO to REDACTED</p> <p>Explain how you would support REDACTED to REDACTED</p>	66	100	16.5%

	Your response should not exceed 1 side of A4.			
7.4	<p><b><u>Work package 4: Risk and opportunity management: supporting the REDACTED</u></b></p> <p>Describe how you would use risk and opportunity management best practice to support REDACTED</p> <p>Your response should not exceed 1 side of A4.</p>	66	100	16.5%
7.5	<p><b><u>Work Package 5: Benefits management: supporting the REDACTED workstream lead REDACTED</u></b></p> <p>Describe how you would use best practice to support the REDACTED PMO in REDACTED</p> <p>Describe how you would approach benefits stakeholder mapping to support the REDACTED PMO</p> <p>Your response should not exceed 1 side of A4.</p>	66	100	16.5%
7.6	<p><b><u>Work package 6: P3M upskilling: help build REDACTED</u></b></p> <p>Describe how you would support REDACTED PMO upskilling. Please provide details of how you would assess REDACTED PMO team P3M capabilities and how you would ensure skills and knowledge transfer. Describe your proposed metrics to measure the success of skills transfer.</p>	66	100	16.5%

	Your response should not exceed 1 side of A4.			
--	---	--	--	--

<b>QUESTIONNAIRE 8 – Quality: Quality Assurance</b>				<b>Overall Weighting – 4%</b>
<b>All Potential Providers MUST answer ALL the following questions</b>				
<b>Question Number</b>	<b>Question</b>	<b>Minimum Acceptable Score</b>	<b>Maximum Available Score</b>	<b>Weighting [X]%</b>
8.1	Is your company ISO 9001:2015 certified? If yes, please provide evidence of certification.	66	100	50%
8.22	Is your company familiar with MOD Allied Quality Assurance Publication's (AQAP's)? Please demonstrate this  Please provide a draft quality plan for this procurement in accordance with AQAP 2105 Edition C, Version 1 and DEFCON 602A.	66	100	50%