Tender Evaluation

Project Title	**Children's Bike Pump Track**
Tenders Received	

Tender Evaluation Criteria/ Matrix

MEAT	Overall Weighting	Category	Category Weighting	Element	Element Weighting
PRICE	30%	Financial	30%	Cost/ Competativeness	Price Evaluation Matrix
QUALITY	70%	Technical	9%	Capability of company to carry out the specified works	3%
				Materials manufactured in house or readily available.	2%
				Programme of works provided and in line with timescales requests.	4%
		Health and Safety	15%	Relevant accreditations in H&S and as required for trades used. E.g NICEIC	4%
				Detailed working practices and procedures/ emergency procedures	3%
				Appropiate Health and Safety Policy provided or available via website.	4%
				Competent contractor with experience, training and qualifications.	4%
		Service Delivery	10%	Company history and experience in the required trades.	4%
				References provided of previous work and received satifactory responses.	2%
				Communication structure, provides a responsible person for contact during works	2%
				Insurance Cover in place sufficient	2%
		Quality	15%	Customer Care/ Warranty of material and workmanship	4%
				Quality of previous work from references/ local projects viewed.	3%
				Professional Membership/ Accreditation	2%
				Experience on similar projects	4%
				Aftercare provided	2%
		Environment	10%	Policy/ Commitment to reducing greenhouse gases	3%
				Distance from site to company for travel during project. Target of 40 miles.	3%
				Waste Management and disposal methods/ recycling	4%
				Interest factor scoring of entire track	6%

	Design Factors	11%	Age groups between toddler to teen catered for.	2%
			Low Maintenance surfacing/equipment provided	3%

Scoring System		
Excellent	Exceeds the required standard. Response answers the question with precision and relevance. Includes improvement through innovation/ added value	5
Good	Meets the standard required. Comprehensive response in terms of detail and relevance to the question.	4
Acceptable	Meets the standard in most aspects but fails in some areas. Acceptable level of detail, accuracy and relavance.	3
Limited	Fails the standard in most aspects but meets some. Limited information/ inadequate/ only partially addressess the question.	2
Inadequate	Significantly fails to meet the standard. Inadequate detail provided/ questions not answred/ answers not directly relevant to the question.	1
Not Eligble for Consideration	Completely fails to meet the standard. Response significantly deficient/ no response	0

Pricing Evaluation

	Percentage Rating	Value of Quote
Quote	30%	Less than £85,000.00
	30%	£ 85,000.00
	27%	£ 85,500.00
	24%	£ 86,000.00
	21%	£ 86,500.00
	18%	£ 87,000.00
	15%	£ 87,500.00
	12%	£ 88,000.00
	9%	£ 88,500.00
	6%	£ 89,000.00
	3%	£ 89,500.00
	0%	£ 90,000.00