

010 Evaluation of tender for the Works Contract for Maternity Theatre and Associated Services

Evaluation: Assessment criteria, weighting

Quality (60%)

1. All evaluators will complete an individual evaluation of submissions based on the responses received from the Bidders, and will provide a score (see below) and explanation in support of each question.
2. The criteria relating to each score is as follows:

Assessment	Score	Interpretation
Excellent	4	<p>Exceeds the requirement. This is likely to be demonstrated by:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • An excellent response from the Bidder's proposed solution / approach to the specification requirements. An excellent and unambiguous explanation of the proposed solution / approach answering all aspects and exhibiting an excellent understanding of the requirements concerned. • The Bidder's response provides an excellent level of confidence, supported by evidence of where the approach has been used successfully in similar deployments. Evidence, examples and/or references have been supplied, where appropriate.
Good	3	<p>Meets the requirement with some additional benefits. This is likely to be demonstrated by:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • A good response from the Bidder's proposed solution / approach to the specification requirements. A good and clear explanation of the proposed solution / approach answering most aspects and exhibiting a good understanding of the requirements concerned. • The Bidder's response provides a good level of confidence, supported by evidence of where the approach has been used successfully in similar deployments. Evidence, examples and/or references have been supplied, where appropriate.
Acceptable	2	<p>Satisfies the requirement. This is likely to be demonstrated by:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • An acceptable response from the Bidder's proposed solution / approach to the specification requirements. An acceptable and satisfactory explanation of the proposed solution / approach answering the relevant aspects and exhibiting an acceptable understanding of the requirements concerned. • The Bidder's response provides an acceptable level of confidence, supported by evidence of where the approach has been used successfully in similar deployments. Evidence, examples and/or references have been supplied, where appropriate.
Poor	1	<p>Satisfies the requirement with major reservations. This is likely to be demonstrated by:</p>

Assessment	Score	Interpretation
		<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • A poor response from the Bidder's proposed solution / approach to the specification requirements. A poor and unclear explanation of the proposed solution / approach answering a few aspects and exhibiting a poor understanding of the requirements concerned. • The Bidder's response provides a poor level of confidence, supported by little, none or non-relevant supporting evidence of where the approach has been used before. No or inadequate evidence, examples and/or references have been supplied, where appropriate.
Unacceptable	0	<p>Does not meet the requirement. This is likely to be demonstrated by:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • An unacceptable response from the Bidder's proposed solution / approach to the specification requirements. An unacceptable and ambiguous explanation of the proposed solution / approach answering no aspects and exhibiting an unacceptable understanding of the requirements concerned. • The Bidder's response provides an unacceptable level of confidence, supported by little, none or non-relevant supporting evidence of where the approach has been used before. No or inadequate evidence, examples and/or references have been supplied, where appropriate.

- Evaluation scores will then be moderated to achieve a consensus score for each question.
- Each question is scored between 0 and 4 (0=low, 4=high) where each question has an associated weighting. The table below in paragraph 3.38 shows a list of the question headings, the relative weightings and the maximum score available allocated to each question.
- The score for each question will be multiplied by the weighting and the results added. The maximum score that can be achieved by Bidders is 1440 points which would enable a total evaluation score of 60%.
- For example, the 'Programme of works' component counts towards 25% of the overall score. The Authority will calculate a 'Programme of works' score out of 25%, as follows:

- The Authority shall take the Bidders total score from the 'Programme of Works'
- This will be divided by the maximum points available, using the formula below:

Service Provision Score = Bidder total points / Maximum points available x 100

For example:

Supplier A total points = 740 (scored maximum points)
Supplier B total points = 640
Supplier C total points = 540

Supplier A will be awarded a Service Provision Score of 100.00 (740/740 x 100)
Supplier B will be awarded a Service Requirement Score of 86.45 (640/740 x 100)

Supplier C will be awarded a Service Requirement Score of 72.98 (540/740 x 100)

(c) The Service Provision Score (out of 100) will be multiplied by 0.20 (Service Provision Criteria is 20%) to give a final weighted score out of 60% (total quality score is 60%).

7. The same process will apply for:

- Programme of works (25%)
- Risk assessment, method statements, COSHH assessment, compliance to CDM regulations, vibrating tool assessment (10%)
- Company profile (2%)
- Public liability insurance (2%)
- Professional indemnity insurance (2%)
- NHS Reference Sites - 3 reference sites, each scoring 3% (9% total)

The overall total score for each quality component will be added together, to form the overall total of 50% scored requirement for the quality criteria.

Price (50%)

8. The pricing evaluation will be based on the Bidder's response to the pricing schedule alongside the narrative responses provided.
9. The pricing evaluation will run alongside the qualitative evaluation.
10. The pricing schedule will be studied in detail to ensure it is compliant (i.e. affordable) and that no errors or clear omissions have been made. Bidders will be offered the opportunity to rectify any arithmetic errors.
11. The pricing schedules will also be studied for robustness at this stage. For example, a pricing schedule submission that contains no transaction costs for any nursing staff might be deemed as not being robust.
12. The bid price submitted must include all costs to deliver the service as described in the service specification and the Bidder's own qualitative response. Any material caveat or qualification in a completed pricing template that implies some additional unknown cost will make a Bidder's submission non-compliant.
13. Bidders will be asked to submit bids which relate to the activity assumptions for the duration of the contract. Bidders will also have to detail all other assumptions they make in the building of their costs.
14. Price will be evaluated on the basis of the lowest acceptable price, i.e. an offer that meets the requirements of the specification. Higher bids will be awarded a score in direct proportion to the difference in value. The lowest bid will be divided by the Bidder's score multiplied by the weighting, for example:

Price Mark = Lowest price proposal / Bidder price proposal x 100

The Authority will calculate the Price Score out of 50%, as follows:

Supplier A price proposal = £100,000

Supplier B price proposal = £125,000

Supplier C price proposal = £150,000

Supplier A will be awarded a Price Score of 100.00 ($\frac{£100,000}{£100,000} \times 100$)

Supplier B will be awarded a Price Score of 80.00 ($\frac{£100,000}{£125,000} \times 100$)

Supplier C will be awarded a Price Score of 66.67 ($\frac{£100,000}{£150,000} \times 100$)

The Price score (out of 100) will be multiplied by 0.50 to give a final weighted score out of 50 (Price Criteria is 50%)

15. Overall, total score for quality and price will be added together to arrive at a total bid score. The Supplier with the highest bid score will be the preferred supplier and recommended for award of the contract subject to resolution of any due diligence or conditions precedent issues.