

SCHEDULE 08 –QUALITY ENVELOPE

UK Pavilion at Expo 2025 Osaka, Japan: Design, Build, Maintain & Decommission (DBMD)

Project_1355

Evaluation – Summary of Technical Question Score Weightings (Quality: 80.00%)

Question No.	Title	Weighting (%) (out of 100% of the quality criteria)	Relative Weighting
1	Architectural Design	40.00	32.00
2	Delivery & Risk Mitigation	40.00	32.00
3	Integrator Capability	20.00	16.00

This Schedule 08 is made up of the following parts:

1. Scoring Methodology (from Page 2)
2. Questions (from Page 5)

NOTES TO TENDERERS: The Tender and accompanying documents must be submitted in the format stated against each question. Any Tenders that are not submitted in accordance with these instructions shall be considered non-compliant and the Tenderer shall be excluded from further participation in the Procurement. Where a question stipulates a maximum page limit (e.g., maximum 3 sides of A4) in the “Response Format” field, this must be adhered to. Where any Tenderer submits a response beyond stated page limits, the Client reserves the right to remove the additional pages that go beyond the stated limit, with the removed pages not being evaluated. **Additionally, where a question stipulates a font-size, this must be adhered to. Any Tenderer that uses a font size other than the size stipulated shall be considered to have submitted a non-compliant Tender and be excluded from the Procurement.**

Tenderers must **not** embed videos or links to external information in its response to any question. Any Tenderer that does this will have any videos and/or links removed before the response is evaluated.

The response to this Schedule 08 shall form part of the Scope provided by the *Contractor* for the purposes of the Contract, and shall be incorporated into the Scope wholesale, save for any amendments that at the Client’s sole discretion are required in order to adhere to Expo requirements.

1. SCORING METHODOLOGY

The following table outlines the scoring methodology to be applied to the Tenderer's response to each quality question. Each question has a number of award criteria that the response to that question will be assessed against. Each of the award criteria under a question are sub-weighted out of 100% of that question. A mark will be awarded for each award criteria using the scoring methodology in the table below to determine how well the response meets that award criterion and in relation to the Scope in Schedule 07:

SCORING METHODOLOGY FOR ALL QUESTIONS			
SCORE	QUALITY	REASON	EXPLANATION
0	Unanswered or totally inadequate response	Does not meet the award criterion	The response does not meet the award criteria or is totally inadequate, meaning it does not demonstrate competence or understanding of the requirement resulting in no confidence that the Tenderer can meet the requirement.
25	Minimal response	Meets some of the award criterion	Limited evidence is provided to support that the response meets the award criteria with major concerns, meaning there is a limited demonstration of competence and understanding of the requirement resulting in a low level of confidence that the Tenderer can meet the requirement.
50	Reasonable response	Meets most of the award criterion	Satisfactory evidence provided to support that the response meets most of the award criteria with minor concerns, meaning there is an acceptable demonstration of competence and understanding of the requirement resulting in a medium level of confidence that the Tenderer can meet the requirement.
75	Good response	Meets all of the award criterion	Good evidence provided to support that the response meets the award criteria, meaning there is a good demonstration of competence and understanding of the requirement resulting in a high level of confidence that the Tenderer can meet the requirement.
100	Excellent response	Meets all of the award criterion and in some cases exceeds it	Comprehensive and extremely detailed evidence provided to support that the response meets and/or exceeds the award criteria, meaning there is an excellent demonstration of competence and understanding of the requirement, resulting in a very high-level of confidence that the Tenderer can meet the requirement.

In respect of each question, a mark for each award criterion for that a question will be awarded, the sub-weighting for that award criteria will be applied to the mark to determine the sub-weighted score for that award criteria. These sub-weighted scores will then be totalled to give a total sub-weighted score out of 100% for the question. The question weighting (within 100% of the quality criteria) will then be applied to give a

weighted score in relation to that question. A final weighting will then be applied that gives a score that represents the score for that question relative to the whole Procurement (i.e., the relative weighted score). The section below “Calculating Weighted Scores” gives a worked example.

Calculating weighted scores

All quality criteria questions within the quality evaluation are sub-weighted out of 100%, as indicated in the table on page 1 of this Schedule 07. Each question is split into award criteria that the response to the question will be evaluated against. These award criteria are further sub-weighted out of 100% of that question.

When an award criterion for a response to a question is awarded a score (0, 25, 50, 75 or 100), it will be multiplied by its award criteria sub-weighting. All sub-weighted scores of award criteria for a question will then be totalled to arrive at a total sub-weighted score for that question (out of a maximum 100% for that question). The total sub-weighted scores will then be multiplied by the weighting for that question (which has been weighted out of 100% of the quality envelope as per the table on page 1). Finally, the total weighted score for that question will be given its relative weighting (out of 80%) for the quality criteria in respect of the entire Procurement.

The table below illustrates an example, using a fictional Tenderer, Tenderer A, and the scores they received against each award criteria for each quality question. This is for illustrative purposes only to show the calculations, the weightings and scores are not representative of the Procurement, nor the Client’s expectations:

Quality Question (and weighting)	Award Criteria (and sub-weighting)	Raw Score (0, 25, 50, 75, 100)	Sub-Weighted Score	Total Sub- Weighted Score	Total Weighted Score	Total Relative Weighted Score
1 – 40%	A – 45%	100	45.00	80.00	32.00	25.60
	B – 25%	50	12.50			
	C – 30%	75	22.50			
2 – 40%	A – 35%	50	17.50	53.75	21.50	17.20
	B – 15%	75	11.25			
	C – 50%	50	25.00			
3 – 20%	A – 30%	75	22.50	92.50	18.50	14.80
	B – 70%	100	70.00			
TOTALS:					72.00	57.60

Failure Threshold

Any Tenderer that receives a score of less than 50.00% out of the available 100% for a single quality question will be excluded from the Procurement.

2. QUESTIONS

1 – Architectural Design (40% Weighting within Quality Envelope, 32% Relative Weighting)	
Question	Response Format
<p>Tenderers must provide a Design Pack (as defined in the list in the “Response Format” part of this question) that shows their initial architectural design solution for the UK Pavilion. The pack must consist of only the elements listed in the “Response Format” section of this question.</p> <p>The proposed design should look to progress the early pavilion design ideas of the Client’s International Content Design Services (ICDS) supplier which can be found at Annex C to the Scope at Schedule 07 of the ITT. The Tenderer has liberty to suggest changes and alternate designs that it believes are deliverable to budget and to time, but must ensure it maintains the creative vision and narrative put forward by the ICDS supplier. The Tenderer must ensure, through the design, that the UK Pavilion will deliver on the proposed concept, content, visitor experience, and is a vehicle to land key messages and achieve HMG’s strategic objectives as listed in the Scope at Schedule 07 of the ITT.</p> <p>The design must meet all functional requirements as listed in the Scope at Schedule 07 of the ITT.</p>	<p>The “Design Pack” as mentioned in the question, which will comprise the Tenderer’s response to this question and be evaluated against the Award Criteria (a-c), must comprise the following suite of documentation:</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. Two (2) Elevations 2. One (1) Section 3. One (1) set of General Arrangements (GAs) per floor of your proposed building design 4. One (1) Render/Architectural Intent 5. Design summary statement (written – three (3) A4 sides maximum) 6. sustainability statement (written – two (2) A4 sides maximum)
Award Criteria	
<p>The Tenderer’s response to this question will be assessed (in accordance with the scoring methodology) against how well it meets the following award criteria. Each award criterion is given a sub-weighting out of 100% of the marks available for this question. For each award criterion, the Tenderer’s response will be awarded a mark, and scores calculated as explained in the example given in the Scoring Methodology section of this Schedule 08.</p> <p><u>Award Criteria</u></p> <p>(a) Creative Vision (40%) – how well does the proposed design maintain and deliver on the creative vision communicated by the ICDS Supplier</p>	<p>Tenderers must not provide any additional documents or other files than those stated above. Any additional files submitted in response to this question will not be considered in evaluation of this question.</p> <p>Please provide files in electronic copy, and for written parts of the “Design Pack”, in editable format (i.e., not PDF or any other read-only format). For non-written components, please do not provide files in formats that require specialist software (e.g.,</p>

(b) Functional & Spatial Requirements (40%) – how well does the proposed design fulfil the functional and spatial requirements of the Client as stated in the section S 350 “Spatial and Functional Requirements” of the Scope at Schedule 07 to the ITT.

(c) Sustainability (20%) - how well does the proposed design, resulting materials, construction methods, and proposal for decommission, meet the sustainability requirements listed in the Scope at Schedule 07 of the ITT.

in CAD format) outside of a standard Microsoft Office application or PDF-reader.

In cases of written parts of the “Design Pack”, **Arial pt-11** font text must be used for regular paragraphs. For annotations of graphics, renders, photos, or diagrams, **Arial pt-9** font text may be used.

Please **do not** embed links to external information, or videos into any part of your response to this question. Any such links or videos will be removed and not evaluated.

Tenderers must use the following naming convention for all files that comprise the response to this question:

**[NAME OF TENDERER] – QUESTION 1 –
[NAME OF FILE WITHIN DESIGN PACK]**

Tenderers must compress all files into a single ZIP Folder and name the folder using the following convention

[TENDERERS NAME] – QUESTION 1

The ZIP Folder must then be attached to this question in Jaggaer as the Tenderer’s response.

2 – Delivery and Risk Mitigation (32% Weighting within Quality Envelope, 28% Relative Weighting)	
Question	Response Format
<p>Tenderers must provide a full <u>Delivery Schedule</u>, detailed <u>Delivery Plan</u> for executing their proposed architectural design (from question 1), and a completed <u>Risk Mitigation Log</u>.</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. The <u>Delivery Schedule</u> must show the critical path, critical dependencies, and key milestones leading to the delivery of the UK Pavilion ahead of the opening for Expo; ensuring appropriate time is allowed for testing, training, and snagging. The schedule must also include detail of decommissioning. 2. The <u>Delivery Plan</u> must: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • detail how the proposed Delivery Schedule will deliver the UK Pavilion on time, to budget, and to the right quality as defined in the Scope (Schedule 07); • must give assurance and confidence that it can meet the key milestone deadlines as highlighted by the Client in section S 630 “Milestone Dates” of the Scope at Schedule 07 of the ITT, including any explanation of where the Tenderer believes it can improve on anticipated milestone deadlines; • detail and explain how the Tenderer’s supply chain will support achievement of the Delivery Schedule. 3. The <u>Risk Mitigation Log</u> template is attached at Annex A to this Schedule 08. The Client has identified a number of key risks that the Tenderer must look to mitigate through their designs, schedule and plan. The Tenderer must input their mitigations into the log and submit it as part of their response to this question. 	<p>The <u>Delivery Schedule</u> must be displayed in a Gantt-style (or similar) chart and in a single file. Tenderers must not provide the file in a format that requires specialist software outside of a standard Microsoft Office application or PDF-reader.</p> <p>The <u>Delivery Plan</u> must be no longer than a maximum of four (4) A4 Sides. Tenderers must provide this in electronic copy editable format (i.e., not PDF or any other read-only format) using Microsoft Word.</p> <p>The <u>Risk Mitigation Log</u> template is attached at Annex A to this Schedule 08. Tenderers must complete it with their mitigations and submit it as part of their response to this question. Individual mitigations must be no longer than two-hundred (200) words each.</p> <p>For the Delivery Plan and Risk Mitigation Log, Arial pt-11 text must be used for regular paragraphs/text. For annotations on any diagrams, tables, graphics etc., and for annotations on the Delivery Schedule, Arial pt-9 may be used.</p>
Award Criteria	
<p>The Tenderer’s response to this question will be assessed (in accordance with the scoring methodology) against how well it meets the following award criteria. Each award criterion is given a sub-weighting out of 100% of the marks available for this question. For each award criterion, the Tenderer’s response will be awarded a mark, and scores calculated as explained in the example given in the Scoring Methodology section of this Schedule 08.</p>	<p>Tenderers must use the following naming convention for all files that comprise the response to this question:</p>

<p><u>Award Criteria</u></p> <p>(a) Delivery Schedule Confidence (35%) – to what extent does the proposed <u>Delivery Schedule</u> meet the milestone deadline dates identified by the Client and show critical path and dependencies of the project.</p> <p>(b) Delivery Plan (35%) – to what extent does the proposed <u>Delivery Plan</u> give confidence to the Client that the Tenderer will be able to deliver the UK Pavilion on time, to budget, and to the right quality.</p> <p>(c) Risk Mitigation (30%) – how well does the Tenderer's mitigations submitted in the <u>Risk Mitigation Log</u> mitigate the key risks identified by the Client.</p>	<p>[NAME OF TENDERER] – QUESTION 2 – [NAME OF FILE]</p> <p>Tenderers must compress all files into a single ZIP Folder and name the folder using the following convention</p> <p>[TENDERERS NAME] – QUESTION 2</p> <p>The ZIP Folder must then be attached to this question in Jaggaer as the Tenderer's response.</p>
--	---

3 – Integrator Capability (16% Weighting within Quality Envelope, 14% Relative Weighting)	
Question	Response Format
<p>Tenderers must demonstrate and explain how their organisation will play the role of the “Integrator” as described in the delivery model in section S 105 “Description of the <i>works</i>” of the Scope at Schedule 07 of the ITT.</p> <p>Within the response, Tenderers must:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Provide its proposal for how it will deliver the Client’s requirements under the role of the “Integrator”, including high-level organisational structure and key personnel that will work on the UK Pavilion project throughout all phases (this must include number of FTEs, names of key personnel and their job-titles, but excluding any other personal details); • Give details of already established supply chain partners or subcontractors, or in the case where partners/subcontractors are not yet established, your intentions for establishing such relationships, and how and why they will be best placed to deliver the Client’s requirements; • Provide details of its proposed processes and procedures for procuring new subcontractors and managing them under your proposed model; 	<p>Four (4) sides of A4 including any diagrams, photos, or sketches (no annexes).</p> <p>Electronic copy editable format (i.e. not PDF or any other read-only format) using Microsoft Office Word.</p> <p>Arial pt-11 font text must be used for the entire answer to this question.</p> <p>Tenderers must use the following naming convention for the single file that comprises the response to this question:</p> <p>[NAME OF TENDERER] – QUESTION 3</p>
Award Criteria	
<p>The Tenderer’s response to this question will be assessed (in accordance with the scoring methodology) against how well it meets the following award criteria. Each award criterion is given a sub-weighting out of 100% of the marks available for this question. For each award criterion, the Tenderer’s response will be awarded a mark, and scores calculated as explained in the example given in the Scoring Methodology section of this Schedule 08.</p> <p><u>Award Criteria</u></p>	

<p>(a) Integrator Capability (50%) – to what extent does the Tenderer’s response provide confidence that the Tenderer can play the role of the Integrator effectively and in a way that will deliver on the Scope at Schedule 07 of the ITT;</p> <p>(b) Supply Chain Capability (25%) – to what extent does the Tenderer’s proposed supply chain (including types of subcontractors and/or partners) provide confidence that it has access to the necessary market access and/or relationships (or ability to establish relationships) to deliver the Client’s requirements.</p> <p>(c) Management (25%) – to what extent does the Tenderer’s response provide confidence that it has the capabilities, procedures and processes to manage the proposed supply chain so that it can effectively deliver the Client’s requirements including meeting all necessary contract management and governance requirements.</p>	
---	--