

SCORING METHODOLOGY – MASTER SUITED KEY & LOCK UPGRADES

Evaluation

- 7.1 The Contract will be awarded on the basis of the most economically advantageous Tender to the Horniman Museum and Gardens (HMG). HMG's decision to accept or reject a Tender will be in accordance with the Public Contracts Regulations 2015, as amended, the provisions of the Local Government Acts 1988 and 1992 and the various Regulations and Guidance issued thereunder.
- 7.2 Prior to evaluating the Tenders, HMG will carry out an initial review to confirm completeness and compliance with the Tender requirements and may, at its discretion, reject a Tender which is incomplete and/or non-compliant.
- 7.3 HMG has established an evaluation methodology and will be carrying out the evaluation of Tenders by applying the methodology set out in this document.
- 7.4 The evaluation criteria for this Procurement are set out in Table 2 below.
- 7.5 In Table 2 below, the overall weighting column shows the total weighting available for each of the evaluation criteria; the sub-headings weighting column shows the maximum marks available that will make up the overall weighting.
- 7.6 Cost is attributed a score out of 300 using a qualitative formula, making up 60% of the overall score.
- 7.7 All other criteria will be assessed qualitatively using the scale shown below in Table 1. Each of these criteria will be scored out of 5 and multiplied by the attributed weighting. The points will be awarded as follows:

Table 1 – Qualitative Scoring Guide

Points	Methodology
5	Very good response against the requirements of the project and exceeds HMG's expectations in major areas.
4	Good response against the requirements of the project and meets HMG's expectations in all material respect.
3	Response meets an acceptable standard in all material respects but falls short of HMG's expectations and/or has minor impact on cost and/or minor risk transfer to HMG.
2	Poor response which fall short of meeting an acceptable standard in some respects and/or fall short of HMG's expectations and/or has a material impact on cost and/or material risk transfer to HMG.
1	Very poor response which fails to meet an acceptable standard in some material respects and/or which fails to meet HMG's expectations in major areas and/or has a significant impact on cost and/or significant risk transfer to HMG.
0	No response submitted or a substantially incomplete response submitted or a response which cannot be accepted by HMG

HMG reserves the right to hold clarification and value engineering meetings with Tenderers and invite the relevant project lead to attend such meetings if required.

- 7.8 Tenders that do not contain all complete and correct information (including supporting evidence for evaluation purposes) may be rejected by HMG. HMG does not undertake to award the Contract to the lowest priced or any tender, and reserves the right to cancel or withdraw the Procurement at any stage; and/or not to award a Contract.
- 7.9 Whilst HMG have issued a scoring matrix, HMG fully reserves the right not to be bound by this in awarding the contract.
- 7.10 **IMPORTANT:** Please note, we are anticipating a large number of responses to this tender opportunity. Therefore the adjudication panel will be undertaking a two stage scoring method. All compliant tenders will be initially assessed and scored according to their cost submissions (representing a maximum of 60% of the total score available). Once these have been assessed we will then undertake the quality

assessment and scoring for the four most economically competitive tenders only.

- 7.11 For the avoidance of doubt, if your submission is not within the four returns that score the highest for cost, the quality responses will not be assessed, and you will only receive a score against the cost evaluation.
- 7.12 The Horniman museum and gardens reserves the right to evaluate and appoint further returns outside of the shortlisted five, if their quality submissions are deemed to be unsatisfactory.

8. Award of Contract.

- 8.1 Following the evaluation process, if required, interviews will be undertaken with the highest scoring appointable companies and responses analysed. Following interviews (if deemed necessary) HMG will make a recommendation to award the contract through its internal governance procedures.
- 8.2 Once approval to award has been obtained, HMG will send letters via email to all those suppliers who submitted a tender to advise:
- whether your bid has been successful or unsuccessful;
 - how to request feedback for unsuccessful bids

Table 2 - Evaluation Criteria

Evaluation Criteria	Sub Headings	Sub Headings Weighting	Overall Weighting	Evaluation
Cost		Total of 300 marks	60%	Completed Pricing Schedule
Quality:	- Comprehensive Programme. - Completed quality questionnaire.	Total of 200 marks	40%	Tender Document
Financial Stability	Financial appraisal via Creditsafe, including credit score rating, balance sheets, P&L etc.	Pass/Fail		Financial Checks

Table 3 – Quality Questions, maximum word count and quality assessment weighting, equalling a maximum of 40%.

No.	Question	Max Word Count	Weighting = 40% of total score
1	<p>Resource & Proposal:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Provide background on your company, experience of the company and the individuals involved (CV's may be provided as appendices). - Provide details of proposed suited system and any alternative proposals. Including information on security level, patent protection etc. - Innovation: Provide suggestions and opportunities around the system for better on-site security, key management or both for the system you are proposing. - Provide details on what concurrent work your company has on. - Provide details of any construction and security accreditations your company has. - Detail makeup of team undertaking work. Directly employed operatives or sub-contracted etc. - References and case studies from three recent relevant master key suiting projects. (as appendices) 	800 (excluding appendices)	40%
2	<p>Implementation:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Outline concisely; - Responsibilities of the main staff involved within this contract. - How you will support the finalising of the suited design? - Detail how you will phase and approach the roll out and installation of the barrels and keys, and how you will support the Horniman to deliver the change before 31st March 2023. 	800	20%
3	<p>Sustainability: The Horniman has declared a climate and ecological emergency. Please read our manifesto here to understand our priorities.</p> <p>Please provide specific information on the sustainable management of the works and actions you will be taking. Including:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Reducing and recycling waste. (How will you recycle old barrels and keys?) - Reducing the carbon impact of the project including deliveries etc. - How is your company reducing its carbon emissions? - Provide details of any relevant accreditations. 	500	30%
4	<p>Programme:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - A detailed programme for the works, showing the phasing approach suggested with critical path. Noting completion must be by 31st March 2023. 	N/A	10%

9. Compliant Bid

9.1 A compliant bid must include the following:

- Form of Tender duly signed
- Appendix D Cost Sheet fully priced and arithmetically accurate.
- A detailed programme for the works with critical path and associated information required.
- Evidence of your insurances, VAT registration and UTR - Three references of recent relevant works.
- Details of your company history and profile, including financial information and environmental policy
- A completed set of quality assessment questions, within the maximum word count for each question.
- Both paper and digital tender submissions must be received by their associated deadlines, as stated in the tender invitation.

9.2 You are welcome to submit any additional supporting documentation relating to the evaluation criteria listed in table 2 to support your tender bid.