**Document 6**

**Award Criteria Methodology**

1. **Introduction**
	1. **Standard Selection Questionnaire (SSQ)**

Each Supplier’s (Offeror’s) response will be evaluated in accordance with Document 10 Standard Selection Questionnaire SQ Award Criteria Methodology**,** Suppliers (Offerors) must pass this stage before proceeding to the next stages.

* 1. **Tender Specification Response**

The Authority will evaluate the Supplier’s (Offeror’s) response set out in

* + 1. Document 8 Specification and Tender Response (Component 1)
		2. Document 8 Specification and Tender Response (Component 2)
		3. Document 9 Commercial Schedule
		4. Document 6b Product Specification Response (Form B)
	1. The Framework Agreement will be awarded based on the most economically advantageous tender criteria under the Public Contracts Regulations (PCR) 2015 and judged based on the criteria and evaluation model set out in this document. The Authority will operate a staged evaluation. The stages are set out below. Reaching some of the stages is dependent on “passing” the preceding stage in terms of meeting all the stated requirements set out in this document. For those Offerors that proceed to the scored evaluation stages, a maximum score of 100% per product lot will be available based on the following Award Criteria:

|  |
| --- |
| **Supplier Evaluation:**  |
| **Stage** | **Award Criteria** | **Specification Point Requirement** | **Weighting** |
| **Stage 1** | **Mandated** | **SSQ** | **Pass/ Fail** |
| **Stage 2** | **Mandated** | **Technical and Quality / quality standards Indicators** | **Pass/Fail** |
| **Stage 3** | **Adjudicated** | **Social Value Model***Fighting Climate Change 5%**Tackling Economic Inequality 5%* | **10%** |
| **Stage 4** | **Adjudicated/ Compliance** | **Technical and Quality**  | **50%** |
| **All specification points that state “for information” are not evaluated and not scored** |
| **Supplier (Offerors) passing ALL the above stages will be awarded to the framework** |

|  |
| --- |
| **Commercial Evaluation (Per Product Lot)** |
| **Stage** | **Award Criteria** | **Specification Point Requirement** | **Weighting** |
| **Stage 5** | **Adjudicated** | **Commercial Schedule** *(Cost Ranking)*All offers in each product lot are ranked in cost order low to high with the lowest cost product lot being awarded the maximum 40% all other offers will be allocated a score relative to their percentage deviation from each of the lowest ‘Product Lot’. | **40%** (*Per product lot*) |
| **Stage 5a** | **Adjudicated** | **Combined Total Score** (*Per Product Lot)*Total Score achieved per product lot is added to the following scores. Stage 3 Social Value (10%)Stage 4 Technical Quality (50%)Stage 5 Commercial Schedule (40%)  | **Combined Total for all scored stages achieves 100%** (*per product lot*) |
| **Stage 5b** | **Product Lot Selection** | The Offer with the highest total score per product lot is selected for quality evaluation | **Highest total score** |
| **The product lot achieving the highest total score is taken through to the product evaluation and stage 6 “In Use Risk Appraisal”** |

|  |
| --- |
| **Product Evaluation (Quality)** |
| **Stage** | **Award Criteria** | **Specification Point Requirement** | **Weighting** |
| **Stage 6** | **Mandated** | In use risk appraisal | **Pass/Fail** |
| **Stage 6a** | **Adjudicated** | In use risk appraisal | **Risk Rating Score.** |
| **Stage 7** | **Product Lot Selection** | Highest Scored Offer with “Low Risk or “Medium Risk” rating is selected for full Quality Assessment | **High Score & low/Medium Risk**  |
| **Stage 8** | **Adjudicated** | Quality Assessment | **Appropriate pharmaceutical quality** |
| **Stage 9** | **Moderation** | **All scores will undergo moderation. This will cover all evaluated stages.** |
| **For each product lot receiving a product offering that achieves a “PASS” after all stages have been evaluated and moderated as per the award criteria requirements will be awarded to the framework agreement** |

* 1. The relevant sub-weightings relating to the different elements that are to be evaluated are set out below. Supplier (Offeror) will be evaluated in accordance with this document and Document 10 Standard Selection Questionnaire Award Criteria Methodology. All scores will undergo moderation.

**Supplier Evaluation**

1. **Stage 1 & Stage 2 Mandatory Specification Requirements**
	1. For the **Stage 1** Assessment of Standard Selection Questionnaire - Parts 1, 2 and 3 of the SSQ must be completed fully and will be assessed in accordance with Document 10 Award Criteria Methodology and completed via the Atamis e-tendering portal.
	2. Suppliers (Offerors) who pass **Stage 1** will proceed to **Stage 2.**
	3. For mandated specification points **Stage 2** Technical & Quality the Supplier (Offeror) will be evaluated against the **Stage 2** Mandated points table below.
	4. Against mandated specification points in Documents 8 Tender Response (Component 2 where applicable) **Stage 2** the Supplier (Offeror) must confirm that they comply with the specification point and where requested either provide a statement or supporting documentation.
	5. Suppliers (Offerors) indicating that they 'disagree' with a specification point must provide details as to the reason why and offer an alternative or equivalent response. The alternative or equivalent response will be reviewed by the evaluators as to the suitability. These may be sourced via clarification question(s).
	6. If the provided response does not give the evaluators confidence that the specification requirement can be met, the Supplier (Offeror) will be scored a FAIL.
	7. Supplier (Offeror) who FAIL **Stage 2** will be rejected and not pass to stage 3, and those who PASS **Stage 2** will progress to **Stage 3.**
2. **Stage 3 & Stage 4 Adjudicated, Information & Compliance Specification Requirements**
	1. Against adjudication and compliance specification points in Documents 8 Tender Response (Component 2 where applicable) **Stage 3 Social Value** and **Stage 4 Technical & Quality,** the Supplier (Offeror) must confirm that they comply with the specification point and where required either provide a statement and/or supporting documentation.
	2. Suppliers (Offerors) indicating that they 'disagree' with a specification point must provide details as to the reason why and offer an alternative or equivalent response.
	3. The alternative or equivalent response will be reviewed by the evaluators as to the suitability. These may be sourced via clarification question(s).
	4. For **Adjudicated & Compliance** specification points Suppliers (Offerors) will be scored in line with the standard scoring model criteria detailed below unless otherwise stated.
		1. For **Adjudicated** specification points Documents 8 Tender Response (Component 2) Suppliers (Offerors) will be scored with a positive response receiving 2 points, a partial response receiving 1 point, and a negative response receiving 0 points.
		2. For **Compliance** specification points Documents 8 Tender Response (Component 2) Suppliers (Offerors) will be scored with a positive response receiving 2 points and a negative response receiving 0 points.
	5. For **Information Only** specification points in Documents 8 Tender Response (Component 1 where applicable) the supplier must confirm that they have read understood and comply with the specification point where required and provide supporting information. Suppliers (Offerors) will not be scored or evaluated against these points.

|  |
| --- |
| **Scoring Model & Criteria**  |
| Response meets specification point requirement | **PASS** **(*Mandatory Points only*)** | **PASS** |
| Response does not meet specification point requirement | **FAIL** **(*Mandatory Points only*)**  | **FAIL** |
| Only relevant to specification points **A2, C2, C3** & **C13****A2** - Supplier has indicated they do not offer an overlabelling service.**C2** - Supplier has indicated they do not utilise a subcontractor.**C3** - Supplier has indicated they do not utilise a subcontractor therefore does not require a Technical Agreement.**C13** - Supplier has indicated they do not utilise a subcontractor for overlabelling or translation services. | **Not Applicable**  | **N/A** |
| The proposals significantly fails to meet the standard required. | **Unsatisfactory Response** | **0** |
| The proposal partially meets the requirements of the tender specification point however the overall response has failed to completely meet satisfactory standard in one or more areas. | **Partial Response** | **1** |
| The proposal meets the required standards in all material respects with enough detail to support and to demonstrate your ability to fulfil the specification point requirements. | **Satisfactory Response** | **2** |

1. **Stage 1: Standard Selection Questionnaire (SSQ)**

|  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| **Section** | **Specification Point Requirement** | **Award Criteria** | **Specification Reference** | **Evaluation Method** |
| SSQ | Parts 1, 2 and 3 must be fully completed and assessed in accordance with Document 10 Standard Selection Questionnaire (SQ) | Mandated | Atamis Requirement Envelope Selection Questionnaire SSQ | Absolute: PASS/FAIL |

1. **Stage 2: Mandated Points**

|  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| **Section** | **Specification Point Requirement** | **Award Criteria** | **Specification****Reference** | **Evaluation Method** |
| **A: Scope** | Suppliers hold relevant licence(s) with the appropriate scope commensurate with services offered. | Mandated | A1  | Absolute: PASS/FAIL |
| Suppliers have the appropriate license scope to offer an over-labelling service.*Not applicable where overlabel service is not offered.* | A2 | Absolute: PASS/FAIL |
| All products must be licensed in a “Trusted Country”. | A3 | Absolute: PASS/FAIL |
| **C: Warehousing, Processing, Distribution, and Quality Culture** | List of the names and addresses of all subcontractors (if used).*Not applicable where supplier does not use subcontractors.* | Mandated | C2 | Absolute: PASS/FAIL |
| Name, address, licences number for all licences held, and a copy of the licence. | C4 | Absolute: PASS/FAIL |
| Agreement that that the Authority will be notified in writing of proposed changes to service and product. | C9 |

1. **Stage 3: Environmental & Social Value Model**

|  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| **Section** | **Specification Point Requirement** | **Award Criteria** | **Specification****Reference** | **Max points available****(Sub-Weighting)** |
| Environmental & Social Value Model | Fighting Climate Change | Adjudicated | J2 | 2 |
| Tackling Economic Inequality | J3 | 2 |
|  | **Environmental & Social Value Model Section Sub-total** | **4** |

1. **Stage 4 Adjudication & Compliance Points**

| **Section** | **Specification Point Requirement** | **Award Criteria** | **Specification****Reference** | **Max points available****(Sub-Weighting)** |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| **A: Scope** | Underpinning detail of scope of contract (members/deliveries/implementation approach). | Compliance | A4 | 2 |
|  | **A: Scope Section Sub-total** | **2** |
| **B:** **Capacity and Contingency** | Contingency / Business Continuity Arrangements.  | Adjudicated | B1 | 2 |
|  | **B: Capacity and Contingency Section Sub-total** | **2** |
| **C: Warehousing, Processing, Distribution, and Quality Culture** | Description of the supply chain for the supply of Imported Unlicensed Medicines. | Adjudicated | C1 | 2 |
| Copy of the Quality/Technical Agreement between all relevant parties and their supplier/sub-contractor approval policy. | Adjudicated | C3 | 2 |
| Please note: Where a supplier does not subcontract manufacturing or distribution, overall scores will be adjusted accordingly. | C3 | 0 |
| Date of most recent MHRA inspection report, and statement from Head of Quality summarising the main findings.  | Adjudicated | C5 | 2 |
| Details of planned/future MHRA inspections and a commitment to share main findings. | Compliance | C6 | 2 |
| Copy of their current Good Distribution Practice (GDP) certificate. | Compliance | C8 | 2 |
| Provide your Site Master File and Quality Policy. | Adjudicated | C10 | 2 |
| Description of how quality incidents are investigated and managed. | Adjudicated | C11 | 2 |
| Policies and procedures for change management | Adjudicated | C12 | 2 |
| Where over-labelling and translation services are offered, the Supplier (Offeror) will provide a statement describing validated provision for these services. | Adjudicated | C13 | 2 |
| Please note: Where a supplier does not offer overlabelled and/or translatory services, overall scores will be adjusted accordingly. | C13 | 0 |
| Quality assessments conducted by the Supplier (Offeror) on imported products and their corresponding suppliers | Adjudicated | C14 | 2 |
| Training and competence policies | Adjudicated | C15 | 2 |
| Content and quality of Validation Master Plan (VMP) | Adjudicated | C16 | 2 |
| Temperature controlled storage (on site) | Adjudicated | C17 | 2 |
| Temperature controlled distribution (product in transit) | Adjudicated | C18 | 2 |
| Internal audit policies and procedures | Adjudicated | C19 | 2 |
| Product’s remaining shelf life upon delivery | Compliance | C20 | 2 |
|  | **C: Manufacturing Process & Quality Culture Section Sub-total** | **32** |
|  | **C: Manufacturing Process & Quality Culture Section Sub-total excluding points where a supplier does not subcontract manufacturing or distribution (C3)** | **30** |
|  | **C: Manufacturing Process & Quality Culture Section Sub-total excluding points where a supplier does not offer overlabelling service (C13)** | **30** |
|  | **C: Manufacturing Process & Quality Culture Section Sub-total excluding points where a supplier does not subcontract manufacturing or distribution AND does not offer overlabelling service (C3 and C13)** | **28** |
| **D: Delivery** | Supplier (Offeror) opening times/bank holidays/delivery times/emergency deliveries | Compliance | D1 | 2 |
| Resilience of delivery packaging | Adjudicated | D3 | 2 |
| Safe handling of loads (Health and Safety at Work Act 1974) | Compliance | D4 | 2 |
|  | **D: Component Materials Section Sub-total** | **6** |
| **E: Product Shortages** | Communicating current or anticipated supply shortages and stock unavailability. | Compliance  | E1 | 2 |
|  | **E: Shelf-Life Section Sub-total** | **2** |
| **F: Communications**  | Supplier’s key business contacts by category. | Compliance | F2 | 2 |
|  | **F: Outer Packaging Section Sub-total** | **2** |
| **G: Ordering & Invoicing** | Electronic transmission of ordering and invoicing information | Compliance | G1 | 2 |
| Order placement and invoicing | Compliance | G2 | 2 |
|  | **G: Delivery Section Sub-total** | **4** |
| **H: Contract Management** | Audit of Suppliers (Offerors) by the Authority | Compliance | H1 | 2 |
| Management data, complaints, and KPIs. | Compliance | H3 | 2 |
|  | **H: Contract Management Section Sub-total** | **4** |
|  |
| **Technical & Quality Total** | **54****(100%)** |
| **Technical & Quality Total (Excluding C3)**   | **52****(100%)** |
| **Technical & Quality Total (Excluding C13)** | **52****(100%** |
| **Technical & Quality Total (Excluding points C3 and C13)** | **50****(100%)** |

**7 Technical, Quality and Social Value Envelope Evaluations**

* 1. All sections and specification points within Technical and Quality are weighted accordingly.
	2. All sections and specification points within the Social Value Model are weighted accordingly.
	3. The Supplier’s (Offeror’s) overall scores shall be calculated:
		1. Technical and Quality - Supplier’s (Offeror’s) achieved score / Maximum available unweighted score \* 50%.
		2. Social Value Model **-** Supplier’s (Offeror’s) achieved score / Maximum available unweighted score \* 10%.
	4. Any Supplier (Offeror) failing to achieve a technical and quality score of 50% or more of the available weighted score of 50% may be disqualified at the total discretion of the Authority.
	5. Any Supplier (Offeror) failing to achieve a Social Value Model score of 50% or more of the available weighted score of 10% may be disqualified at the total discretion of the Authority.
	6. Where a Supplier (Offeror) is not disqualified in accordance with Stage 2 & Stage 4 above, the final scores for the responses will be added together.
	7. The weighting of the Social Value Model will form 10% of the overall tender score. (As referred to in paragraph 1.3 above).
	8. The weighting of the Technical and Quality scores will form 50% of the overall Tender score.

|  |
| --- |
| **EXAMPLE CALCULATION Stage 3 & Stage 4** |
| **Stage** | **Weighting** | **Score Achieved** | **Max Score Available** | **Calculation** | **Supplier must achieve a score equal to or greater than**  | **Score Outcome** |
| **Stage 3 -** Social Value | 10% | 3 | 4 | 3/4 = 0.75\*10 = **7.5%** |  5% | **PASS** |
| **Stage 4** - Technical & Quality | 50% | 46 | 54 | 46/54=0.85\*50 =**42.59%** |  25% | **PASS** |

**Commercial Schedule Evaluation**

1. Following successful evaluation as an acceptable supplier, the products offered by the Supplier (Offeror) will be assessed against their commercial schedule for the following:
	1. Offers shall be adjudicated against the award criteria methodology and the successful product lot shall be taken through for “In Use Risk Appraisal” and Product Quality Evaluation.

|  |
| --- |
| **Commercial Evaluation (Per Product Lot)** |
| **Stage** | **Award Criteria** | **Specification Point Requirement** | **Weighting** |
| **Stage 5** | **Adjudicated** | **Commercial Schedule** *(Cost Ranking)*All offers in each product lot are ranked in cost order low to high with the lowest cost product lot being awarded the maximum 40%; all other offers will be allocated a score relative to their percentage deviation from each of the lowest ‘Product Lot’. | **40%** (*Per product lot*) |
| **Stage 5a** | **Adjudicated** | **Combined Total Score** (*Per Product Lot)*Total Score achieved per product lot is added to the following scores. Stage 3 Social Value (10%)Stage 4 Technical Quality (50%)Stage 5 Commercial Schedule (40%)  | **Combined Total for all scored stages achieves 100%** (*per product lot*) |
| **Stage 5b** | **Product Lot Selection** | The Offer with the highest total score per product lot is selected for quality evaluation | **Highest total score** |
| **The product lot achieving the highest total score is taken through to the product evaluation and stage 6 “In Use Risk Appraisal”** |

* 1. An individual product description as listed in the Document 9 Commercial schedule (Tab: Wave 1), shall be deemed a ‘product lot’ and each product lot shall be identified by an independent offer code for the purpose of this Invitation to Tender. Offerors have the opportunity to bid for all product lots within Wave 1.
	2. Supplier (Offerors) are able to submit up to two (2) additional alternative proposals against each product lot i.e. 3 in total where applicable. Please refer to point 11 of Document 2 Terms of Offer.
	3. Within Document 9 Commercial Schedule the **Wave 2** product lots are for **information only** and will be issued as part of a further competition after completion of this overall tender award process where Suppliers (Offerors) and Wave 1 Products have been awarded to the framework. The product lots listed in **Wave 2** are subject to change.
1. **Stage 5 Adjudicated Award Criteria - Commercial Schedule (Cost Ranking)**
	1. All offers in each product lot will be ranked in cost order low to high.
	2. The lowest product lot score for each lot offered against will achieve a 100% of the overall score of 40%. All other offers will be allocated a score relative to their percentage deviation from each of the lowest ‘Product Lot’. Please refer to **Appendix 1** below for a worked example.
	3. Where offered pack sizes differ to the tender pack size the price ranking shall be calculated at price per common denominator (e.g. Oral liquid offered as both 80ml and 100ml: the common denominator = 1ml).
2. **Stage 5a Adjudicated Award Criteria - Commercial Schedule (Combined Total Score Per Product Lot)**
	1. All Suppliers (Offerors) will receive an overall percentage score out of 100% based on a combined total score for
		1. **Stage 3** - Social Value (out of 10%)
		2. **Stage 4** - Technical & Quality (Out of 50%)
		3. **Stage 5** - Commercial cost ranking score (Out of 40%)
	2. The combined score out of 100% will be per product lot.
	3. Please refer to **Appendix 2** for a worked example.
3. **Stage 5b Product Lot Selection**
	1. The product lot achieving the highest combined percentage score out of 100% at stage 5a “Total score per product lot” (Most Economically Advantageous Tender) will be selected and taken through to the product quality evaluation and stage 6 “In Use Risk Appraisal”.
	2. In the event of a tie-on the overall percentage score then both product lots will proceed to stage 6 “In Use Risk Appraisal” with the product achieving the lowest numerical risk score proceeding to the next stage.

**Product Evaluation (Quality)**

1. Following successful evaluation of the commercial schedule, the product lot offered by the Supplier (Offeror) and selected at stage 5b will be assessed as follow*s*.

|  |
| --- |
| **Product Evaluation (Quality)** |
| **Stage** | **Award Criteria** | **Specification Point Requirement** | **Weighting** |
| **Stage 6** | **Mandated** | In use risk appraisal | **Pass/Fail** |
| **Stage 6a** | **Adjudicated** | In use risk appraisal | **Risk Rating Score.** |
| **Stage 7** | **Product Lot Selection** | Highest Scored Offer with “Low Risk or “Medium Risk” rating is selected for full Quality Assessment | **High Score & low/Medium Risk**  |
| **Stage 8** | **Adjudicated** | Quality Assessment | **Appropriate pharmaceutical quality** |
| **Stage 9** | **Moderation** | **All scores will undergo moderation. This will cover all evaluated stages.** |
| **For each product lot receiving a product offering that achieves a “PASS” after all stages have been evaluated and moderated as per the award criteria requirements will be awarded to the framework agreement** |

* 1. Offers shall be adjudicated against the award criteria methodology and successful product lots shall be awarded to the framework agreement. Each product lot will have a maximum of one supplier awarded. Suppliers (Offerors) can be awarded multiple lots.
1. **Stage 6 Mandated Award Criteria - In Use Risk Appraisal**

The Import Product ‘In Use Risk’ Appraisal Document 6a Product Specification & QA Assessment Tool shall be used to evaluate all offers against the following:

**A. Product Information (PI)** - Any failed offers against each product lot shall be rejected at this stage
**B. Product Status (PS)** - Any failed offers against each product lot shall be rejected at this stage
**C. Product specifications (1.1, 1.2, 1.3**) - Any failed offers against each product lot shall be rejected at this stage.

As a result of this product evaluation all offers shall be deemed Pass or Fail. All failed product offers shall be rejected at this stage and shall not move on to stage 6a product Packaging & Presentation evaluation process.

**All Offers for each product lot passing stage 6 Mandatory Award Criteria shall be taken through to stage 6a Packaging & Presentation.**

1. **Stage 6a** **Adjudicated Award Criteria - Packaging & Presentation**

The import Product ‘In Use Risk Appraisal Document 6a Product Specification & QA Assessment Tool’ shall be used to evaluate **All Offers** passing mandatory award criteria (stage 8) and shall be assessed against the non-mandated product specification points to determine a ‘score’ for packaging and presentation. The following ‘scoring rationale’ shall be used:

• Allocation of zero for compliance with specification point(s)
• Allocation of zero for specification point(s) not relevant to the product
• Allocation of ‘1’ for non-compliance with relevant specification point(s)

The above process shall yield a ‘base score’ typically:

• 0 to 36 for topical and irrigation products
• 0 to 42 for oral medicines (tablets/capsules)
• 0 to 43 for oral liquid medicines
• 0 to 41 for injectable medicines

All offers shall then be rated for packaging and presentation risk

• **Green** (low risk): score of 0 to 14
• **Amber** (medium risk): score of 15 to 28
• **Red** (high risk): score of 29 to 43

Offers receiving a High (Red) risk score shall be deemed as Fail.

1. **Stage 7 Product Lot Selection - High Score Low/Medium Risk**
	1. The Highest combined scored product lot “Low (**Green**) or Medium (**Amber**) risk” product lot will be selected for stage 8 Quality Assessment.
	2. If the Highest combined scored product lot “Low (**Green**) or Medium (**Amber**) risk” product lot is deemed to be a fail at this stage, then the next Highest combined scored product lot offer undergoes the In Use Risk Appraisal and the process is repeated until a product lot is deemed a “Pass” and selected for quality assessment.
	3. If) there are no “Low (**Green**) risk" or "Medium (**Amber**) risk” rated product lots, then the product lot will not proceed to Stage 8 Quality Assessment and the product lot will not be awarded to the framework.
	4. In the event of a tie-on the overall percentage score where more than one product has received an “In Use Risk Appraisal” the product achieving the lowest numerical risk score proceeds to Stage 8 Quality Assessment.

**All offers for each product lot achieving a high score and given a Low (Green),** **or Medium (Amber) risk rating shall be taken through to Stage 8 Quality Assessment. All offers receiving a High (Red) risk rating will not be taken through to stage 8 and will be deemed a fail.**

1. **Stage 8 Adjudicated Award Criteria - Quality Assessment**
	1. This evaluation shall consider the quality of the offer in each product lot along with other prescribing requirements e.g. suitability of package insert/information. The NHS Pharmaceutical QC Committee Quality Assessment of Unlicensed Medicines (First Edition November 2016) will be used for this process Document 8 Specification Tender Response (Component 2) Appendix A.
	2. If the highest combined scored product lot, “Low (**Green**) risk” or “Medium (**Amber**) risk rated product lot meets the required quality standard then it is then deemed to be a “PASS”.
	3. If the highest combined scored product lot, “Low (**Green**) risk” or “Medium (**Amber**) risk rated product lot “FAILS” to meet the required quality standard then the process is repeated.
	4. If there are no “Low (**Green**) risk" or "Medium (**Amber**) risk” rated product lots passing the required quality standard the product lot will not be awarded to the framework.
2. **Stage 9 Moderation**
	1. All scores from the evaluated stages will undergo moderation.
3. **Award of Product Lot**
	1. For each product lot in Wave 1 receiving a product offering that achieves a “PASS” after all stages have been evaluated and moderated as per the award criteria requirements will be awarded to the framework agreement.
	2. Each product lot will have a maximum of one supplier awarded. Suppliers (Offerors) can be awarded multiple lots.

 **Appendix 1**

**FOR ILLUSTRATION PURPOSES ONLY -** Commercial evaluation will be assessed as per the following

**Stage 5 Adjudicated Award Criteria - Commercial Schedule (Cost Ranking) 40%**

* All Offers in each product lot will be ranked in cost order low to high.
* The lowest product lot price (per pack) for each lot offered against will achieve a 100% of the overall score of 40%. All other offers will be allocated a score relative to their percentage deviation from each of the lowest ‘Product Lot’ prices submitted. Please refer to table 1 below for a worked example.

|  |
| --- |
| **TABLE 1** |
|  | **Supplier A** | **Supplier B** | **Supplier C** |
| **Description** | **Usage** | **Highest Score** | **Lowest Price** | **Price** **(Per Pack)** | **Price Score (out of 40)** | **Price** **(Per Pack)** | **Price Score (out of 40)** | **Price** **(Per Pack)** | **Price Score (out of 40)** |
| PRODUCT LOT 1 | 500 | 40% | £1.10 | **£1.10** | **40.00** | £1.30 | 33.85 | \*£1.20 | \*Not Assessed |
| PRODUCT LOT 2 | 1000 | 40% | £21.00 | £25.00 | 36.00 | **£22.50** | **40.00** | \*£21.00 | \*Not Assessed |
| PRODUCT LOT 3 | 100 | 40% | £15.50 | **£15.50** | **40.00** | £20.00 | 31.00 | \*£30.00 | \*Not Assessed |

\*Supplier C and their offers for all 3 product lots were “Not Assessed” and were not ranked as they failed at Stage 2 Technical Quality (Mandated) Supplier Evaluation therefore not awarded to the framework.

* Price score is allocated by dividing the lowest priced offer for the respective product lot by the suppliers bid for the respective product lot multiplied by the weighting value of 40 (**Example Supplier A & Supplier B**). Therefore, the lowest total cost for each product lot will achieve full available marks of 40 (Supplier A). This analysis method will be used for each product lot.

**Example Product Lot 1**

**Supplier A (using above figures)**

Step 1 - Lowest Price Supplier A **£1.10 /** Supplier A Price **£1.10** = **1.00**

Step 2 - 1.00\*40 = Supplier A Score **40.00**

**Supplier B (using above figures)**

Step 1 - Lowest Price Supplier A **£1.10 /** Supplier B Price **£1.30** = **0.846**

Step 2 - 0.846\*40 = Supplier B Score **33.85**

**Appendix 2**

**FOR ILLUSTRATION PURPOSES ONLY -** Commercial evaluation will be assessed as per the following

**Stage 5a Adjudicated Award Criteria - Commercial Schedule (Total Score Per Product Lot)**

* All Suppliers (Offerors) will receive an overall percentage score out of 100% based on a combined total score for stage 3 Social Value, Stage 4 Technical & Quality, and Stage 5 Commercial Schedule (*cost ranking).*
* The highest score for the product lot will go through to Stage 6 In Use Risk Appraisal.

|  |
| --- |
| **EXAMPLE - Product Lot 1** |
| **Description** | **Price****(Per Pack)** | **Stage 1** | **Stage 2** | **Stage 3** | **Stage 4** | **Stage 5** | **Stage 5a & 5b** | **Stage 6** | **Stage 6a, 7** | **Stage 8** | **AWARD DECISION** |
| **SQ****(Mandated)** | **Technical & Quality****(Mandated)** | **Social Value****(Adjudicated)** | **Technical & Quality (Adjudicated)** | **Price Score (out of 40)** | **Overall Combined****(out of 100) Score & Product lot Selection** | **In Use Risk Appraisal (Mandated)** | **In Use Risk Appraisal Adjudicated** **& Product lot selection** | **QA Assessment** |
| Supplier A | **£1.10** | **PASS** | **PASS** | 5.00 | 35.00 | 40.00 | 80.00 | Not Assessed | Not Assessed | Not Assessed | No Award |
| Supplier B | £1.30 | **PASS** | **PASS** | 10.00 | 50.00 | 33.85 | 93.85 | PASS | 0 | Low Risk | PASS |
| Supplier C | \*£1.20 | **PASS** | FAIL | Not Assessed | Not Assessed | Not Assessed | 0 | Not Assessed | Not Assessed | Not Assessed | No Award |
| **EXAMPLE - Product Lot 2** |
| Supplier A | £25.00 | **PASS** | **PASS** | 10.00 | 40.00 | 36.00 | 86.00 | PASS | 15 | Medium Risk | PASS |
| Supplier B | **£22.50** | **PASS** | **PASS** | 7.50 | 29.62 | 40.00 | 77.12 | Not Assessed | Not Assessed | Not Assessed | No Award |
| Supplier C | \*£21.00 | **PASS** | FAIL | Not Assessed | Not Assessed | Not Assessed | 0 | Not Assessed | Not Assessed | Not Assessed | No Award |
| **EXAMPLE - Product Lot 3** |
| Supplier A | **£15.50** | **PASS** | **PASS** | 10.00 | 40.00 | 40.00 | 90.00 | PASS | 43 | HIGH Risk | No Award |
| Supplier B | £20.00 | **PASS** | **PASS** | 7.50 | 29.62 | 31.00 | 68.12 | PASS | 0 | Low Risk | PASS |
| Supplier C | \*£30.00 | **PASS** | FAIL | Not Assessed | Not Assessed | Not Assessed | 0 | Not Assessed | Not Assessed | Not Assessed | No Award |

\*Supplier C excluded following a failure to pass stage 2 therefore price is not considered in calculations.

**Stage 5b Product Lot Selection**

* The product lots achieving the most economically advantageous score **progresses to Stage 6 In Use Risk Appraisal** in the above examples these are:

**Product Lot 1** = Supplier B achieved a higher overall combined score at stage 5a

**Product Lot 2** = Supplier A achieved the second highest overall combined score at stage 5a.

**Product Lot 3** = Supplier B achieved the second highest overall combined score at stage 5a.