

## **Appendix 6 – Quality**

### **1. Documents for Completion**

Tenderers must complete and return the Quality Questionnaire. This can be found below at Annex 1 of this Appendix 6 (Quality).

### **2. Quality Evaluation Process**

- 2.1 The questions asked within the Quality Questionnaire are designed to test a Tenderer's ability to deliver the requirements as set out in Appendix 2 (Specification). Tenderers must answer all questions.
- 2.2 Tenderers must achieve a minimum acceptable Quality Score for each question as set out in the table below. If following the evaluation process set out below a Tenderer fails to meet the Minimum Threshold, its Tender will be rejected and will not be considered further.
- 2.3 Responses submitted to the Quality Questionnaire will be assessed in accordance with the process and criteria set out below.
- 2.4 Annex 1 provides details of any elements/criteria considered as critical to the requirement. These are criteria, which will be evaluated on a pass/fail basis. A fail may result in the tender being excluded from further evaluation.
- 2.5 Each response provided to each question within the Quality Questionnaire will be awarded a score in accordance with the Scoring Matrix set out below.
- 2.6 Each mark achieved will be multiplied by the corresponding weighting to provide an overall question score.
- 2.7 When the score for each question has been determined they will be added together to provide an overall score for the Quality Evaluation ("Quality Score").
- 2.8 **Consensus Marking Procedure-** The Consensus Marking Procedure is a two-step process, comprising of:
  - Independent evaluation; and
  - Group consensus marking.
- 2.9 During the independent evaluation process, each evaluator will separately (i.e. without conferring with other evaluators) scrutinise the quality of answers given by Tenderers in their Tender. Each evaluator will then allocate a mark for the answer in accordance with the Marking Scheme applicable to that question
- 2.10 During the meeting, the evaluators will discuss the independent marks until they reach a consensus regarding the marks that should be attributed to each Tenderer's answer to the questions.

- 2.11 Once all quality responses have been evaluated the individual scores attributed to each response will be added together to provide a 'Quality Score'.

### 3. Scoring Matrix

3.1 The scoring methodology used to assess and allocate scores to each criteria are included in the table below:

Score	Definition of Score
5	The Tenderer demonstrates fully that they can meet the requirement as detailed in the Requirements Specification
4	Meets all requirements but with minor issues
3	Meets some requirements but with a few major gaps or issues
2	Meets some requirements; major concerns
1	Meets few requirements; serious concerns
0	The method of fulfilling the stated requirement is inadequate / not addressed

Based on the allocated score, a percentage will be calculated against each element using on the following calculation:

$$\frac{(\text{Allocated Score})}{(\text{Maximum Score})} \times \text{Weighting}$$

For example, "Quality Element 1" can be allocated a score between 0 and 100 but carries a weighting of 10%. Supplier A is given a score of 60 for this element so receives a score of  $(60/100 \times 10) = 6\%$ . The scores for each element will then be added together to calculate the overall Quality Criteria score.

### 4. Quality and Social Value (if applicable) Criteria

<b>Mandatory Criteria</b>	<b>Mandatory Criteria Description</b>	<b>Pass/Fail</b>
<b>Information assurance</b>	Supplier confirms they will meet the requirements of HMG Security Policy Framework	
	Supplier confirms they will meet the requirements in relation to “Offshoring of Government Data”	
	Supplier confirms they will meet requirements for “Data Protection”	
<b>Cyber Security</b>	Supplier confirms they will meet requirements for “Cyber Security” as set out in the tender document.	
<b>Accessibility</b>	Supplier confirms they will produce documents and any other relevant products to the standards set out in the “Accessibility” component of the tender document	
<b>Service conditions and environmental factors</b>	Supplier confirms they can provide sufficient computing power and storage to carry out this project effectively.	

### Scored Quality Criteria

<b>Questionnaire Number</b>	<b>Question</b>	<b>Minimum Acceptable Score</b>	<b>Maximum Available Score</b>	<b>Weighting %</b>
1	Evidence of experience of building and updating transport models	3	5	20%
2	Technical approach for updating NTMv5 with limited timescales and data	4	5	40%
3	Demonstration of sufficient resources and capability for the contract	3	5	15%
4	Procedures for managing time, risk, change and quality	3	5	15%

## Appendix 6 – Quality

Version issued with above-threshold ITT incorporating Mid-Tier Contract  
Contract Reference: TBC

5	Social value: Evidence of creating new businesses, new jobs and new skills	2	5	4%
6	Social value: Evidence of Reducing the Disability Employment gap and Tackle Workforce Inequality	2	5	3%
7	Social value: Evidence of Improve health and wellbeing	2	5	3%