**Evaluation Guidance – Quality and Price**

**1. Evaluation Methodology**

1.1 The ratio that will be used to evaluate the tenders received is as follows:

* Price – 30%
* Quality: Method Statement – 60%
* Quality: Interviews – 10%

**2.** **Evaluation of Quality – Method Statement**

2.1 Bidders are asked to submit their Method Statement (no more than 16 A4 pages of content in total, font size 11 or larger (excluding appended team CVs)) in the form of a written submission that responds to the following questions/requirements:

1. **Appreciation of the brief**

Demonstrate your understanding of the Councils’ and other main stakeholders’ aspirations for the area, your appreciation of the project requirements and objectives, and identify the key opportunities that the realisation of the Low Line project could deliver for Vauxhall, Nine Elms and Battersea.

1. **Methodology**

Provide a detailed methodology that shows the tasks you will undertake to deliver all requirements included within the project specification, demonstrating creativity and innovation throughout.

1. **Project management & quality assurance**

Demonstrate how the overall project and each stage of work will be delivered and managed, including an indication of all proposed meetings and engagement with stakeholders. Your response should indicate the estimated timescales for your proposed methodology and overall project delivery. A completed Resource Schedule should also be provided showing the estimated number of days allocated to each project team member throughout each stage of the project, aligned with your proposed methodology tasks (using the template provided).

1. **Relevant experience & expertise**

Detail the structure of your project team and the role of each team member, demonstrating their relevant expertise and experience. Further detail / CVs can be appended to the Method Statement. Use three case study examples of recent projects to show how the team is suitably experienced and fully capable of;

1) establishing an area vision or strategy for a similar or comparable project, producing arresting visual and graphic material to communicate this project vision;

2) delivering innovative designs for small public realm or meanwhile projects, and

3) undertaking economic or socio-economic analysis and/or related strategies.

1. **Achieving social value**

Explain how your proposed methodology and resulting proposals will deliver against the Council’s social value priorities, how you will promote training and skills opportunities through the project and how you will respond to the Councils’ declaration of a climate emergency.

2.2 The responses to the above questions/requirements within submitted Method Statements will be evaluated using the following criteria:

|  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- |
| **IITEM** | **QUESTIONS/REQUIREMENTS** | **Weighting %** | **Maximum Score per Question** |
| 1 | **Appreciation of the brief*** Strong understanding of the VNEB Opportunity Area, its ongoing development, and the subsequent opportunities and challenges outstanding
* Clear grasp of the Councils’, and key stakeholders’ aspirations for regeneration, economic and inclusive growth throughout the area
* Appreciation of the Councils’ strategic positions post-pandemic and the implications for this project
* Appreciation of the Councils’ commitment to Net Zero by 2030 and the desire to incorporate climate adaptation measures throughout the commission
* Appreciation of the Project Objectives
* Appreciation of the opportunities the extension of the Low Line could bring to the VNEB Opportunity Area
 | **10** | **5** |
| **2** | **Methodology*** Good understanding of the services required
* Robust and achievable project methodology that fully responds to the tasks set out in the project specification and the aspirations for the project
* A clear, focused and concise submission that effectively articulates detailed methods with defined outputs and deliverables
* Creativity and innovation evident throughout the proposed approach
 | **35** | **5** |
| **3** | **Project management and quality assurance*** Effectiveness of quality assurance and project management techniques to deliver high quality project outputs on time and on budget
* Clear project programme with suitable proposed resource and personnel allocation for each method task
* Demonstrates how the team will effectively work together and the role and responsibilities of the lead consultant to manage this
* Indication of how project ‘success’ will be defined, continually monitored and evaluated throughout the course of the project
* Demonstrates actions that would be taken to identify and address any potential risks and slippages within the project programme
 | **15** | **5** |
| **4** | **Relevant experience and expertise*** Proposed team demonstrates required skills and expertise as set out in the project specification
* Evidence of team members’ relevant skills and experience is provided, and their role within the project team is made explicit
* Experience and a good track record in delivering successful strategic projects in comparable locations
* Experience of consortium working together previously on similar projects (where applicable)
 | **30** | **5** |
| **5** | **Achieving social value*** Commits to paying London Living Wage (to contract and sub-contract employees)
* Demonstrates accreditation with the London Healthy Workplace Charter (or equivalent commitment)
* Demonstrates an understanding of issues of sustainability, air quality and climate change adaptability
* Responds to the Councils’ declaration of a climate emergency as part of the project approach and proposals, including but not limited to addressing waste reduction, sustainable transport, elimination of the use of single-use plastic, carbon footprint reduction, and air quality concerns
* Demonstrates a commitment towards supporting the local workforce and supply chains, and promoting training, up-skilling and work experience opportunities for the local community (particularly but not exclusively to young residents)
* Provides other informal learning opportunities for stakeholders
* Promotes equality, diversity and accessibility through the proposed engagement with stakeholders
 | **10** | **5** |
| **Quality (Method Statement) Evaluation Mark** | **100** |  |
| **Quality (Method Statement) Score (60% weighting applied)** | **60** |  |

2.3 The Councils reserve the right to challenge any information provided in response to the tender and request further information in support of any statements made therein.

2.4 Where only one (1) submission is received, the Councils reserve the right to enter into dialogue and seek assurances regarding the delivery of the requirement.

2.5 The Method Statement is designed to test tenderers’ ability to deliver the requirements. Potential Providers must answer all questions in full and to the best of their knowledge.

2.6 Tenderers’ responses must clearly demonstrate how they propose to meet the requirements set out in the question and address each element in the order they are asked.

2.7 Tenderers’ responses should be limited to and focused on each of the component parts of the question posed. They should refrain from making generalised statements and providing information not relevant to the topic.

2.8 Whilst there will be no marks given to layout, spelling, punctuation and grammar, it will assist evaluators if attention is paid to these areas including identifying key sections within responses.

2.9 Tenderers will be marked in accordance with the marking scheme set out in Section 4 – Marking Scheme.

2.10 A preferred minimum score of 3 will be set for each Method Statement question and only tenderers who meet this minimum threshold will be eligible for progression to the interview stage of the Quality Evaluation.

**3. Evaluation of Quality - Interviews**

3.1 The three highest scoring tenderers, who have all achieved a minimum score of 3 for each Method Statement question, will be invited to interview, along with any practices within 2% of the third-place score. An interview date of 3rd February 2022 (afternoon) has provisionally been set; interviews will take place via Microsoft Teams and will last for approximately 1 hour.

3.2 The interview panel will include officers relevant to the commission from both Lambeth and Wandsworth Councils.

3.3 Interviews will be scored by the panel against the questions in the table below. A single score for each question or competence will be agreed collectively by the panel.

| **Item** | **Interview Questions** | **Weighting %**  | **Maximum Score per Question** |
| --- | --- | --- | --- |
| **1** | *The Low Line is a project which originated in Southwark - how can we maintain connection and continuity across borough boundaries whilst ensuring the project is authentic to our area and tailored to VNEB neighbourhoods?* | 25 | 5 |
| **2** | *Can you talk about your experience delivering projects with multiple agencies in partnership, or on projects which required a strategic or pan-London approach?* | 25 | 5 |
| **3** | *Bringing local stakeholders on-board and ensuring the project is relevant to existing communities is key – what experience do you have of balancing different stakeholder and community priorities on similar projects?* | 25 | 5 |
| **4** | *The relationship between arts and culture and wayfinding is one strand that will need to be drawn out in this project – how do you feel that this could be achieved, or what factors will need to be considered as part of the project approach to this?* | 25 | 5 |
| **Quality (Interview) Evaluation mark**  | **100** |  |
| **Quality (Interview) Score (10% weighting applied)** | **10** |  |

3.4 The questions/requirements (Method Statement and Interview) are indicated with appropriate weightings and will be evaluated by the panel, whereby an appropriate score will be agreed and added, to form the Quality Evaluation Mark. The score achieved for this section, Quality Evaluation Mark, will be weighted at 70% to give the final score for quality (Quality Score).

**4. Marking Scheme**

4.1 The following scoring matrix will be used:

|  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- |
| **Score** | **Rating** | **Description** |
| 0 | No Response | No proposal has been received. |
| 1 | Unacceptable | A proposal at this rating:* Builds very little or no confidence that the Tenderer can deliver the requirements due to insufficient evidence of relevant ability, understanding, skills, resources and quality measures;
* Builds very little or no confidence that the Tenderer’s approach/solution will deliver the requirements due to insufficient evidence or an inappropriate approach/solution.
 |
| 2 | Poor | A proposal at this rating:* Raises reservations that the Tenderer can deliver the requirements due to insufficient evidence of relevant ability, understanding, skills, resources and quality measures;
* Raises reservations that the Tenderer’s approach/solution will deliver the requirements due to insufficient evidence or an inappropriate approach/solution.

Note: a response at this rating includes reservations which cannot be easily resolved with the Tenderer pre-contract award (i.e. changes which would distort the competition) or during the contract term without impacting time, quality or cost. |
| 3 | Acceptable | A proposal at this rating:* Confirms that the Tenderer can deliver the requirements through evidence of relevant ability, understanding, skills, resources and quality measures;
* Provides an acceptable approach/solution to delivering the requirements utilising standard strategies, plans, tools, methods or technologies.

Note: an acceptable response may include minor reservations that can easily be resolved with the Tenderer pre-contract award (i.e. changes which would not distort the competition) or during the contract term without impacting time, quality or cost. |
| 4 | Good | A proposal at this rating:* Builds confidence that the Tenderer can deliver the requirements through evidence of relevant ability, understanding, skills, resources and quality measures;
* Provides a good approach/solution to delivering the requirements utilising appropriately tailored strategies, plans, tools, methods or technologies.

Note: a good response may include a small number of minor reservations that can easily be resolved with the Tenderer pre-contract award (i.e. changes which would not distort the competition) or during the contract term without impacting time, quality or cost. |
| 5 | Excellent | A proposal at this rating:* Builds a high level of confidence that the Tenderer can deliver the requirements through evidence of relevant ability, understanding, skills, resources and quality measures;
* Provides an exceptional approach/solution to delivering the requirements utilising appropriately tailored and at times innovative strategies, plans, tools, methods or technologies.

Note: an excellent response should not include any reservations. |

**5. Price Evaluation**

5.1 Bidders are asked to price against a Pricing Schedule to give a fixed price that will be evaluated.

5.2 Only the three bidders with the highest quality scores, who are then invited to interview, will have their submitted price evaluated and combined with their Quality Score to give a Final Score.

5.3 For price, each submission will be assessed on the total cost of delivering the programme, using the following equation:



As an example (not related to expected pricing for this commission):

|  |  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| **Price 30%:** |  |  |  |  |  |
|  |   |   |   |  |  |
| A= Tendered price |   |   |   |  |  |
| B= lowest price = |   | £80,000.00 |   |  |  |
|   |   |   |   |  |  |
| **Price Score = (100% -(A-B)/B)\*30 - Lambeth Standard Pricing mechanism** |  |   |   |  |  |
| Bidder name |   | Tendered Price | Price score |  |  |
| Bidder 1 |   | £80,000 | 30.00 |  |  |
| Bidder 2 |   | £100,000 | 22.50 |  |  |
| Bidder 3 |   | £120,000 | 15.00 |  |  |
| Bidder 4  |   | £170,000 | 0.00 |  |  |

5.4 Any tenders which are over twice the price of the lowest tender will be awarded 0 for price.

5.5 Where the Councils deem a price submission to be abnormally low, they shall require the tenderer to explain the price or costs proposed in the request for quote. The tenderer will be given one working day (by 17:00 hours on the working day following the requirement) to respond. A decision to reject the quote will be made if the evidence supplied does not satisfactorily account for the low level of price or cost proposed.

5.6 The Councils reserve the right to undertake a normalisation exercise if we deem items to have been missed or incorrectly priced.

5.7 The contract will be awarded to the tenderer with the highest Final Score. Feedback will be provided to unsuccessful bidders on request.

**6. Clarification Questions and Submission**

6.1 Clarification questions can be submitted via email to both Laura Cheyne, Neighbourhood Regeneration Manager at lcheyne@lambeth.gov.uk and to Rheanne Holm, Head of Neighbourhood Regeneration at rholm@lambeth.gov.uk.

6.2 All questions will receive a response within two working days and anonymised questions, and their responses will be collated and shared with any potential bidders who have also submitted questions or have been in contact with the above officers about the commission. An updated clarification log will also be available as an attachment to the Contracts Finder notice.

 Key Dates for Clarification Questions

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
| 22nd December 2021 to 4th January 2022 | Enquiries received during this time will not be addressed until after 4th January. |
| 19th January 2022 | Cut-off for clarification questions – last date that questions can be submitted and provided with a response. |
| 21st January 2022 | Collated questions and responses shared with bidders as outlined in section 6.2. |

6.3 Submissions should be sent to the following individuals by the submission deadline of 5.00pm on Monday 24th January 2022:

* Laura Cheyne, Neighbourhood Regeneration Manager at lcheyne@lambeth.gov.uk
* Rheanne Holm, Head of Neighbourhood Regeneration at rholm@lambeth.gov.uk
* Declan Costello, Nine Elms Strategic Projects Manager at declan.costello@richmondandwandsworth.gov.uk

6.4 Submissions should comprise completed:

1. Supplier Self Certification Form
2. Method Statement
3. Resource Schedule
4. Pricing Schedule