

## **1.0 Evaluation of Expressions of Interest**

The evaluation criteria will be based upon some or all of the following aspects of the Bidders' proposals (not in order of significance):

### **Commercial**

- i. Competitive price
- ii. Price clarity
- iii. Management information provisions
- iv. Contractual compliance

### **Service Capability**

- i. Service delivery experience
- ii. Service delivery models (including business continuity)
- iii. Quality
- iv. Compliance with Service Levels
- v. Culture and ability to work with SHAP
- vi. Ability to adapt to changing business requirements
- vii. Continuous improvement plans

### **Long term roadmap proposals**

- i. Innovation and added value
- ii. Strategic fit

#### **Financial**

- i. Financial strength demonstrated across the Bidder's group structure. Please include your company's revenue and net results for the last two years with your response.
- ii. An established financial track record demonstrated for the legal entity that SHAP would be contracting with (please include your company's registration number and registered address in your response).

### **Level of Compliance with this tender**

- i. Understanding of all parts of the tender
- ii. Proposals / bids provided are in accordance with the Instructions
- iii. Adherence to the timescales to send back responses

Throughout the process SHAP will continually assess all contact with the bidder's organisations including compliance to the process, presentations and on-site representatives. SHAP reserves the right at its sole discretion to disqualify without further consideration any submission that does not satisfy this basic requirement.

SHAP' choice of supplier will be made on the basis of the Most Economically Advantageous Tender (MEAT) and we will assess economic advantageousness having regard to the criteria set out below.

Quality elements will attract a maximum of 60% of the available score and price scores attract a maximum of 40% of the available score (total 100%).

| Category   | Weighting   |
|--|-------------|
| Quality / experience and technical proposed solution | 60%         |
| Price  | 40%         |
| <b>Total</b>   | <b>100%</b> |

## 2.0 Scoring Methodology

### 2.1 Quality Scores

Responses to each of quality elements will be scored out of a maximum of 10 marks, using a standard method of scoring as set out in the table below:

| Assessment   | Score | Judgement/Criteria for assessment of answer  |
|--------------|-------|--|
| Exceptional  | 10    | The standard of the service offered and demonstrated experience and expertise demonstrates strengths, no weaknesses or omissions and exceeds expectations in some or all respects. |
| Good         | 7-9   | The standard of the service offered and demonstrated experience and expertise fully meets expectations.  |
| Satisfactory | 4-6   | The standard of the service offered and demonstrated experience and expertise are acceptable but with some minor reservations.   |

|              |     |   |
|--------------|-----|---|
| Poor         | 1-3 | The standard of the service offered and demonstrated experience and expertise are deficient in certain areas where the details of relevant proposal require the reviewer to make assumptions. |
| Unacceptable | 0   | The standard of the service offered and demonstrated experience and expertise are unacceptable or non-existent or there is a failure to properly address any issues.                          |

The written submissions will be reviewed and scored by members of the scoring team. The same assessors will score each set of written submissions to ensure total consistency.

The scores for each quality question will then be added up to give an overall quality % score out of 60.

## 2.2 Price Scores

Each submitted Expression of Interest will receive a score against the total price, which shall be calculated by reference to the lowest total price submitted. The lowest tendered total price will receive a score of 40. The remaining tenders will then be scored on a standard deviation approach, based upon the difference between their tender and the lowest tender.

a) *Example: if the lowest tenderer bids [a price of £20,000] and another tenderer bids £25,000 then the £20,000 bid will receive a score of 40 out of 40. The score for the £25,000 bid, being 25% higher than the lowest tender, will reduce by 25%, therefore receiving a score of 30 out of 40.*

When scoring the tenders, if SHAP consider that a tendered value is abnormally low, SHAP will seek an explanation or further breakdown from the tenderer, in accordance with Regulation 69(1) of the Public Contracts Regulations. If the tenderer is able to satisfy SHAP that it can provide the services for the price tendered then the price will be benchmarked as set out above. However, if the tenderer cannot satisfy SHAP that it can provide the services for the price tendered, it will be awarded a score of 0 (zero) and the next lowest value will then be used as the benchmark (assuming it too is not judged to be abnormally low) or (in its discretion) SHAP may reject the tender in accordance with Regulation 69(1) – (5) of the Public Contracts Regulations 2015.

The remainder of the tenders, higher than the benchmark tender will then be scored in respect of their deviation from the benchmark tender in the same way as described above.

B) *Example: where Tenderer 1 is considered to have submitted a tender, which SHAP considers to be abnormally low such that the services cannot be delivered, then scoring would be as follows:*

|              | <b>Tenderer 1</b> | <b>Tenderer 2</b> | <b>Tenderer 3</b> | <b>Tenderer 4</b> |
|--------------|-------------------|-------------------|-------------------|-------------------|
| Basket Value | £50,000           | £100,000          | £110,000          | £120,000          |
| Score        | 0                 | 10                | 9                 | 8                 |

Tenderer 1: price deemed to be unrealistic and/or unsustainable so scores 0.

Tenderer 2: price deemed to be benchmark for scoring and scores 10.

Tenderer 3: the value is 10% higher than the benchmark value and therefore tenderer 3's score is 10 less ( $10 \times 10\%$  [1]) = 9

Tenderer 4: the value is 20% higher than the benchmark value and therefore tenderer 4's score is 10 less ( $10 \times 20\%$  [2]) = 8

During the evaluation of pricing submissions, tenderers may be required to clarify aspects of their submission in order to ensure that they have understood the specification requirements. Tenderers will be contacted individually regarding any such clarifications and a clarification interview maybe requested. Please note that the deadlines for clarification responses may be short, but must be met in order that pricing submissions can be included within the evaluation process.

You are reminded that throughout the process SHAP will continually assess all contact with the bidders' organisations including compliance to the process, presentations and on-site representatives. SHAP reserves the right at its sole discretion to disqualify without further consideration any submission that does not satisfy this basic requirement.