



## 1 INTRODUCTION

- 1.1 This document provides an overview of the methodology which will be adopted by the Authority and its Agent to evaluate Potential Provider responses to each question set out within the e-Sourcing event. It also sets out the marking scheme which will apply.
- 1.2 The following information has been provided in relation to each question (where applicable);
- 1.2.1 Weighting – highlights the relative importance of the question
  - 1.2.2 Guidance – sets out information for the Potential Providers to consider
  - 1.2.3 Marking Scheme – details the marks available to evaluators during evaluation
- 1.3 The defined terms used in the ITT document shall apply to this document.

## 2 OVERVIEW

- 2.1 The e-Sourcing event is broken down into the following Questionnaires:

Questionnaire Reference	Questionnaire Title
1	KEY PARTICIPATION REQUIREMENTS
2	CONFLICTS OF INTEREST
3	INFORMATION ONLY
4	QUALITY - METHODOLOGY
5	QUALITY - EXPERIENCE
6	PRICE
7	PRESENTATION

### 2.2 Quality Evaluation Process

2.2.1 The evaluation of each response to the Quality/Service Delivery Questionnaire(s) will be conducted and consensus checked in accordance with the Consensus Marking Procedure set out in paragraph 2.3 below.

2.2.2 Each response to questions within the Quality/Service Delivery Questionnaire(s) will be marked in accordance with the table below:



Mark	Comment
0	Failed to provide confidence that the proposal will meet the requirements. An unacceptable response with serious reservations.
25	A Poor response with reservations. The response lacks convincing detail with risk that the proposal will not be successful in meeting all the requirements.
50	Meets the requirements – the response generally meets the requirements, but lacks sufficient detail to warrant a higher mark.
75	A Good response that meets the requirements with good supporting evidence. Demonstrates good understanding.
100	An Excellent comprehensive response that meets the requirements. Indicates an excellent response with detailed supporting evidence and no weaknesses resulting in a high level of confidence.

2.2.3 Each mark achieved will be multiplied by the corresponding weighting to provide an overall question score.

2.2.4 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”).

## 2.3 Consensus Marking Procedure

2.3.1 Tenders that are scored and require evaluation will be evaluated in accordance with the procedure described in this paragraph.

2.3.2 The Consensus Marking Procedure is a two-step process, comprising of:

- 2.3.2.1 Independent evaluation; and
- 2.3.2.2 Group consensus marking.

2.3.3 During the independent evaluation process, each evaluator will separately (i.e. without conferring with other evaluators) scrutinise the quality of answers given by Potential Providers in their Tender. Each evaluator will then allocate a mark for the answer in accordance with the Marking Scheme applicable to that question.

2.3.4 The Agent will review the marks allocated by the individual evaluators before facilitating a group consensus marking meeting.

2.3.5 During the meeting, the evaluators will discuss the independent marks until they reach a consensus regarding the marks that should be attributed to each Potential Providers’ answer to the questions.



2.3.6 Once all quality responses have been evaluated in accordance with Section 8 of the Invitation to Tender the individual scores attributed to each response will be added together to provide a ‘Quality Score’.

## 2.4 Price Evaluation Process

2.4.1 Prices submitted by Potential Providers’ in the Price Schedule will be recorded and evaluated in accordance with the following process.

2.4.2 Potential Providers’ are required to provide a completed pricing schedule against the ‘Price’ Questionnaire within the e-Sourcing event.

2.4.3 Prices offered will be evaluated against the range of prices submitted by all Potential Providers for that item.

2.4.4 The Potential Provider with the lowest price shall be awarded the Maximum Score Available. The remaining Potential Providers shall be awarded a percentage of the Maximum Score Available equal to their price, relative to the lowest price submitted.

2.4.5 The calculation used is the following:

$$2.4.6 = \frac{\text{Lowest Price Tendered} \times \text{Maximum Score Available}}{\text{Tender price}}$$

Potential Provider	Price Submitted	Score Calculation	Maximum Score Available	Score Awarded
Potential Provider A	£1,000	£1,000/£1,000 *100	100	100
Potential Provider B	£2,000	£1,000/£2,000 *100	100	50
Potential Provider C	£2,500	£1,000/£2,500 *100	100	40

## 2.5 Final score

2.5.1 The Quality Score achieved at stage one (1) will be added to the Price Score to determine a ranking for each Potential Provider (“Stage One Score”).

2.5.2 The 4 highest ranked Potential Providers, who achieve the minimum acceptable Quality Score and are within 10% of the first ranked Potential Provider at stage one (1) will be invited to participate in stage two (2).



2.5.3 The Quality/Price Score at stage one (1) will be combined with the Quality Score at stage two (2) to determine the final score for each Potential Provider (“Final Score”).

### 3 EVALUATION CRITERIA

- 3.1 A summary of all the questions contained within the e-Sourcing event, along with; the minimum acceptable score, maximum score available and weighting (where applicable) are set out below:
- 3.2 Questionnaires 1 and 2 contain ‘Pass/Fail’ questions and act as a doorway for progression to the following stages of the evaluation. Potential Providers are strongly advised to read and understand the specific guidance provided before responding to these questionnaires.
- 3.3 Questionnaire 3 is for information only. Although this questionnaire does not form part of the evaluation process, Potential Providers are advised to complete it in full as any omissions could affect the award process.
- 3.4 The Authority and its Agent reserve the right to challenge any information provided in response to Questionnaire 3 and request further information in support of any statements made therein.

GUIDANCE			
Question Number	Question	Max Score	Weighting (%)
	The following questions are ‘Pass/Fail’ questions. If Potential Providers are unwilling or unable to answer “Yes”, their submission will be deemed non-compliant and shall be rejected. Potential Providers should confirm their answer by selecting the appropriate option from the drop down menu.		
[1.1]	Have you read, understood and agree with Appendix A, Terms of Participation? By answering “Yes”, you are confirming your ‘Declaration of Compliance’ at Annex 1 of Appendix A, Terms of Participation.	Pass/Fail	N/A
[1.2]	Have you read, understood and accepted the Invitation to Tender and all associated appendices, specifically Appendix B, Statement of Requirement?	Pass/Fail	N/A
[1.3]	Do you agree, without caveats or limitations, that in the event that you are successful the Crown Commercial Service’s Terms and Conditions within Appendix C, Draft Contract Document will govern the provision of this contract?	Pass/Fail	N/A



[1.4]	Do you confirm your Organisation’s e-Sourcing suite profile is complete and accurate at the time of Tendering and that any amendments made following acceptance of this event will be notified to the buyer in writing.	Pass/Fail	N/A
-------	---	-----------	-----

**QUESTIONNAIRE 2 – CONFLICTS OF INTEREST**

<b>GUIDANCE</b>	<p>Question 2.1 is a ‘Yes/No’ question and will dictate whether or not question 2.2 needs to be answered.</p> <p>Question 2.2 is a Pass / Fail question. Potential Providers are required to provide details of how the identified conflict will be mitigated. The Contracting Authority will review the mitigation in line with the perceived conflict of interest, to determine what level of risk this poses to them. Therefore if Potential Providers cannot or are unwilling to suitably demonstrate that they have suitable safeguards to mitigate any risk then their Tender will be deemed non-compliant and will be rejected.</p>		
-----------------	--	--	--

Question Number	Question	Max Score	Weighting (%)
[2.1]	Please confirm whether you have any potential, actual or perceived conflicts of interest that may be relevant to this requirement.	None	N/A
[2.2]	We require that any potential, actual or perceived conflicts of interest in respect of this ITT are identified in writing and that companies outline what safeguards would be put in place to mitigate the risk of actual or perceived conflicts arising during the delivery of these services.	Pass/Fail	N/A

**QUESTIONNAIRE 3 – INFORMATION ONLY**

<b>GUIDANCE</b>	<p>The following questions are for information only and do not form part of the evaluation. Information provided in response to these questions may be used in preparation of any Contract Award and any omissions may delay completion of this Tender exercise.</p>		
-----------------	--	--	--

Question Number	Question	Max Score	Weighting (%)
[3.1]	Please provide the name, office address, telephone number and email address for your organisation’s	None	N/A



	Tender point of contract.		
[3.2]	Please confirm whether your organisation is an SME as defined within <a href="#">EU recommendation 2003/361</a>	None	N/A
[3.3]	Please provide details of any sub-contractors you propose to use in order to meet your obligations should you be awarded a Contract. Your response must include their; <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Trading Name(s)</li> <li>• Registered Address(es) and contact details</li> <li>• Goods/Services to be provided</li> </ul>	None	N/A
[3.4]	If you are the Lead contact for a Group of Economic Operators, please provide details of all the members of the Group. Your response must include their; <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Trading Names(s)</li> <li>• Registered address(es)</li> <li>• Dunns Number(s)</li> <li>• Role/responsibility within the Group</li> </ul>	None	N/A

- 3.5 The following Quality/Service Delivery Questionnaires are designed to test Potential Providers' ability to deliver the requirement as set out in Appendix B, Statement of Requirements. Potential Providers *MUST* answer all Quality/Service Delivery questions.
- 3.6 Potential Providers must achieve the minimum acceptable Quality Score, as described, for each of the questions below. Only those responses which achieve the minimum acceptable Quality Score will be included in the Price Evaluation Process.
- 3.7 Where none of the submissions received meet the minimum acceptable Quality Score, the Authority reserves the right to enter into dialogue and seek assurances regarding the delivery of the requirement prior to including those submissions in the Price Evaluation Process.
- 3.8 Potential Providers must provide attachments as specified below. Question text fields must be populated with detailed references to relevant attachments to confirm that they have been uploaded.
- 3.9 Potential Providers should set out their response in the following format;



- 3.9.1 Attachment 1 – Questions 1,2 and 3 in PDF format attached at question 1 only on the eSourcing portal.
- 3.9.2 Attachment 2 – Questions 4 and 5 in PDF format attached at question 4 only on the eSourcing portal.
- 3.9.3 Attachment 3 – Question 6 (Appendix E) in an Excel file attached at questions 6 only on the eSourcing portal.
- 3.10 Potential Providers should confirm within the text fields of the portal that they have attached their response as a PDF.
- 3.11 Potential Providers’ 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.
- 3.12 Potential Providers’ 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.
- 3.13 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.
- 3.14 Potential providers will be marked in accordance with the marking scheme at Section 2.
- 3.15 The page limit on attachments is set at 10 sides (5 pages) of A4, although CVs are not included within this page limit. Attachments 1 and 2 must be submitted in PDF format and be in Ariel font size 11. Attachment 3 should be submitted as an Excel file as provided (Appendix E).

**QUESTIONNAIRE 4 – QUALITY - METHODOLOGY**

**Weighting – 35%**

**All Potential Providers MUST answer ALL the following questions**



Question Number	Question	Minimum Acceptable Score	Maximum Available Score	Weighting 100%
4.1	Please describe how you will plan and execute this project as defined within Appendix B. Please also include the range of skill sets and knowledge needed, and how you will ensure such resources are available at the right time. Please include any third party involvement that might be required.	50	100	70%
4.2	Please provide CVs of the key people who will take part in the review outlining their experience and capabilities in this area. CVs will not form part of the page limit.	50	100	30%
<b>QUESTIONNAIRE 5 – QUALITY - EXPERIENCE</b>			<b>Weighting – 25%</b>	
<b>All Potential Providers MUST answer ALL the following questions</b>				
Question Number	Question	Minimum Acceptable Score	Maximum Available Score	Weighting 100%
5.1	Please provide details of your experience and knowledge of the Police IT network and expertise in risk management and your understanding of the information risk management landscape that the College operates in.	50	100	60%
5.2	Please provide two examples of projects that you have delivered to timescale and of high quality in the last two years (at least one of these should be a public sector example). The examples should be of similar size, scope and complexity	50	100	40%



	to this project.			
<b>QUESTIONNAIRE 6 – PRICE</b>		<b>Weighting – 30 %</b>		
<b>GUIDANCE</b>	<p>Potential Providers must upload the price schedule at the question level on the e-Sourcing event.</p> <p>With reference to Appendix B - Section 4 - Scope of the Requirement, please provide a transparent breakdown of the tasks and cost to deliver this requirement. This will be the total capped cost to deliver the requirement as specified in Appendix B - Statement of requirements.</p> <p>Prices should be submitted in pounds Sterling inclusive of any expenses but exclusive of VAT.</p> <p>Potential Providers will be marked in accordance with the marking scheme at Section 2.</p>			
Question Number	Question	Max Score		
6.1	Please confirm, by selecting 'YES' that you have attached a completed Price Schedule to the response to this question. In so doing, you are also confirming that prices offered are inclusive of any expenses, exclusive of VAT and firm for a period of 90 days following the Deadline for Submission.	100		

**4 STAGE TWO**

<b>QUESTIONNAIRE 7 – PRESENTATION</b>		<b>Weighting – 10%</b>
<b>GUIDANCE</b>	<p>The 4 highest ranked potential Suppliers, who achieve the minimum acceptable quality score and are within the 10% of the first ranked potential Supplier at stage (1) will be invited to participate in stage (2). The quality/price score at stage (1) will be combined with the quality score at stage (2) to determine the final score for each potential Supplier (“final score”).</p> <p>Potential Providers will be invited to make a presentation based upon their written Quality response and to respond to questions prompted by their written Quality Response and their presentation.</p> <p>As per the indicative timetable in the ITT, specific questions to all invited</p>	



	<p>Tenderers will be provided a minimum of 48 hours prior to Presentations taking place for the Tenderers to answer and present back in the presentation.</p> <p>Timeslots will be provided by invitation. Potential Providers are requested to indicate by selecting 'YES' on the CCS portal that they understand the presentation process and to acknowledge the dates provided.</p> <p>The key members of the team that will carry out the work on this contract will be expected to attend the presentations, which will take place on Monday 27<sup>th</sup> November 2017. Potential Suppliers will be invited for presentation on or before Thursday 23<sup>rd</sup> November 2017. We expect the presentations to last around 45 minutes.</p> <p>The format of the presentation is set out below, each section will be scored as shown.</p>		
Question Number	Question	Max Score	Weighting
7.1	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Presentation of overview of proposal – 10 to 15 minutes</li> <li>• Q&amp;A from tender evaluation panel - all potential suppliers invited to presentation will be sent the same set of questions, along with their invitation</li> <li>• Discussion, including an opportunity for suppliers to ask questions of the COP tender evaluation panel (not scored).</li> </ul>	100	100%