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**V3 5th June 2016 with typo removed**

Method Statements should be of up to 3000 words and should focus on addressing the matters raised in the method statement description.

|  |
| --- |
| **Section 1 – Price** |
| **60%** | **Price** |
| **Section 2 – Method Statements** |
| 13% | MS1: Base Container Specification- How you would ensure the quality of the containers before conversion |
| 13% | MS2: Conversion quality- how you would change the containers to the Council’s specification  |
| 14% | MS3: Ease of assembly- how you would configure the containers for easy assembly,  |
| **40%** | **Quality** |

**Table 1**

***TENDER PRICE EVALUATION***

The following methodology will be used in evaluating any tender price submission.

The evaluation of the tender price will be based on the scoring criteria as indicated below subject to the following parameters.

|  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- |
| **Element** | **Number** | **Cost per Container** | **Sub total £** |
| 20 foot containers as per specification | 30 |  |  |
| 40 foot containers as per specification | 6 |  |  |
|  |  |  |  |
|  |  |  |  |
|  |  |  |  |
|  |  |  |  |
|  |  |  |  |
|  |  |  |  |
|  |  |  |  |
| **Total Price as Bid Back for evaluation purposes** |  |  |  |

**Table 2**

Your bid back price will be evaluated based on the following percentage weighting:-

Your total price as bid back will be evaluated as follows:

*Lowest submitted x60%*

*Your price*

These pricing scores will be added to give your total financial score

**SECTION 3 – Method Statements**

Please address the description of each method statement.

Each of the following method statements will be marked out of 5 as below. The score out of 5 will then be multiplied by the relevant percentage for each method statement

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
| **0** | **Unacceptable Response**No response given, response not relevant or Method Statement not answered. |
| **1** | **Poor Response**The response is partially compliant, but with serious deficiencies in meeting service requirements (any supporting evidence is minimal). |
| **2** | **Fair Response**The response is partially compliant (some evidence may be provided which supports compliant elements) with shortfalls in meeting service requirements. |
| **3** | **Satisfactory Response**The response is compliant with service requirements likely to be met, any concerns are of a minor nature. |
| **4** | **Good Response**The response is compliant and offers relevant evidence to support their claims, clearly indicating that service requirements would be met.  |
| **5** | **Excellent Response**The response is compliant and offers relevant detailed evidence to support their claims, clearly demonstrating a comprehensive understanding of the service requirements. |

**Method Statement 1 -** Base Container Specification- How you would ensure the quality of the containers before conversion

**Method Statement 2** Conversion quality- how you would change the containers to the Council’s specification

**Method Statement 3 -** Ease of assembly- how you would configure the containers for easy assembly