**RFQ Evaluation Criteria**

**Award Criteria**

Evaluation Criteria

It is the Authority’s intention to select the tender which represents the most economically advantageous tender (MEAT) regarding technical expertise and price against the evaluation criteria described below:

**Ratio:**

The following ratio will determine the weightings of the scores elements of the evaluation:

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
| Evaluation Criteria  | Criteria Weighting %  |
| Commercial  | Compliant/Non-compliant |
| Technical Part 1 | Compliant/Non-compliantFull compliance against the non-scored questions in the Schedule of Requirements |
| Technical Part 2 |  70%See Technical Evaluation Criteria below |
| Financial  |  30% See Financial Evaluation Criteria below |

*Annex B - Table 1: Evaluation Criteria and Weightings*

Any tender that is not compliant against **all** mandatory criteria of the Commercial and Technical Part 1 evaluation will not be taken forward to the Technical Part 2 and Financial evaluation and **will not receive a score**.

**Commercial Evaluation Criteria**

Compliant/Non-compliant against unqualified acceptance of the MoD contract Terms and Conditions SC1B

**Calculation**

Tenders will be technically evaluated by the DE&S Project Professionals team. The chosen Technical Evaluators will review un-priced elements of the tenders and score them based on methodology detailed below.

There are scored, Compliant/Non-compliant and Pass/Fail elements to the Evaluation criteria. The Commercial and Technical Part 1 criteria are Compliant/Non-compliant or Pass/Fail and the tender must be compliant with these criteria to progress. The Technical Part 2 and Financial scores will be weighted according to the ratio at Table 2 to Annex B and added together to give the final score, from which the tenders will be ranked and the tenderer with the highest score will be deemed to be the Most Economically Advantageous tender and the contract award will proceed accordingly.

In the event that two or more fully compliant tenders receive the same score, the tender with the higher pass rate will be declared the winning bid.

 **Technical Evaluation Criteria**

The Pass/Fail elements are detailed in the Table on Page 6 – Pass means fully able to deliver outputs against the requirement. The scored Technical Part 2 will be judged by how well the tenderer’s response meets the stated criteria and will be awarded a score of 0-5, as shown in the example below. That score will then be subject to the multiplier to reflect the percentage of the evaluation criteria allocated to that question.

Example: As the evaluation criterion is weighted at 70%, the total score achieved out of 20 will be divided by the total score multiplied by 70; so if a Provider scores 8 (2 marks in each question) from the available 5 marks this will equate to a result of 28 by using the following calculation:

(Total Score/Total Points Available) x Criterion Weighting ((8/20) x 70 = 28)

**Compliant/Non-compliant Criteria**

The following table sets out the mandatory Pass/Fail Criteria for Technical Part 1 Evaluation that will be used to evaluate tenders. The numbering below maps across to the EVM Foundation & Practitioner training statement of requirement.

Please indicate your response to these criteria below:

|  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- |
| Task  |   | Evidence Required |
| 1.Background |   | N/A |
| 2. Scope of Requirement |   | N/A |
| 3. Affiliation | The provider must be an Accredited Training Organisation (ATO) (or an affiliate of) for APMG International in order to provide courses and exams in APMG International qualification schemes | Please confirm you are an Accredited Training Organisation (ATO) (or an affiliate of) for APMG International in order to provide courses and exams in APMG International qualification schemesa. Pass b. Fail |
| 4. Timing | Maximum of 12 classroom based training events until 31 Mar 2020Courses are scheduled for:Courses are scheduled for:1st July- 5nd July 201919th-23rd August 2019 A further 10 courses between contract award -31st March 2020 as agreed between the partiesOption Years(Should the Authority exercise the option for the further 2 x 1 year) with a schedule to determine by the Authority – this may be at short notice Option Year 1Maximum of 12 classroom based training events - 1 Apr 20 – 31 Mar 21, Option Year 2Maximum of 12 classroom based training events 1 Apr 21 – 31 Mar 22  | Please confirm you are able to meet the timelines of the requirement.a. Pass b. Fail |
| 5. Class size | The Provider shall make provision for up to 14 students per class  | Please confirm that 14 delegates can be accommodated per class: a. Pass b. Fail |
| 6. Location | The Authority will provide a classroom environment at either MoD Abbey wood or within a 5 mile radius for the delivery of the training courseIt may be necessary to carry out courses at other UK locations although this is rare and subject to demand; the majority of training will be at MoD Abbey Wood | N/A |
| 7.Course Administration and Deliverables |  The provider will deliver all pre- course reading to a nominated point of contactThe provider will deliver all course learning materials and accompanying structured course notes for each course. The provider will provide student evaluations, course feedback and exam outcomesThe provider shall maintain a pass rate no less than 80%. If 80% is not met, the Authority will hold a review with the provider invoking the reduction to the maximum cost in line with the RFQ. The Authority reserves the right to terminate the contract should pass rates not improve.The provider is to provide a copy of APM Planning, Scheduling, Monitoring and Control – the Practical Project Management of Time, Cost and Risk (ISBN 978-1-903494-44-8) per attendee to be delivered in conjunction with pre-course reading material | Please confirm whether you are able to meet the Course Administration and Deliverables: a) Passb) Fail  |
| 8.Management Information | The provider shall issue a copy of the examination results and success rate metrics after every course to the nominated point of contact | Please confirm whether you are able to meet the Management Information deliverables: a) Passb) Fail |
| 9. Alternative Venue | The provider may be asked to source a venue within a 5 mile radius on MoD Abbey Wood should facilities be unavailable. The Authority will inform the provider whether or not provision of venue is required on a course by course basis. The provider shall ensure that the venue provides an acceptable classroom training environmentVenue costs will be firm for each year and will be taken from the providers response to the RFQ | A firm price has been provided against venue hire if required: a) Passb) FailThe price will not be evaluated during the financial evaluation |

**Scored Technical Criteria**

The following table sets out the scored element of the technical Part 2 evaluation:

|  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- |
| Contractors Personnel |   |   |
| Trainers | The provider shall provide suitably qualified and experienced personnel to deliver the training. The provider must demonstrate knowledge and experience of delivering APMG Project Planning and Control Foundation and Practitioner level training through the provision of Curriculum Vitae’s (CV’s)  | Please provide details of the trainers that you propose to deliver the training. You should provide a CV for each proposed trainer. In addition, please ensure that the following are included: 1) [5 marks] The trainer’s previous professional experience of delivering APMG PPC Foundation and Practitioner training.2. The trainers experience in delivery of APMG PPC training courses, including:1. How many times the trainer has delivered the required course at Foundation & Practitioner level in the last 12 months (March 18 - March 19) and,
2. The average pass rate achieved for those courses.

3. Whether the proposed trainer holds the desired Baseline or Security Clearance and when it expires or is willing to obtain it.4. At least two contacts who can be approached to provide references on the trainer’s behalf. A CV should be supplied for each proposed trainer on no more than two sides of A4 paper each in size ten arial font along with a summary paper (adhering to the page limit set out above)  |

The criteria for assessing the tender response to this scored question as follows:

|  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- |
| Evaluation Criteria70% | “No Evidence/Limited Confidence” RFQ Response | “Good Confidence” RFQ Response | “High Confidence” RFQ Response |
| SCORE | 0 | 2 | 5 |
| The provider’s response demonstrates that the proposed trainer(s): |   |   |   |
| 1.Are SQEP to provide training on APMG Project Planning and Control training courses at Foundation and Practitioner level30% | No evidence, or evidence does not demonstrate that the trainer has the necessary skills and ability to provide the required training  | Response demonstrates that the trainer has the skills and ability to deliver the training required at an acceptable standard | Response demonstrates that the trainer has the skills and ability to deliver the training required above the acceptable standard |
| 2.Are SQEP to deliver quality outputs15% | No evidence, or evidence does not demonstrate that the trainer has the necessary skills and ability to deliver training | Response demonstrates delivery of the required courses within the last twelve months with an average of 80%+ of delegates achieving a pass rate | Response demonstrates the required courses within the last twelve months with an average of 90%+ of delegated achieving a pass rate  |
| 3.Pass rate committing to achieve15% | No evidence, or evidence does not demonstrate a commitment to achieve pass rates in the future | Response demonstrates a commitment to deliver the required courses moving forward with an average of 80%+ of delegates achieving a pass rate | Response demonstrates a commitment to deliver the required courses moving forward with an average of 90%+ delegates achieving a pass rate |
| 4.Current level of security clearance 10% | No evidence, or trainer not willing to gain any security clearance  | Currently holds ‘Baseline Personnel Security Standard’ (that does not expire before 31st March 2020) and is willing to gain Security Clearance | Currently holds ‘Security clearance’ (that does not expire before 31 March 2020) |

*Annex B – Table 2*

**Financial Evaluation Criteria – 30%**

The Financial Evaluation Criteria will be scored out of 30%. The lowest Maximum Price for the delivery receiving 30% of the marks, the remaining quotes will then be marked on a pro-rata basis.

Financial Response

All figures should be provided in £GBP and Excluding VAT

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
| Financial Evaluation Response |  |
| The score relating to the Financial Evaluation Criteria carries a weighting of 30% for the overall tender evaluation based on all 3 years |  |
| Ending 31 March 2020 |  |
| Course Element | **Cost** |
| Maximum Price Per course  |   |
| Cost per additional courses |   |
| Maximum Number of Courses  | 12 |
| Maximum Price (all courses until March 2020) |   |
| Venue – Firm Price cost (not evaluated) |  |
| Travel and Subsistence  |  |

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
| Option Year 1 - Ending 31 March 2021 |  |
| Course Element | **Cost** |
| Maximum Price Per course  |   |
| Cost per additional courses |   |
| Maximum Number of Courses  | 12 |
| Maximum Price (all courses until March 2021) |   |
| Venue – Firm Price cost (not evaluated) |  |
| Travel and Subsistence |  |

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
| Option Year 2 - Ending 31 March 2022 |  |
| Course Element | **Cost** |
| Maximum Price Per course  |   |
| Cost per additional courses |   |
| Maximum Number of Courses  | 12 |
| Maximum Price (all courses until March 2022) |   |
| Venue – Firm Price cost (not evaluated) |  |
| Travel and Subsistence  |  |

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
| TOTAL Maximum Price for 12 courses per annum including Exam Fees  |   |

Annex B – Table 3

Reduction to Maximum Price should the pass rate per course of 80% not be met

|  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- |
| 80% | 70%-79% | 60%-69% | Less than 60% |
| No reduction | Minus \_\_% | Minus \_\_% | Minus % |

Notes

1 – The number of delegates per course will be variable by agreement. The table above should be completed with your pricing offer per course to give a maximum price, and then the amount by which that price would be reduced should a pass mark of 80% per course not be reached.

2 - The option years April 2020 - March 2021 and April 2021 – March 2022 will be exercised at the sole discretion of the Authority.

3 – The maximum price for all courses is the only scored element of the Financial Criteria.