

PART 4

Tender Evaluation Model

4.1 Award Criteria and Evaluation Criteria

All Tenders received will be evaluated and Contract(s) awarded on the basis of the offer that is the most economically advantageous to the Authority. Bidders can either bid for individual lots or both lots.

Tenderers must demonstrate how they will meet the Authority's requirements, set out in the Specification, both in terms of the cost and quality of the provision and the method by which it will deliver that provision.

It is the Tenderers responsibility to ensure that Tenders contain sufficient information to allow a complete evaluation to be conducted.

It should be noted that once a desk-top evaluation has been undertaken a further on-site evaluation of the preferred bidder/ bidders will be undertaken to verify information provided and give confidence that the final chosen supplier meets the requirements of the St Helena Government.

4.2 Mandatory requirements

Tenderers submitting a response to Lot 1 must have, or work with an aircraft operator that has, the relevant approvals from the aircraft operator's regulator. As an example, based on a South African regulated company, the following approvals must be in place and demonstrated as part of this tender process:

- i. An Air Operator's Certificate, covering the aircraft types being offered, and permitting operations to St Helena
- ii. Adequate insurance for the aircraft, passengers and third party liabilities
- iii. Compliance with the regulatory requirements detailed in SA-CATS 138 Air Ambulance Operations

4.3 Key dates

| | |
|--|------------------|
| Open Tender Issue | 23 December 2015 |
| Tender Closing Date | 15 February 2016 |
| Tender Evaluations / Interviews / Checks | March 2016 |
| Interviews and Site Visits | April 2016 |
| Final Determinations / Notification of decisions | May 2016 |
| Contracting | June 2016 |

4.4 Evaluation Criteria

Bidders are invited to submit tenders for either Lot 1, Lot 2 or both.

[Lot 1: Emergency Aero Medical Evacuation Service](#)

The Award Criteria for the above lot is as follows:

- 50% cost.
- 50% technical / quality.

Lot 1: Cost Criteria

| Ref | Criteria | Weighting |
|-----------|--|-------------|
| C1 | Pricing based on Option 1 or Option 2 Scenarios (Supplier to dictate how option 2 price is rebated on the first 15 Medevac flights) – see Part 5 Cost matrix for the calculation | 100% |

Lot 1: Technical/ Quality Criteria

| Ref | Criteria | Weighting |
|------------|---|------------|
| TQ1 | Guaranteed Response Time for Emergency Call (Arrival within 24 Hrs) | 25% |
| TQ2 | Range of aircraft types available and Medical Equipment Provision | 20% |
| TQ3 | Capability to operate without a technical stop between South Africa and St Helena | 10% |
| TQ4 | On Flight Medical Staffing, Experience and Qualifications | 20% |
| TQ5 | Aircraft Capacity (More than 1 Medevac Passenger) | 25% |

Lot 2: Specialist secondary/tertiary healthcare provision in South Africa

The Award Criteria for the above lot is as follows:

- 40% cost
- 60% technical / quality

Lot 2: Cost Criteria (Notes discounts will be benchmarked against current pricing paid)

| Ref | Criteria | Weighting |
|-----------|--|------------|
| C1 | Discount offered to SHG against standard Scale of Fees for Private Hospitals | 35% |
| C2 | Discount offered against standard published tariffs for procedures and consumables used during any hospital stay | 35% |
| C3 | Ability for SHG to access Hospital Supply Chain for discounts in Pharmaceuticals, Consumables, Equipment and Staff | 20% |
| C4 | The arithmetically weighted average of the costs associated with the provision of medical professionals to accompany patients on the scheduled flights | 10% |

Lot 2: Technical/ Quality Criteria

| Ref | Criteria | Weighting |
|------------|--|------------|
| TQ1 | Physical location of private healthcare / private hospital facilities (including the proximity to air access – Johannesburg); Preference Pretoria and/or Cape Town | 20% |
| TQ2 | The scope and level of hospital/technical facilities provided (as per SHG Specification Part 6) | 20% |
| TQ3 | Quality of care provision by the private healthcare / private hospital facility (as evidenced by external accreditation / ISO certification / survey reports) | 20% |
| TQ4 | Availability of dedicated concierge / patient transport / ambulance transfer facilities | 10% |
| TQ5 | Access to a pathology laboratory service (for those services unable to be performed on St Helena), including transfer of specimens from O. R. Tambo International Airport to the designated laboratory | 5% |
| TQ6 | Access to a radiology reporting service (X-ray, Ultrasound, 16-slice CT Scan) | 5% |

| | | |
|------------|---|------------|
| TQ7 | Ability to deploy nursing / paramedical / medical personnel on the outbound commercial flight from O. R. Tambo International Airport to St Helena, to accompany medically stable patient(s) from St Helena to a private healthcare / private hospital facility in Johannesburg / Pretoria (Note: the expected duration of the flight time is 4-5 hours in each direction, with a one hour turnaround time at St Helena International Airport) | 10% |
| TQ8 | Ability to facilitate transfer of non-stretcher (i.e. either ambulant or wheelchair-bound) patients who arrive at O. R. Tambo International Airport to either Cape Town or an alternative location in South Africa to receive medical treatment in healthcare / private hospital facilities at that location rather than in Johannesburg / Pretoria | 10% |

4.5 Evaluation process

Technical / Quality evaluation

The technical evaluation will be scored in accordance with the table below.

| SCORE | MEANING |
|--------------|--|
| 0 | Absent |
| 1 | Very weak – almost completely unacceptable |
| 2 | Weak – well below expectations |
| 3 | Poor – below expectations |
| 4 | Slightly below expectations |
| 5 | Meets expectations |
| 6 | Slightly exceeds expectations |
| 7 | Good – above expectations |
| 8 | Very good – well above expectations |
| 9 | Excellent – significantly above expectations |
| 10 | Outstanding |

Scoring matrix for the technical and quality criteria

Below is a worked example of how the Technical/Quality scores will be calculated:

| Question | Score (Out of 10) | Weighting | Total Points | Maximum Points Available |
|--------------|----------------------|-----------|--------------|--------------------------|
| | [A] | [B] | [A x B] | (B x Max Score of 10) |
| 1 | 5 | 10 | 50 | 100 |
| 2 | 6 | 5 | 30 | 50 |
| 3 | 6 | 5 | 30 | 50 |
| 4 | 8 | 10 | 80 | 100 |
| 5 | 6 | 15 | 90 | 150 |
| 6 | 5 | 20 | 100 | 200 |
| 7 | 8 | 5 | 40 | 50 |
| TOTAL | | 70 | 420 | 700 |

In this example, the Applicant achieved a score of 420 points out of a maximum 700 points. They have scored 42 points out of the maximum 70 available for Technical/Quality.

Pricing evaluation

Responses to question C1a in Part 5 of this ITT will be separately scored on a comparative basis with the lowest bid receiving 100% of the available marks. All other bids will be compared against that bid, attracting a pro-rated score against that bid.

Where a bid price is 100% or greater than the lowest price, the score for this criteria will be zero.

Below (Table 4) is a worked example of how the Cost score will be calculated:

| | | Bid A | Bid B | Bid C | Bid D | Bid E |
|-----|--|--------------|--------------|--------------|--------------|--------------|
| (a) | Cost | £10.00 | £12.00 | £10.00 | £8.00 | £16.00 |
| (b) | % Difference above lowest price* | 25 | 50 | 25 | 0 | 100 |
| (c) | Adjusted Cost Score [100 - (b)]** | 75 | 50 | 75 | 100 | 0 |
| (d) | Price Weighting | 30 | 30 | 30 | 30 | 30 |
| (e) | Weighted score [(c) x (d)] / 100 | 22.5 | 15 | 22.5 | 30 | 0 |

Worked Example, Cost

* = (This bidders price/lowest bidders price)*100 - 100

** = (100 - % above lowest price)

Bid E scored a score of zero as their bid price was 100% more than the lowest price.

Overall Score

To obtain the overall score the Applicants Technical/Quality score achieved is combined with their Cost score to give the total for score for the Applicant.

| | Max Quality Score | Quality Score | Max Cost Score | Cost Score | Final Score |
|----------|--------------------------|----------------------|-----------------------|-------------------|--------------------|
| Bidder 1 | 70 | 42 | 30 | 22.5 | 64.5 |
| Bidder 2 | 70 | 54 | 30 | 24.5 | 78.5 |

Table 5 - Worked Example, Final Scores