Twyford Parish Council Skatepark Replacement Contract

TENDER ASSESSMENT PROCESS

Assessment Criteria

The following criteria and weightings will be applied in the evaluation of the Tenderers Technical Proposals:

| Evaluation Criteria Breakdown | Means of Evaluation | |
|-------------------------------|---------------------|--|
| Criteria | | |
| | | |
| Approach | 15% | |
| Quality | 20% | |
| Previous Project Experience | 20% | |
| Management and Communication | 15% | |
| Programme | 10% | |
| Budget management | 20% | |

Scoring Guidelines

Tenderers should be aware that the supporting information provided will be evaluated in such a way that the highest scores will be awarded to Tenderers who demonstrate they have provided innovation, good management and value for money on similar projects. It should be noted that to achieve the highest scores available overall then the Tenderer would also have demonstrated that they can not only meet but exceed the Council's minimum requirements.

All scored question shall be evaluated in accordance with the guidelines below:

| Score 0 | No response | No response | | |
|-------------|---------------------------|-------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------|-----------------------|--|
| Score 1 | Extremely Weak | Very poor proposal/response; does not cover the associated requirements, major deficiencies in thinking or detail, significant detail missing, unrealistic or impossible to implement and manage | | |
| Score 2 | Very Weak | Poor proposal/response, only partially covers the requirements, deficiencies in thinking or detail apparent, difficult to implement and manage | Weak | |
| Score 3 | Weak | Mediocre proposal/response, moderate coverage of the requirements, minor deficiencies either in thinking or detail, problematic to implement and manage | | |
| Score 4 | Fair - Below Average | Proposal/response partially satisfies the requirements, with small deficiencies apparent, needs some work to fully understand it | | |
| Score 5 | Fair - Average | Satisfactory proposal/response, would work to deliver all of the Council's requirements to the minimum level | | |
| Score 6 | Fair - Above Average | Satisfactory proposal/response, would work to deliver the majority of the Council's requirements to the minimum level with some evidence of where the Applicant could exceed the minimum requirements | Fair - Good | |
| Score 7 | Good | Good proposal/response that convinces the Council of its suitability, response slightly exceeds the minimum requirements with a reasonable level of detail | | |
| Score 8 | Strong | Robust proposal/response, exceeds minimum requirements, including a level of detail or evidence of original thinking which adds value to the bid and provides a great deal of detail | | |
| Score 9 | Very Strong | Proposal/response well in excess of expectations, with a comprehensive level of detail given including a full description of techniques and measurements employed | Strong - Excellent | |
| Score 10 | Outstanding/ Excellent | Fully thought through proposal/response, which is innovative and provides the reader with confidence of the suitability of the approach to be adopted due to the complete level of detail provided | | |

Approach (15%)

The Council is looking for evidence of the Tenderers previous experience in relation to managing and delivering projects of a similar nature to that required here, as well as detail of how that experience will be used during the delivery of this Contract. The Council is also looking for evidence of the Tenderers previous experience of working collaboratively with key stakeholders and engaging in consultation with young people and how that experience will be used during the delivery of this Project.

Quality (20%)

The Council is looking for evidence that the Tenderer has an understanding of managing key stakeholder's expectations of scope and quality within a particular budget envelope. The Council require an assessment of Whole Life Costs relative to a Warranty Period of a minimum of 15 years.

Previous Project Experience (20%)

The Council is looking for relevant project examples which demonstrate the Tenderers track history of successful delivery of similar facilities within agreed timescales and budgets.

Management and Communication (15%)

The Council is looking for the appropriateness of the project team to meet the requirements of the Project, details of their previous experience of working together as a team, the project management structures that will be in place to ensure adherence to a realistic programme and the means by which they will communicate with the Council and key stakeholders throughout the life of the Contract.

Programme (10%)

The Council is looking for the submission of a realistic programme that is clearly presented so that the timing and completeness of the services offered are easily understood.

Budget Management (20%)

Council's minimum requirements: The Council is looking for a Contractor that is willing to work with the Council to manage the out-turn costs of the project having regard to the current Allocated Budget.

24th November 2023