

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 Key dates

Open Tender Issue	February 2016
Tender Closing Date	8 th April 2016
Tender Evaluations / Interviews / Checks	April 2016
Site Visits	TBA
Final Determinations / Notification of decisions	April/ May 2016
Contracting	May/ June 2016

4.3 Evaluation Criteria

The Award Criteria is as follows:

- 40% cost.
- 60% technical / quality.

Cost Criteria

Ref	Criteria	Weighting (%)
C1	Total Transparent Open Book Cost of Proposed Operation with overhead and Profit percentages.	30
C2	Transport Policy & Maintenance Strategy that will drive user behaviour	10
C3	Savings and Efficiency programme clearly articulating areas where cost savings and efficiencies are to be made and as well as resources required and timings of change.	30
C4	Proposed Investment Programme made into the operation that will yield cost and service benefits	10
C5	Proposed Charging Mechanism- Cost transparency that allows	10
C6	Proposed Supply Chain and vehicle & part discount mechanism (Standard & Non Standard V)	10

Technical/ Quality Criteria

Ref	Criteria	Weighting (%)
TQ1	Clarity of the Proposed Target Operating Model- Infrastructure and Process with key milestones for financial and service delivery benefits	35
TQ2	Divestment- Understanding how the proposition will stimulate the Private Sector & Benefit the Island out with government solution	10
TQ4	Vehicle Policy to be instigated that will deliver balance between client needs and appropriate cost management.	15
TQ5	Evidence of Quality & Management Systems adopted in terms of Policy, Process and Performance	15
TQ6	Proposed Supply Chain (vehicle & part) (Standard & Non Standard) that will deliver quality & performance and appropriate stock control.	10
TQ8	Customer Satisfaction – How the organisation plans to measure customer service and satisfaction	5
TQ9	Staff Training & Development Programme	10

4.3 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 and C1b 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