



1 INTRODUCTION

- 1.1 This document provides an overview of the methodology which will be adopted by the Authority and its Agent to evaluate Potential Provider responses to each question set out within the e-Sourcing event. It also sets out the marking scheme which will apply.
- 1.2 The following information has been provided in relation to each question (where applicable);
- 1.2.1 Weighting – highlights the relative importance of the question
 - 1.2.2 Guidance – sets out information for the Potential Providers to consider
 - 1.2.3 Marking Scheme – details the marks available to evaluators during evaluation
- 1.3 The defined terms used in the ITT document shall apply to this document.

2 OVERVIEW

- 2.1 The e-Sourcing event is broken down into the following Questionnaires:

Questionnaire Reference	Questionnaire Title
1	KEY PARTICIPATION REQUIREMENTS
2	CONFLICTS OF INTEREST
3	INFORMATION ONLY
4	SERVICE DELIVERY AND APPROACH
5	PRICE

- 2.2 Quality Evaluation Process

2.2.1 The evaluation of each response to the Quality/Service Delivery Questionnaire(s) will be conducted and consensus checked in accordance with the Consensus Marking Procedure set out in paragraph 2.3 below.

2.2.2 Each response to questions within the Quality/Service Delivery Questionnaire(s) will be marked in accordance with the table below:

Mark	Comment
0	Failed to provide confidence that the proposal will meet the requirements. An unacceptable response with serious reservations.
25	A Poor response with reservations. The response lacks convincing detail with risk that the proposal will not be successful in meeting all the requirements.



50	Meets the requirements – the response generally meets the requirements, but lacks sufficient detail to warrant a higher mark.
75	A Good response that meets the requirements with good supporting evidence. Demonstrates good understanding.
100	An Excellent comprehensive response that meets the requirements. Indicates an excellent response with detailed supporting evidence and no weaknesses resulting in a high level of confidence.

2.2.3 Each mark achieved will be multiplied by the corresponding weighting to provide an overall question score.

2.2.4 When the score for each question has been determined they will be added together to provide an overall score for the Quality Evaluation (“Quality Score”).

2.3 Consensus Marking Procedure

2.3.1 Tenders that are scored and require evaluation will be evaluated in accordance with the procedure described in this paragraph.

2.3.2 The Consensus Marking Procedure is a two-step process, comprising of:

- 2.3.2.1 Independent evaluation; and
- 2.3.2.2 Group consensus marking.

2.3.3 During the independent evaluation process, each evaluator will separately (i.e. without conferring with other evaluators) scrutinise the quality of answers given by Potential Providers in their Tender. Each evaluator will then allocate a mark for the answer in accordance with the Marking Scheme applicable to that question.

2.3.4 The Agent will review the marks allocated by the individual evaluators before facilitating a group consensus marking meeting.

2.3.5 During the meeting, the evaluators will discuss the independent marks until they reach a consensus regarding the marks that should be attributed to each Potential Providers’ answer to the questions.

2.3.6 Once all quality responses have been evaluated in accordance with Section 8 of the Invitation to Tender the individual scores attributed to each response will be added together to provide a ‘Quality Score’.

2.4 Price Evaluation Process

2.4.1 Prices submitted by Potential Providers’ in the Price Schedule will be recorded and evaluated in accordance with the following process.



2.4.2 Potential Providers’ are required to provide a completed pricing schedule against the ‘Price’ Questionnaire within the e-Sourcing event.

2.4.3 Prices offered will be evaluated against the range of prices submitted by all Potential Providers for that item.

2.4.4 The Potential Provider with the lowest price for the requirement shall be awarded the Maximum Score Available. The remaining Potential Providers shall be awarded a percentage of the Maximum Score Available equal to their price, relative to the lowest price submitted.

2.4.5 The calculation used is the following:

$$2.4.6 = \frac{\text{Lowest Price Tendered}}{\text{Tender price}} \times \text{Maximum Score Available}$$

Potential Provider	Price Submitted	Score Calculation	Maximum Score Available	Score Awarded
Potential Provider A	£1,000	£1,000/£1,000 *100	100	100
Potential Provider B	£2,000	£1,000/£2,000 *100	100	50
Potential Provider C	£2,500	£1,000/£2,500 *100	100	40

2.5 Final score

2.5.1 The Quality Score will be added to the Price Score to determine the final score for each Potential Provider (“Final Score”).

3 EVALUATION CRITERIA

3.1 A summary of all the questions contained within the e-Sourcing event, along with; the minimum acceptable score, maximum score available and weighting (where applicable) are set out below:

3.2 Questionnaires 1 and 2 contain ‘Pass/Fail’ questions and act as a doorway for progression to the following stages of the evaluation. Potential Providers are strongly advised to read and understand the specific guidance provided before responding to these questionnaires.

3.3 Questionnaire 3 is for information only. Although this questionnaire does not form part of the evaluation process, Potential Providers are advised to complete it in full as any omissions could affect the award process.

- 3.4 The Authority and its Agent reserve the right to challenge any information provided in response to Questionnaire 3 and request further information in support of any statements made therein.

QUESTIONNAIRE 1 – KEY PARTICIPATION REQUIREMENTS			
GUIDANCE	The following questions are ‘Pass/Fail’ questions. If Potential Providers are unwilling or unable to answer “Yes”, their submission will be deemed non-compliant and shall be rejected. Potential Providers should confirm their answer by selecting the appropriate option from the drop down menu.		
Question Number	Question	Max Score	Weighting (%)
1.1	Have you read, understood and agree with Appendix A, Terms of Participation? By answering “Yes”, you are confirming your ‘Declaration of Compliance’ at Annex 1 of Appendix A, Terms of Participation.	Pass/Fail	N/A
1.2	Have you read, understood and accepted the Invitation to Tender and all associated appendices, specifically Appendix B, Statement of Requirement?	Pass/Fail	N/A
1.3	Do you agree, without caveats or limitations, that in the event that you are successful the Crown Commercial Service’s Terms and Conditions within Appendix C, Draft Contract Document will govern the provision of this contract?	Pass/Fail	N/A
1.4	Do you confirm your Organisation’s e-Sourcing suite profile is complete and accurate at the time of Tendering and that any amendments made following acceptance of this event will be notified to the buyer in writing.	Pass/Fail	N/A
1.5	Please confirm you hold an ISO9001: 2008 accreditation or equivalent certification to undertake the works outlined in the Statement of Requirements.	Pass/Fail	N/A
1.6	Please confirm that all testing will be carried out in compliance with the 2007 Issue 4 of the Energetic Materials Testing Assessment.	Pass/Fail	N/A
QUESTIONNAIRE 2 – CONFLICTS OF INTEREST			
GUIDANCE	Question 2.1 is a ‘Yes/No’ question and will dictate whether or not question 2.2 needs to be answered. Question 2.2 is a Pass / Fail question. Potential Providers are required to provide details of how the identified conflict will be mitigated. The Contracting Authority		



	will review the mitigation in line with the perceived conflict of interest, to determine what level of risk this poses to them. Therefore if Potential Providers cannot or are unwilling to suitably demonstrate that they have suitable safeguards to mitigate any risk then their Tender will be deemed non-compliant and will be rejected.		
Question Number	Question	Max Score	Weighting (%)
2.1	Please confirm whether you have any potential, actual or perceived conflicts of interest that may be relevant to this requirement.	None	N/A
2.2	We require that any potential, actual or perceived conflicts of interest in respect of this ITT are identified in writing and that companies outline what safeguards would be put in place to mitigate the risk of actual or perceived conflicts arising during the delivery of these services.	Pass/Fail	N/A

QUESTIONNAIRE 3 – INFORMATION ONLY

GUIDANCE	The following questions are for information only and do not form part of the evaluation. Information provided in response to these questions may be used in preparation of any Contract Award and any omissions may delay completion of this Tender exercise.		
Question Number	Question	Max Score	Weighting (%)
3.1	Please provide the name, office address, telephone number and email address for your organisations Tender point of contract.	None	N/A
3.2	Please confirm whether your organisation is an SME as defined within EU recommendation 2003/361	None	N/A
3.3	Please provide details of any sub-contractors you propose to use in order to meet your obligations should you be awarded a Contract. Your response must include their; <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Trading Name(s) • Registered Address(es) and contact details • Goods/Services to be provided 	None	N/A



3.4	<p>If you are the Lead contact for a Group of Economic Operators, please provide details of all the members of the Group. Your response must include their;</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Trading Names(s) • Registered address(es) • Dunns Number(s) • Role/responsibility within the Group 	None	N/A
-----	---	------	-----

- 3.5 The following Quality/Service Delivery Questionnaires are designed to test Potential Providers’ ability to deliver the requirement as set out in Appendix B, Statement of Requirements. Potential Providers *MUST* answer all Quality/Service Delivery questions.
- 3.6 Potential Providers must achieve the minimum acceptable Quality Score, as described, for each of the questions below. Only those responses which achieve the minimum acceptable Quality Score will be included in the Price Evaluation Process.
- 3.7 Where only one (1) submission is received which does not meet the minimum acceptable Quality Score, the Authority reserves the right to enter into dialogue and seek assurances regarding the delivery of the requirement.
- 3.8 Potential Providers are able to provide attachments against each question. Question text fields must be populated with detailed references to relevant attachments or sections within their attachments.
- 3.9 Potential Providers’ responses must clearly demonstrate how they propose to meet the requirements set out in the question and address each element in the order they are asked.
- 3.10 Potential Providers’ responses should be limited to, and focused on each of the component parts of the question posed. They should refrain from making generalised statements and providing information not relevant to the topic.
- 3.11 Whilst there will be no marks given to layout, spelling, punctuation and grammar, it will assist evaluators if attention is paid to these areas including identifying key sections within responses.
- 3.12 Potential providers will be marked in accordance with the marking scheme at Section 2.
- 3.13 As attachments are permitted, the maximum word count is **2000** words including titles and paragraph headings. This word count must not be exceeded and any text which is in excess of this limit shall be disregarded and shall not be considered in the evaluation process.

QUESTIONNAIRE 4 – SERVICE DELIVERY & APPROACH				Weighting – 60%	
All Potential Providers MUST answer ALL the following questions					
Question Number	Question	Minimum Acceptable Score	Maximum Available Score	Weighting %	
4.1	<p>Please describe your proposed methodology for undertaking and managing the ‘Explosive Data Testing Service’. Your response should detail how the requirements set out in Appendix B will be addressed.</p> <p>A good response will outline the processes you will undertake in actioning each of the relevant tests, drawing attention to how this will meet the relevant EMTAP requirement.</p>	50	100	40%	
4.2	<p>Please provide any additional information that the Hazard Test Certificates could include that would increase the validity and quality of the testing service for CAST.</p>	50	100	10%	
4.3	<p>Please provide a detailed project plan and timetable of service outlining the key dates and milestones for this requirement.</p> <p>Your timetable of service should commence from the time a request of testing has been received from the Authority.</p> <p>This timetable should also outline how</p>	50	100	40%	



	you will ensure that the SLA's stated within the Appendix B are adhered to.			
4.4	Please outline any potential risks in the delivery of this contract and describe how you plan to mitigate these risks throughout the contract term. Your response to this question should also include information on how service failures are reported and managed.	50	100	10%

QUESTIONNAIRE 5 – PRICE		Weighting – 40%
GUIDANCE	<p>Potential Providers must enter costs by uploading the price schedule at the question level on the e-Sourcing event.</p> <p>Prices should be submitted in pounds Sterling inclusive of any expenses but exclusive of VAT.</p> <p>Potential Providers are requested to provide a firm price for each possible type of explosive against each of the 8 (eight) types of test outlined in Section 5.5 of Appendix B – Statement of Requirements.</p> <p>The price evaluation will be conducted based on a Total Average Contract Cost.</p> <p>The Total Average Contract Cost will be based on an average price per test against the possible number of tests needed. This will be calculated as follows: An average price per test will be calculated based on the average price of all types of explosives to the tested for that test. This will give outcome A1 to A8;</p> <p>Once an average cost per test has been calculated (A1 to A8), we will further average: the two (2) highest costs for outcomes A1 to A8 to give outcome B1 the four (4) medium costs for outcomes A1 to A8 to give outcome B2 the two (2) lowest costs for outcomes A1 to A8 to give outcome B3.</p> <p>Once outcomes B1 to B3 have been established, we will then calculate three (3) total figures by: Multiplying outcome B1 by 3 (to give Total C1) Multiplying outcome B2 by 6 (to give Total C2)</p>	



	<p>Multiplying outcome B3 by 3 (to give Total C3) Once Totals C1 to C3 have been established, these will be added together to give the Total Average Contract Cost.</p> <p>Suppliers are advised that the Total Average Contract Cost is for evaluation purposes only. This pricing model has been adapted because the Authority is unable to give indicative numbers of explosives to be tested or the number of test types to be conducted. On award of contract the firm price per test per explosive type shall be used when the Authority submits a request for testing.</p>	
Question Number	Question	Max Score
5.1	<p>Please confirm, by selecting 'YES' that you have attached a completed Price Schedule to the response to this question. In so doing, you are also confirming that prices offered are inclusive of any expenses, exclusive of VAT and firm for a period of 90 days following the Deadline for Submission.</p>	100