

Occupational Health Contract & Employee Assistance Programme

Tender Evaluation Methodology

1 Introduction

- 1.1 This section sets out the methodology that will be used to evaluate Tenders received to deliver the Occupational Health Service /Employee Assistance Programme contract for the council, referred to as OHS below.
- 1.2 The council will conduct a qualitative and financial evaluation of the Tenders received. It is important that the council is able to achieve the best possible value for money.
- 1.3 The council intends to use a weighted evaluation model of **60% quality:40% price**
- 1.4 The decision to appoint the successful Tenderer will be made on the basis of the company that best demonstrates its ability to provide the most economically advantageous tender taking account of the evaluation criteria set out in this document for both quality and price.

2. The Evaluation Team

- 2.1 An evaluation team has been assembled to undertake a comprehensive, systematic and consistent evaluation of each Tender. This team will be made up of officers of the council with expertise in provision and utilisation of OHS.

3. Initial Screening Assessment

- 3.1 Tenders will be subject to an initial compliance check to confirm that -
 - a. Tenders have been submitted on time, are completed correctly and meet the requirements of the Invitation to Tender.
 - b. Tenders are sufficiently complete to enable them to be evaluated in accordance with this Section.
 - c. The Tenderer has not contravened any of the terms and conditions of the Restricted Procedure or the tender process – as contained in the Public Contracts Regulations 2015 (as amended) and/or the Invitation to Tender
 - d. The Tenderer has confirmed the acceptance of the terms and conditions of the Contract.
 - e. The Tender is capable of acceptance.
- 3.2 Tenders that do not meet these requirements may be rejected at this stage.
- 3.3 Tenders that pass the initial screening assessment check will be subject to a detailed evaluation in accordance with the criteria and weightings set out in this document.
- 3.4 The council reserves the right to call for further information or clarification from Tenderers, as appropriate, to assist in its consideration of their Tenders.

4. Quality Evaluation

- 4.1 The quality assessment will be based on the written statements and method statements received from the Tenderers in response to the specification. This is clearly laid out in the specification.

- 4.2 Each criterion has been weighted according to its relative importance. Tenderers are required to submit responses to all areas of the specification and requests for method statement questions and responses to each will be assessed against the council's requirements.
- 4.3 In addition to the written submissions, Tenderers may be required to attend a meeting to seek clarifications and explore further the offer being made.
- 4.4 The 60% weighting for quality has been sub-weighted across the elements as contained in Appendix 1.

5. Financial Evaluation

- 5.1 The financial assessment will be based on the written statements received from the Tenderers in response to the Specification. This is clearly laid out in the specification and is repeated in Appendix 2.
- 5.2 In addition to the written submissions, Tenderers may be required to attend a meeting to seek clarifications and explore further the offer being made.
- 5.3 The 40% weighting for finance/ price has been sub-weighted 30 % for the core service 10% for supplemental services. This is explained further in Appendix 2.

Appendix 1

Quality Scoring

1. Scoring of Tenderers' responses for the purposes of Quality will be based on the following scale

Table 1

Score	Descriptions
0	Cannot be scored No submission was made or response given did not address the question or part thereof.
1	Poor Although the response demonstrates some understanding of the council's requirements there are some major omissions in relation to the proposed solution to deliver the service.
2	Partially meets requirements Response broadly meets all or meets some of the council's requirements but contains minor omissions that can be addressed through the contract.
3	Satisfactory A complete response that meets fully the council's requirements.
4	Exceeds requirements A good response, which not only meets requirements, but gives some confidence that the Tenderer has a process and plan that can deliver additional benefits and value.
5	Excellent Outstanding response, exceeds expectations, adds value, shows innovation and creative solutions and gives full confidence.

2. A maximum score of 60 can be achieved for responses to the quality evaluation criteria noted below.

3. The response to each question will be scored from 0 to 5 using the guidance in the Table above. These scores will then be divided by the maximum score available (5) and then multiplied by the sub-weightings shown below for each element. A final quality score (out of 60 points.) is achieved by adding all weighted scores together and dividing by 5.

For example

Core Service – Occupational Health Assessments & Management Advice

Total score available = 12%

Tenderer A = 5 (as table 1 above) so $5 / 5$ (maximum score available) \times 12 (sub weighting) = 12%

Tenderer B = 2 (as table 1 above) so $2 / 5$ (maximum score available) \times 12 (sub weighting) = 4.8%

Tenderer C = 3 (as table 1 above) so $3 / 5$ (maximum score available) \times 12 (sub weighting) = 7.2%

4. Tenderers' evaluation scores will be based on their written responses. The council reserves the right to clarify this (and substantiate its veracity and accuracy) by the following methods:

- Clarification meetings / presentations
- By responses to clarification questions raised by the council (if any)
- Obtaining references from previous or current contracts

5. In addition to providing a written response, Tenderers may be required to meet with the Evaluation Panel. Note that any Tenderer who does not achieve the threshold for quality evaluation noted below, based on their written responses, will not be called for a meeting.
6. The information gathered by the Panel at the meeting will be incorporated into the evaluation process and therefore the final score given for this section.
7. The initial score will be based on the evaluators' review of the Tenderers' response document and may be updated following further clarification of the response ascertained in the other methods outlined above. The final scores therefore may differ from the initial scores to reflect the full evaluation process undertaken by the panel. Overall scores will be calculated to ascertain the Tenderer's overall percentage score.
8. In respect of all responses, there must be a clear distinction between clarifications and omissions; the meeting process is not about providing an opportunity to address something that has not been included in a tender, as this would be unfair to other Tenderers.
9. Tenderers are advised that the Evaluation Panel shall conduct a "consensus scoring" process where moderation of the scores awarded during the exercise will take place. The moderation shall give regard to any variance in the scores between the evaluators, together with the subsequent assessment following any clarification obtained from the Tenderer. A consensus score will be agreed by the evaluators for each of the evaluation criteria.

Threshold for Quality Evaluation

10. The council requires submissions received to be of a consistently good level of quality across all areas and in certain areas. In the criteria covering Core Service Delivery and Resource Management, Bidders must score a minimum 3 out of 5 for each of the components.

In the remaining areas, the council reserves the right to reject any bid that scores 2 or less against the components. (partially meets requirements/ poor/ cannot be scored) in their submission.

Example below -

Component	Score (0-5)	Weight	%
A	3	12%	7.2%
B	4	3%	2.4%
C	4	5%	4.0%
Total available			20.0%
Total Scored			13.6%

Appendix 1 – Quality Evaluation Criteria = 60%

Evaluation Criteria	Components	Weighting	Comments
Core Service Delivery	<p>Pre employment medical screening - 3 %</p> <p>Occupational health assessments & management advice – 12 %</p> <p>Health advice, promotion and innovation – 2 %</p> <p>Independent Medical Advisers - Local Government Pension Scheme – 3 %</p> <p>Statutory responsibilities (Ill health) – 3%</p> <p>Responsibility for the provision of advice & “education” – 2 %</p> <p>Counselling / EAP – 5%</p>	30%	<p>Qualitative assessment</p> <p>Note the sub weightings indicted against each service or area</p>
Resource Management	<p>Staff allocated to our contract; numbers & job role.- 5%</p> <p>Systems (including IT), facilities & processes. – 5 %</p> <p>Contract management arrangements, including key performance indicators & flexibility in resource allocation to meet the shifting demands on the service. Transition, lead up to & exiting contract – 5 %</p>	15%	<p>Qualitative assessment</p> <p>Note the sub weightings indicted against each service or area</p>
Approach to delivering service	<p>Customer services. – 5 %</p> <p>Ensuring quality – 3%</p> <p>Work with other health professionals including Fit for Work Service. – 2 %</p>	10%	<p>Qualitative assessment.</p> <p>Note the sub weightings indicted against each service or area</p>
Supplementary services & Innovation	<p>Services that enable the council to manage its workforce &/or those on sickness absence to achieve organisation efficiency – 5 %</p>	5%	<p>Qualitative assessment.</p> <p>Note the sub weightings indicted against each service or area</p>

Appendix 2 Finance / Pricing Criteria = 40%

The evaluation criteria are set out in Section 4 below.

1. Core Service

Tenderers are asked to submit an annual price below noting –

- a. You are asked to bid on a service for **4,800 employees**, plus 500 pre-employment assessment, assuming that 70% of these will achieve immediate clearance via an on line assessment. For the remaining 30% (**150 people**) there may need to be some OHS intervention.
- b. The council will seek to agree **an annual contract price** with the chosen contract for the core service. As per the terms of contract an annual contract price would vary by changes in CPI rate. We recognise that there are multiple items that make up the core service and demand may reasonably shift between those tasks, e.g. at some points there may be more clinical demand for face to face sickness assessments than telephone assessment. Unless there was a significant change in staff numbers (plus or minus 10%) which could reasonably require re-casting the contract price we would expect the contract to enable this flexibility.
- c. You will be asked to indicate how the total annual contract price would vary were staff numbers to increase by 10% or decrease by 10%.
- d. It must be stressed that we are looking for a total contract price; it will be a matter for bidders to assume the costs of any consumables, overheads, IT services, management costs, cost of further medical evidence reports.
- e. We will determine the bidder with the “lowest price” by looking at the average annual contract price across the three figures; core service to 4,800 workforce; core service to workforce + 10%, core service to workforce - 10%

2. Core Service

Indicative volumes to a workforce of **4,800 employees**, before submitting a price please read the notes in section 1a) – 1e)

Area	Indicative numbers per annum	Notes
Pre Employment Checks	150 requiring Occupational Health intervention	Assumes up to 500 pre employment assessments a year with 70% cleared via OHS provided on line questionnaire. OHS assessment will be variable dependent on presenting case; telephone, face to face, requirement further medical evidence
Occupational Health Assessments	1,000 assessments	OHS assessment will be variable dependent on presenting case; telephone, face to face, requirement further medical evidence.
Statutory screening - Night worker, drivers assessment	30 screenings	
Ill health retirements	25	
Ill health retirements appeals	5	This would be post termination
Half day - case conferences	4 per year *	
Employee Assistance Programme	250 phone calls per year Counselling to 100 staff, delivering 400 sessions.	24/7 365 telephone & web. Promotional materials – including paper methods 2 x per year.
Health education promotion events	6 per year *	Delivered at council premises, delivery time half day per occasion, plus set up.
Health promotion screening events	4 per year *	Delivered at council premises, day including set up, typical activities; blood pressure checks, cholesterol checks, bmi checks. Assume up to 20 people screened per day.
Text reminder service	1,200 per year	Potential across all activities
Annual contract price based on workforce of 4,800 employees and indicative volumes as above		£
Annual contract price assuming workforce & above indicative volumes increase by 10% (note those marked * would not change based on variations to workforce numbers)		£
Annual contract price assuming workforce & above indicative volumes decrease by 10% (note those marked * would not change based on variations to workforce numbers)		£

3. Supplementary Services

Tenderers are asked to provide a fully inclusive cost for the following services. The services of these practitioners may be used in various ways to meet contract needs, e.g. on demand face to face employee health assessments, participation in case conferences/ meetings on council premises, work station assessments, stress risk assessments, vaccination / immunisation programme of staff at council premises.

Input by -	Charge hourly rate	Charge daily rate
Occupational Health Physician		
Occupational Health Nurse		
Occupational Health Advisor		
	Charged session	Charge daily rate
Counsellor		

4. Pricing Evaluation

1. Core Service 30% of the marks

When assessing bidders' proposed prices we will award up to 30% for the **core service**. The bidder with the lowest price will be awarded 30%. **A maximum price which the council would be prepared to pay for the core service has been determined as £180k per annum. Any bidders submitting prices above this will be awarded 0%.**

For prices between the lowest price and the maximum price marks will be deducted from the 30% on a pro rata basis.

For example

The maximum price has been fixed at £180k.

If the lowest bidder's price is £120k, this gives a range of £60k. Bidders are compared to the lowest price.

Bidder 1 a bid price of £136k would be marked as 22%.

$(£136k - £120k) = £16k$ above the lowest bid, divided by 60 (the range) x 30 (the available marks) = 8. 30% of the available mark minus 8 **gives a score of 22%**

Bidder 2 a bid price of £154k would be marked as 13%

$(£154k - 120k) = £34k$ above the lowest bid, divided by 60 (the range) x 30 (the available marks) = 17. 30% of the available mark minus 17 **gives a score of 13%**

Bidder 3 a bid price of £120k would be marked as 30%

$(120k - 120k) = £0k$ above the lowest bid, divided by 60 (the range) x 30 (the available marks) = 0
30% of the available mark minus 0 (zero) **gives a score of 30%**

(Please note that these are indicative figures only and do not reflect any actual or expected prices).

2. For the supplemental pricing criteria – 10% of the marks

When assessing bidders' proposed prices we will award **10%** for the **supplementary service**. The bidder with the lowest price will be awarded 10%.

Scores for the other bids will be awarded on the basis of the price relative to the lowest price bid. The price will be arrived at by adding the four daily rates. In the absence of a daily rate the hourly rate will be multiplied by 7

For example

Bids being received of £6k, £4k and £2k the scores using this method would be

Tenderer A costs = 6k so, $2 \text{ (lowest score)} / 6 \text{ tenderer's cost} \times 10$ available score= 3.3 %

Tenderer B costs = 4k so, $2 \text{ (lowest score)} / 4 \text{ tenderer's cost} \times 10$ available score= 5.0 %

Tenderer C costs = 2k so, $2 \text{ (lowest score)} / 2 \text{ tenderer's cost} \times 10$ available score= 10 %

(Please note that these are indicative figures only and do not reflect any actual or expected prices).

END