**Section 3: Remuneration Committee (Advisory Service) – Evaluation Criteria (Open Procedure)**

**Selection Questionnaire**

Tenderers are required to complete the Selection Questionnaire (SQ) set out on the Tender Portal. The SQ is located as a link on the Tender Portal. The SQ is a Pass / Fail response with no specific evaluated sections.

**Quality Evaluation**

3.1 The scored Quality criteria will account for 50% of the total score. These will be assessed as set out in Section 4. Questions that are labelled “For Information Only” and Pass/Fail are not evaluated.

3.2 Any word limits, referred to on the Tender Portal for a question are the **maximum** number of words applicable to the relevant response. No additional information or supplementary documentation should be appended to these responses. Any additional information provided with a Tender response will be disregarded and will not be scored as part of the evaluation process.

**Commercial Evaluation**

3.3 The scored Commercial criteria will account for 30% of the total score.

**Social Value Evaluation**

3.4 The scored Social Value criteria will account for 10% of the total score.

 The responses in this section will be evaluated in line with the scoring criteria at Table 2.

**Supplier Charter Evaluation**

3.5 The scored Supplier Charter criteria will account for 10% of the total score.

 The responses in this section will be evaluated in line with the scoring criteria at Table 2.

**Contract**

3.6 The Form of Contract is available on the Tender Portal at Appendix C. The Open Procedure does not allow for the Contract to be negotiated after the decision to award has been made, or during the evaluation process. As such, Tenderers are not invited to mark-up the Contract as part of this tender exercise. Tenderers should ensure that they have read and understood the terms of the Contract prior to submitting their Tenders and receive sign-off as necessary from their board/executive members, legal advisers and insurers.

3.7 Tenderers are required to obtain sign-off on the Contract from their legal advisers and insurers and confirm within their proposals that they are able to enter into contract with The Crown Estate on the form of contract, without amendment. The Crown Estate will not enter into negotiation with a Tenderer either during or after the award decision.

3.8 By confirming acceptance of the Form of Tender, Tenderers are indicating their unequivocal acceptance of the contractual documentation in the forms attached to this ITT. The Crown Estate reserves the right to reject any Tender where the Tenderer subsequently seeks any amendments, either pre- or post-award.

**Section 4: Evaluation methodology**

Evaluation Methodology

4.1 The Crown Estate will conduct an evaluation of the Tenders received. The Contract will be

 awarded on the basis of the most economically advantageous tender and in accordance with

the methodology set out below. Tenders must be submitted alongside the completed Annex 1

Form of Tender in the ITT. Failure to submit a completed Form of Tender will render the

submission incomplete and not submitted in the required timeline. This is to form Stage 1 of

the evaluation process as noted in 4.3. For clarity this Stage includes the review of the completed SQ.

The Evaluation Team

4.2 An evaluation team will undertake a comprehensive, systematic and consistent evaluation of

 each Tender. The evaluation team will be made up of subject matter experts of The Crown

 Estate The Crown Estate's technical and legal advisers where required.

General information on the evaluation process

4.3 Tenders will be subject to a six-stage evaluation process:

Stage 1 – Initial Screening Assessment (Completion and return of Tender Document Checklist on the Tender Portal);

Stage 2 – Selection Questionnaire (Assessment of completed Selection Questionnaire on the Tender Portal);

Stage 3 – Quality Evaluation (Evaluation of completed Technical envelope on the Tender Portal);

Stage 4 – Social Value Evaluation (Evaluation of completed Social Value on the Tender Portal)

Stage 5 – Supplier Charter Evaluation (Evaluation of completed Supplier Charter on [the](http://www.sourcedogg.com) Tender Portal); and

Stage 6 – Commercial Evaluation (Evaluation of completed Commercial envelope on the Tender Portal).

Stage 1 – Initial Screening Assessment

4.4 Tenders will be subject to an initial screening assessment to confirm that the Tender includes all the mandatory documents set out in the checklist at Annex 5 (Supplier ITT Tender Return Checklist of this ITT).

**Tenders that are not substantially complete, which are non-compliant with the requirements of the ITT as noted in the Instructions to Tender (Section 1), or which do not include all the mandatory documents referred to in Annex 5 (Supplier ITT Tender Return Checklist) may be excluded at this stage and not considered further.**

Stage 2 – Selection Questionnaire Evaluation

4.5 Tenderers who successfully pass the Stage 1 Initial Screening Assessment will be subject to a review made up of the questions set out in the SQ set out on the Tender Portal these assessments are usually pass/fail questions and identified as such. The Crown Estate will evaluate all Tenders that are not excluded in Stage 1 as set out above.

Stages 3 to 5 – Quality, Supplier Charter and Social Value Evaluations

4.6 During Stages 3 – 5, The Crown Estate reserves the right to request clarification from Tenderers, as appropriate, to assist with its evaluation of the Tenders. Clarifications from The Crown Estate will be raised with the Tender via the Tender Portal.

4.7 The successful Tender will be the Tender which has achieved the best overall score. The

 Tenders will be assessed according to the criteria set out below in Table 2 and each section

 will carry the following weightings. The sub criteria for each section are identified in Table 1:

|  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- |
| **STAGE** | **SECTION** | **PERCENTAGE %** |
| 3 | Quality | 50% |
| 4 | Supplier Charter | 10% |
| 5 | Social Value | 10% |

**Table 1 – Question Detail and Weighting**

|  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- |
| **Question number** | **Quality Question** | **Question Weighting** |
| **1** | **Reputation and Credibility** | **5%** |
| **2** | **Approach to Advising the Committee and Working with Management** | **10%** |
| **3** | **Innovation and Creativity** | **5%** |
| **4** | **Sector Knowledge** | **10%** |
| **5** | **Impartiality and Conflict of Interest** | **5%** |
| **6** | **Access to the External Market** | **5%** |
| **7** | **Quality and Risks** | **5%** |
| **8** | **Firm Details and Capabilities** | **5%** |
| **Question number** | **Social Value Questions**  | **Question Weighting** |
|  | **MAC 6.1****MAC 4.2**  | **5%****5%** |
| **Question number** | **Supplier Charter Questions** | **Question Weighting** |
|  | **Sustainability** **Ethical and Inclusive Practices****Health, Safety and Wellbeing****Information Security and Data Residency****Data Protection and GDPR** | **2%****2%****2%****2%****2%** |
|  | **Total available** | **100%** |

**Table 2 – Scoring Criteria**

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
| **Scoring 0-5** | **Scoring Criteria** |
| 0 | (No response) Failure to submit an answer or confirmation. |
| 1 | (Poor response) The question is not directly addressed, and the answer demonstrates minimal understanding of the subject. |
| 2 | (Weak response) The answer addresses some aspects of the question but overall does not demonstrate sufficient understanding of the subject matter. |
| 3 | (Satisfactory response) The answer addresses material aspects of the question and demonstrates sufficient understanding of the subject matter, although there may be some minor uncertainty or gaps in how it applies to this project.  |
| 4 | (Good response) The answer addresses all aspects of the question and demonstrates a clear understanding of the subject matter with good consideration of how it applies to this project. |
| 5 | (Excellent response) The answer addresses all aspects of the question in a high level of detail that demonstrates a clear understanding of the subject matter and a thorough consideration of how it applies to this project. |

4.8 Each of the "scored" Quality Criteria, Supplier Charter Criteria and Social Value Criteria in Table 1 will be marked out of 5 using the scoring scale set out in Table 2. Each member of the evaluation team will mark individually and allocate individual scores. These scores will then be subject to moderation and the evaluation team will meet to agree a final score by consensus. The agreed final scores of the panel will then be detailed in accordance with the percentage weightings set out in Table 1.

4.9 Tenderers should be aware that the tender questions are fundamental to TCE selecting the successful bid. Tenderers should note that if they score less than 3 (0, 1 and/or 2) on any question their PQQ will automatically be rejected and will not be considered further.

4.10 All weightings, including sub-weightings are based on a percentage of the total score

 available in respect of each of the criteria. Once each score has been weighted in accordance with the percentage weightings set out in Table 1, the weighted score will be added together to identify the total score in respect of each criteria for that Tender.

 Please see the worked example below where quality forms 70% of the total tender score.

 **Example:**

Tenderer A is awarded a score of 272 out of maximum possible score of 350.

70% x (Tenderer A’s score/maximum possible score).

Tenderer A’s score is therefore 54.4%.

Tenderer B is awarded a score of 252 out of maximum possible score of 350.

70% x (Tenderer B’s score/maximum possible score).

Tenderer B’s score is therefore 50.4%.

* + Stage 6 – Commercial Evaluation

4.13 Following completion of Stage 3, 4 and 5 (Quality, Supplier Charter and Social Value Evaluation), Tenders will be evaluated under Stage 6 (Commercial Evaluation) for the remaining 30% (the Pricing Schedule - Appendix B).

4.14 The lowest net tendered Price (the Lowest Tender Sum) will then receive 30%.

4.15 Price will be scored based on the Tenderer that submits the lowest price achieving

 the maximum available score (expressed as a percentage) for the pricing element.

 Higher priced Tenders will receive a proportional score based on the amount higher

 they are than the lowest priced Tender, calculated as follows:

**Example:**

Tenderer A provides a Tendered Price of £500,000 (lowest)

Tenderer B provides a Tendered Price of £750,000

Tenderer A’s Pricing Score is 30% as they have submitted the lowest Tendered Price in the competition.

Tenderer B’s Pricing Score is calculated as follows:

Pricing Score = Total Available Marks x (Lowest priced Tender / Tender price)

e.g. 30 x (500,000 / £750,000) = 20%

**All scores will be rounded to 1 decimal places**

4.16 If any aspect of a price submission is deemed by The Crown Estate to be abnormally

 low, The Crown Estate may, at its discretion, reject that offer but only after seeking

 clarification in accordance with Regulation 69 of the Public Contract Regulations 2015.

**Final decision and Approval**

4.17 Final weighted scores for all stages of the tender evaluation will be added together to produce a final ranking of Tenderers.

4.18 The Crown Estate reserves the right to clarify a Tenderer's Tender response at any point during the evaluation process and will do this by communicating with the Tenderer concerned via the Tender Portal.

4.19 The Tenderers acknowledge and agree that the requirements set out in the SQ continue to apply throughout the Procurement and, if successful, into the Contract duration. With that in mind, prior to contract award and prior to entering into the Contracts (and at any other reasonable time throughout the Procurement), The Crown Estate reserves the right to request any information from a Tenderer to ensure its continued compliance with the SQ criteria, including (but not limited to) evidence of the Tenderer's economic and financial standing.