**DNO/228 – MoE Training Rig**

 **Annex C to DEFFORM 47**

**Tender Evaluation Methodology**

**Introduction**

1. This document details the process and criteria that the Authority will use to evaluate the Method of Entry (MoE) training rig tender.
2. Negotiations do not apply to this tender process.
3. The Tender evaluation will be conducted using the Most Economically Advantageous Tender (MEAT) calculation which is detailed in Paragraph 29 within this document. The Evaluation Criteria are detailed in Annex B to the DEFFORM 47 and will be available via the Defence Sourcing Portal (DSP).
4. The MEAT will be determined by calculating a Tender Score for each Tender using the Value for Money Index method. In this method, the Tender Score is calculated by dividing the non-cost score by the Tender Price. The aim of this method is to maximise the capability that is delivered by each £ of tender cost. The Tenderer that achieves the highest Tender Score will be the winning Tenderer and the MEAT.

**Outline of the Tender Evaluation Process**

1. There are three stages to the evaluation. Table 1 below demonstrates these stages and the order of the evaluation.

**Table 1**

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
|  | **Description** |
| Stage 1 | Suitability Assessment Questions (SAQ) Eligibility  |
| Stage 2 | Commercial Compliance Evaluation (Pass/Fail) |
| Stage 3 | Technical Evaluation (Weighted Scores) |
| Stage 4 | Determination of Price (Including MEAT evaluation) |

**Evaluation Teams and Governance**

1. The Tender Evaluation process will be overseen by the Tender Assessment Panel (TAP). The purpose of the TAP is to ensure that the evaluation process set out in this evaluation methodology has been followed and to endorse the outcome of the evaluation.
2. The Authority has appointed teams of assessors, who are professionals or subject matter experts (SMEs) in their respective fields, to undertake the commercial and technical evaluations. If substitutions become necessary, staff with equivalent experience and skills will be used.

**Stage 1 Suitability Assessment Question (SAQ) Eligibility**

1. The Authority will assess the Tenderer’s response to Suitability Assessment Questions (SAQ) prior to reviewing the Tender bid.
2. This stage will be evaluated on a PASS/FAIL basis.
3. If the Tender achieves a FAIL, the Tenderer will be discounted from the competition and their bid will not be evaluated.
4. Tenderers that PASS Stage 1 will progress to Stage 2 which is evaluation of the Tender.

**Stage 2 Commercial Compliance Evaluation**

1. The Commercial Evaluation checks that the Tender is complete in accordance with the tendering instructions contained in the DEFFORM 47, and subject to further evaluation, it could form the basis of the Contract.
2. The evaluator will assess the questions below as part of the Commercial Evaluation. Permitted answers to each question are ‘YES’ or ‘NO’.
	1. Has the Tenderer provided and completed all documents requested?
	2. Does the Tenderer confirm full compliance to all Terms and Conditions associated with the Contract?
3. The Commercial Compliance Evaluation will be completed on a PASS/FAIL basis using the following definitions:

**PASS -** The evaluation response to all the above questions is “YES”

**FAIL -** The evaluation response to one or more of the above questions is “NO”

1. Only those that achieve a PASS at Stage 2 will qualify for Stage 3. Tenderers that obtain a FAIL at Stage 2 will be excluded from further consideration in the evaluation process.

**Stage 3 Technical Evaluation**

1. The Technical evaluation is a scored assessment of the evidence provided in the Tenders. The aim is to establish a non-cost score to be used in calculating the Tender Score to determine the MEAT.
2. The Tenders that have not been discounted from the competition (see Stage 1 and Stage 2) will be evaluated in the Technical Evaluation.
3. Additional information or prior knowledge that is not contained within the Tender will not be used in the Technical Evaluation.
4. Criteria will be used to assess the merit of the Tenderer’s proposals and their ability to deliver the proposed requirement against the criteria listed below. The ITT Evaluation Criteria descriptions and allocated weightings that underpin the evaluation model are listed in Table 2 below. The evaluation criteria for each question is detailed in Annex B to this DEFFORM 47 and will be made available in the DSP.
5. Table 2details the questions that will be asked in the ITN Evaluation Criteria document and their associated weightings. The weighting represents the maximum proportion of the total non-cost score that can be allocated to each question.

**Table 2**

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
| **Question**  | **Non-Cost Weighting (%)** |
| 1. Subject Matter Expertise and Previous Experience
 | 15 |
| 1. Design and Build of the Rig
 | 10 |
| 1. Annual Servicing, Minor Repairs and Ad hoc repairs
 | 25 |
| 1. Risk Mitigation
 | 15 |
| 1. Delivery Team
 | 15 |
| 1. Continuous Improvement
 | 10 |
| 1. Social Value
 | 10 |
| **Total** | 100 |

1. The objective of the Technical Evaluation is to understand the Tenderer’s capability to deliver the requirements of the contract as identified within the User Defined Requirements.
2. Table 3 below details the confidence characteristics used to evaluate Questions 1-6 of Annex B to the DEFFORM 47 during the Technical Evaluation. For each question, Tenderer’s will be given a confidence characteristic score based on the evidence provided within the response of either 0, 25, 50, 75 or 100 marks. The total mark that can be achieved per question is 100. These confidence characteristics can also be found in the Evaluation Criteria at Annex B to the DEFFORM 47.
3. Tenderers must achieve a minimum of 25 in each question across Stage 3 to remain in the competition. If a question is scored lower than 25, it will be deemed an unacceptable response and tender will be classed as non-compliant. No further evaluation will be performed on this tender.

**Table 3**

|  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- |
| **Confidence Characteristic**  | **Score %** | **Criteria**  |
| **No Confidence**   | 0%  | No response provided or the response failed to provide confidence that the proposal will meet the requirements.  An unacceptable response that will deem the entire bid as non-compliant.   |
| **Low confidence**   | 25%  | A poor response with reservations that only partially meets the requirement and gives concern in several significant areas. The response lacks convincing detail/evidence to instil confidence in the Tenderer’s ability to deliver the requirement.    |
| **Moderate Confidence**    | 50% | A response which broadly meets the requirements but raised concerns in some areas. There was a lack sufficient evidence or detail to warrant a higher mark and to instil greater confidence in the Tenderer’s ability to deliver the requirement.    |
| **Good Confidence**    | 75% | A response that meets the requirement with supporting evidence/detail provided. There are no significant areas of concern and sufficient competence is demonstrated through the relevant evidence.   |
| **High Confidence**    | 100% | An excellent comprehensive response that meets the requirements which included detailed supporting evidence and no weaknesses were highlighted resulting in a high level of confidence. The response leaves no doubt as to the capability and commitment to deliver what is required.     |

**Application of Weighting for Technical Evaluation**

1. The evaluated score derived from the Confidence Characteristic is divided by the maximum score available. This is then multiplied by the applicable weighting for that question.
2. The total evaluated non-cost score will be the sum of evaluated scores for all questions (1-6).
3. The following Table 4 is an example of how the weightings would apply:

**Table 4: Example – Noting that the values and applicable weightings used in this example are illustrative and must not be taken as an indication of expected functionality. Please refer to the Evaluation Criteria (Annex B) for the breakdown of weighting per question.**

|  |  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| **Question** | **Max Score** | **Evaluated Score** | **Question Weighting (%)** | **Scoring Calculation** | **Score (contribution to total non-cost score rounded to 1 decimal place)** |
| Q1  | 100 | 50 | 15 | (50/100)x 15 | 7.5 |
| Q2  | 100 | 75 | 10 | (75/100) x 10 | 7.5 |
| Q3  | 100 | 50 | 25 | (50/100) x 25 | 12.5 |
| Q4  | 100 | 75 | 15 | (75/100) x 15 | 11.3 |
| Q5  | 100 | 75  | 15 | (75/100) x 15 | 11.3 |
| Q6  | 100 | 75 | 10 | (75/100) x 10 | 7.5 |
| Q7 | 100 | 50 | 10 | (50/100) x 10 | 5.0 |
| **Total Weighting**  | 100 | **Total score**  | **62.6** |

As per the example above, the total non-cost score for the Technical Evaluation would be 62.6out of a maximum of 100.

**Stage 4 – Determination of Price**

1. Tenderers will be required to complete the DEFFORM 47 Annex A (Offer) with their Tender price.
2. Tenderers will complete the Schedule of Requirements included within the tender documentation which will be used to determine the total firm price. The total firm price will be used for the MEAT calculation.

**MEAT Calculation**

1. The Tenderers overall score calculated by dividing the total non-cost score as determined in Stage 2 (Technical Evaluation) by the firm Tender Price as shown in the DEFFORM 47 Annex A (Offer)

**Tender Score (rounded to 1 decimal place) = Total non-cost score/Tender Price (£NPV)**

**For example, based on a price of £110,000:**

*62.6 (Total non-cost score) / 11 (Price £NPV) =* ***5.69***

The Tenderer’s score in this example is 5.69

1. The Tenderer that achieves the highest tender score is the winning Tenderer as the Most Economically Advantageous Tender (MEAT).

**Tie-Break Scores**

1. In the event of a tie-break, the winning Tenderer will be the Tenderer that achieved the highest non-cost score.

**Notification of Results and Contract Award**

1. The Tenderer with the highest MEAT Calculation will be nominated as the ‘Preferred Tenderer’ and will be notified in writing of the Authority’s acceptance of their Tender.
2. Concurrent with the notification, unsuccessful Tenderers will receive a written debrief stating why they were unsuccessful. Tenderers may also request a verbal debrief but the scope of verbal debriefs will remain the same as the written debriefs.