



**Invitation to Tender**

**Audience Insights Research**

**Ref: NHMF 318**

**Schedule 4**

**Evaluation Process**

## **TABLE OF CONTENTS:**

<b>Evaluation Process</b>	<b>1</b>
<b>1 Overarching Award Criteria</b>	<b>3</b>
<b>2 Price</b>	<b>3</b>
<b>3 Quality</b>	<b>3</b>

## 1 Overarching Award Criteria

Your proposal for undertaking the work will be evaluated as follows –

- Price = 30%
- Quality = 70%
- The scores for quality and price will be added together to obtain the overall score for each Bidder.

## 2 Price

Your bid price will be evaluated as follows –

- 100% will be awarded to the lowest priced bid
- All remaining bidders will be allocated scores based on their deviation from this figure. Your fixed and total costs figures (if any) will be used to score this question.
- For example, if the lowest price is £50 and the second lowest price is £100 then the lowest priced bidder gets 100% (full marks) for price and the second placed bidder gets 50% (see schedule 6a for a worked example).
- The scores for price will be multiplied by the weighting (30%) (see schedule 6a for a worked example) .

## 3 Quality

There are a total of 8 quality questions. Each will be scored out of 5. The maximum score for all 8 questions would therefore be 40 marks. The following percentage weightings will then be applied.

Table 1: Percentage weightings

Tender response	Quality question	Weighting (%)
1. Method Statement	Demonstrated a clear understanding of the aims, objectives and main concerns of the research	20
2. Method Statement, General Requirements	Demonstrated that the methods selected are appropriate to the research	15

Tender response	Quality question	Weighting (%)
(Research Ethics, Data Protection)	requirements in this brief	
3. Method Statement	Demonstrated an awareness of the specific context of the heritage sector and relevant issues relating to the heritage audiences	15
4. Previous Experience	Demonstrated experience relevant to the design of an audience segmentation system	15
5. Quality of Research Outputs, Other Requirements (Accessibility)	Demonstrated ability to produce high quality research outputs which meet Heritage Fund accessibility requirements	10
6. Project Plan, Risks and Mitigations	Demonstrated a clear and realistic project plan, showing phases of the research, with appropriate consideration of risks	10
7. Project Plan, Staffing, Financial 'Bid' Model	Demonstrated the clear allocation of appropriate resources, with detail on roles and responsibilities for each member of the team	10
8. Carbon Net Zero (CNZ)	Demonstrates a commitment to environmental sustainability and CNZ	5

The 0 to 5 scores for each question will be awarded as follows.

Table 2: Quality Questions Scoring Mechanism.

Score	Word descriptor	Description
0	Poor	No response or partial response and poor evidence provided in support of it. Does not give the Heritage Fund confidence in the ability of the Bidder to deliver the Contract.
1	Weak	Response is supported by a weak standard of evidence in several areas giving rise to concern about the ability of the Bidder to deliver the Contract.
2	Satisfactory	Response is supported by a satisfactory standard of evidence in most areas but a few areas lacking detail/evidence giving rise to some concerns about the ability of the Bidder to deliver the Contract.
3	Good	Response is comprehensive and supported by good standard of evidence. Gives the Heritage Fund confidence in the ability of the Bidder to deliver the contract. Meets the Heritage Fund's requirements.
4	Very good	Response is comprehensive and supported by a high standard of evidence. Gives the Heritage Fund a high level of confidence in the ability of the Bidder to deliver the contract. May exceed the Heritage Fund's requirements in some respects.
5	Excellent	Response is very comprehensive and supported by a very high standard of evidence. Gives the Heritage Fund a very high level of confidence the ability of the Bidder to deliver the contract. May exceed the Heritage Fund's requirements in most respects.