

Appendix 1

Evaluation Methodology (Document K)

Evaluation of bids

Bids will be evaluated in accordance with the methodology set out below.

Overall evaluation criteria

Tenders will be evaluated to identify the economically most advantageous tender having regard to price and quality elements.

Price will carry 60% of the evaluation weightings, quality 40 per cent.

Evaluation of Price

Price will consist of 60% of the evaluation weightings.

Price will be evaluated based on the Council's core element of the Contract.

Price will be evaluated based on the deviation from the mean. The following methodology will be used:

- 1 Calculate the mean price by adding all tenderers' prices together and dividing by the number of tenderers
- 2 Mean price minus Tenderer A's price = x
- 3 x divided by the mean price = y
- 4 y multiplied by 100 = z
- 5 z add 50 = Tenderer A's raw score
- 6 Tenderer A's raw score multiplied by relevant weighting for the criterion = Tenderer A's weighted score

Tenderers scores will be rounded up or down as appropriate to one decimal point. For example, 92.55 would be rounded up to 92.6 whereas 92.54 will be rounded down to 92.5.

Evaluation of Quality

The overall Quality weighting is 40%.

The criteria and their relative weightings¹ used to evaluate Quality are detailed in the table below.

Bidders are required to complete Method Statements detailed in Appendix 1. The Method Statements and their relative weightings are detailed in the table below.

Criteria Number	Criteria	Weighting	Method Statement	Method Statement Weighting
EC1	Bidders' proposed business models.	23%	MS 1	15%
			MS 11	2%
			MS 13	6%
EC2	Bidders' proposed plans for ensuring effective quality management of the Services and maintenance of the Contract Standard, including self-monitoring and evaluation.	35%	MS 4	5%
			MS 5	4%
			MS 8	12%
			MS 9	12%
			MS 10	2%
EC3	Bidders' proposals for ensuring that the requirements of Child Protection legislation are fully applied in the delivery of the service	5%	MS 12	5%
EC4	Bidders' proposed approach for working in partnership with the Council and its partners.	25%	MS 2	12%
			MS 3	8%
			MS 6	5%
EC5	Bidders' proposals with regard to information systems to be used to monitor service(s) required by the Specification.	12%	MS 7	12%

¹ Weightings detailed are a percentage of the Quality criterion

Scoring System

The scoring system for Quality criteria to be used will be as follows:

Score	Acceptability	Bidder Response Demonstrates
0	Unacceptable	Information is either omitted or fundamentally unacceptable and/or there is insufficient evidence to support the proposal to allow the Authority to properly evaluate
1	Major Reservations	The information submitted has insufficient evidence that the specified requirements can be met and/or there are significant omissions, serious and/or many concerns
2	Some Reservations	The information submitted has some minor omissions against the specified requirements. The solution achieves basic minimum standard in some respects but is unsatisfactory in others and raises some concerns
3	Satisfactory	The information submitted meets the Authority's requirements and is acceptable in most respects, and there are no major concerns
4	Good	The information submitted provides good evidence that the specified requirements can be met. It is a full and robust response, and any concerns are addressed so that the proposal gives confidence
5	Outstanding	The information submitted provides strong evidence that the specified requirements will be exceeded, and provides full confidence with no concerns

A score of "0" for any question will preclude further consideration of the tender.

Should a Tenderer fail to achieve a score of 55% for Quality criteria, this will preclude further consideration of the tender.

Evaluation panel

Tenderers responses will be evaluated by a team of Council officers, stakeholders and advisers drawn together by the Council with expertise in the delivery of these services.