

Appendix 1
Tender Evaluation Methodology

Evaluation of bids

Bids will be evaluated in accordance with the methodology set out below. The PQQ and ITT documentation will be analysed concurrently. Bidders must pass all stages as indicated in the PQQ Instructions and reach the minimum scoring thresholds set for responses to the method statements.

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%.

Evaluation of Price

Price will consist of 60% of the evaluation weightings. The tenderer with the lowest evaluated price will receive the highest score; other tenderers will receive a proportional score to the lowest evaluated price.

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.

Tenderers are required to complete Method Statements detailed in Tender Document (k) . The Method Statements and their relative weightings are detailed in the table below.

Criteria Number	Criteria	Weighting	Method Statement	Method Statement Weighting
EC1	Proposed business model	41%	MS 1	23%
			MS 2	5%
			MS 3	5%
			MS 4	8%
EC2	Tenderer's proposed plans for ensuring effective quality management of the Services and plan to achieve and maintain performance to Contract standards, requirements and targets including self-monitoring and evaluation	25%	MS 5	15%
			MS 6	10%
EC3	Tenderer's proposed	22%	MS 7	10%

¹ Weightings detailed are a percentage of the Quality criterion

	approach for working in partnership with all stakeholders including the children, young people and their parents, Council, and any other relevant agencies/ organisations		MS 8	10%
			MS 9	2%
EC4	Health and Safety	2%	MS 10	2%
EC5	Tenderer's proposals for adhering to Child Protection requirements	10%	MS 11	10%

Scoring system

The scoring system to be used will be as follows:

Score	Acceptability	Tenderer 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 raises 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

For each method statement tenderers must score a minimum of 2.in order for the tender to be considered further.

Tenderers should note that word limits for method statements will be strictly applied and words beyond the specified limit will not be taken account of in the evaluation scoring.

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.

