## Award of contract for banking, card acquiring and bill payment Services

## Appendix 1- Evaluation Criteria

## Banking Services

| Evaluation Criteria | Weighting (\%) |
| :--- | :--- |
| Price | $\mathbf{4 0 \%}$ |
| The qualitative aspect consists of the <br> following breakdown: | $\mathbf{6 0 \%}$ |
| • Service delivery approach as set |  |
| out in the service specification <br> requirement. | $30 \%$ |
| • Risk management | $10 \%$ |
| - Continuous improvement | $20 \%$ |

## Card Acquiring

| Evaluation Criteria | Weighting (\%) |
| :--- | :--- |
| Price | $\mathbf{6 0 \%}$ |
| The qualitative aspect consists of the <br> following breakdown: | $\mathbf{4 0 \%}$ |
| •Service delivery approach as set <br> out in the service specification <br> requirement. | $12.5 \%$ |
| • Risk management. | $15 \%$ |
| • Continuous improvement | $12.5 \%$ |

## Bill payment

| Evaluation Criteria | Weighting (\%) |
| :--- | :--- |
| Price | $\mathbf{4 5 \%}$ |
| The qualitative aspect consists of the <br> following breakdown: | $55 \%$ |


| •Service delivery approach as set <br> out in the service specification <br> requirement | $30 \%$ |
| :--- | :--- |
| • Risk management | $5 \%$ |
| - Continuous Improvement | $20 \%$ |

## Quality Criteria

The above qualitative criteria will be evaluated by officers from the Council from the submissions made by tenderers, using the following scoring methodology.

| Score | Assessment |
| :---: | :---: |
| 0 | Totally unacceptable. <br> Response supplied in method statement totally fails <br> to grasp / reflect core issues and requirements. |
| 1 | Response supplied in method statement reflects a <br> very limited understanding of core issues and <br> requirements. |
| 2 | Acceptable. <br> Response supplied in method statement reflects <br> adequate understanding of core issues and <br> requirements. |
| 3 | Geood. <br> Response supplied in method statement reflects <br> good understanding of core issues and <br> requirements. |
| 4 | Very good <br> Response supplied in method statement reflects very <br> good understanding of core issues and <br> requirements. |

## Pricing Criterion

The pricing schedules will be evaluated by the Council's Central Finance division using the arithmetic mean method; an example is set out below. In achieving the most economic advantageous tender the pricing evaluation will be based on the total price for each lot.

## TENDER EVALUATION

## Bidder 1

£ 462,491
Bidder 2
MEAN
£ 479,727.00
£ 471, 109
\% Difference between actual and mean
Pricing $\quad-2 \% \quad 2 \%$

TOTALS $-2 \% \quad 2 \%$
If mean 50 deduct 1 point for each \% point above
ooint added to score each percentage point below mean
Pricing $52 \quad 48$

TOTAL $52 \quad 48$
Weighting
Multiply Price Score by agreed weighting $40 \%$
$\begin{array}{lll}\text { Pricing } & 21 & 19\end{array}$

TOTAL 21

Scores for the qualitiative criteria scores will be converted into percentage scores and combined with the financial percentage scores to reach final percentage scores for each tenderer.

