

APPENDIX 2

MERCHANT ACQUIRING CONTRACT

TENDER EVALUATION GRID

QUALITY TENDER EVALUATION GRID		CONTRACTOR WEIGHTED SCORE			
		Weighting of 100%	A	B	C
<p>1. Requirements for Counter Payments</p> <p>1 The delivery of the full merchant acquiring service requirement must be fully implemented by 1st April 2018 without exception</p> <p>2 Given the tight schedule for implementation, the merchant acquirer needs to be accredited to work with the following software. Please provide evidence that your service is accredited to work with these.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Adaptis permit software solution which is owned by PayByPhone - RingGo cashless parking and permit solution owned by Cobalt - Cobalt online and IVR solution which handles Parking Penalty Charge Notice payments <p>3 The council uses the Arena software from Axiell to take online payments for Libraries. The supplier needs to either provide evidence that their system currently works with Arena, or assurance that will work to integrate their system with Arena. This will be the one part of the contract for which a payment gateway will be required initially.</p>	Pass/Fail	Pass	Pass	Pass	
<p>2. Terminal Rental</p> <p>Over the life of the contract, technology for terminals may improve with technology that makes for easier payments. For instance, over the life of the current contract, contactless payments have been adopted by a significant proportion of UK Card holders. Please advise how this contract will keep the technology used in terminals relevant.</p> <p>Any costs for terminal upgrade should be shown separately in the pricing schedule.</p>	5%	3.33%	2.67%	2.67%	
<p>3. Authorisation of Changes</p> <p>The successful merchant acquirer will process a significant volume and value of transactions for the council. Please advise how any changes to the setup, e.g. council bank accounts used, will be authorised. This should include the process for keeping the authorisers up to date.</p>	5%	2.33%	3.33%	3%	
<p>4. Fraud Prevention</p> <p>The council wishes to improve how uses data and systems available from the merchant acquirer to prevent fraudulent payments. Different payment methods have different risks attached to them, so the council has a lower risk appetite for high risk</p>	10%	5.34%%	8%	8%	

<p>transactions, such as those via the telephone, than transactions where there is liability shifting to the card issuer.</p> <p>The council needs to understand and make the best use of the available tools to prevent fraud.</p> <p>Please advise how your solution will help the council prevent fraud.</p> <p>Any additional costs of the proposed solution should be captured in the pricing schedule.</p>				
<p>5. Chargebacks</p> <p>The council wishes to improve its current chargeback handling processes. The council wants a web based chargeback handling process that allows chargeback handling to be distributed across the council, with different teams allocated responsibility for chargebacks on different merchant account numbers. The council wants to be able to easily report on the performance in disputing chargebacks of teams. Ideally, benchmarks should be provided for other local authority customers so that performance can be compared.</p> <p>There is also a need for a training programme, so that key council teams understand how to most effectively dispute chargebacks.</p> <p>Please advise how your recommended solution meets this need.</p> <p>Any additional costs of the proposed solution should be captured in the pricing schedule.</p>	10%	4%	8%	7.34%
<p>6. Transition plan</p> <p>The council wishes to improve its current chargeback handling processes. The council wants a web based chargeback handling process that allows chargeback handling to be distributed across the council, with different teams allocated responsibility for chargebacks on different merchant account numbers. The council wants to be able to easily report on the performance in disputing chargebacks of teams. Ideally, benchmarks should be provided for other local authority customers so that performance can be compared.</p> <p>There is also a need for a training programme, so that key council teams understand how to most effectively dispute chargebacks.</p> <p>Please advise how your recommended solution meets this need.</p> <p>Any additional costs of the proposed solution should be captured in the pricing schedule.</p>	10%	8%	5.34%	10%
<p>7. Day to Day queries</p> <p>The council wishes to improve its current chargeback handling processes. The council wants a web based chargeback handling process that allows chargeback handling to be distributed across the council, with different teams allocated responsibility for chargebacks on different merchant account numbers. The council wants to be able to easily report on the performance in disputing chargebacks of teams. Ideally, benchmarks should be provided for other local authority customers so that performance can be compared.</p> <p>There is also a need for a training programme, so that key council teams understand how to most effectively dispute chargebacks.</p> <p>Please advise how your recommended solution meets this need.</p> <p>Any additional costs of the proposed solution should be captured in the pricing schedule.</p>	10%	6.66%	5.34%	8.66%

8. Management and Electronic Information <p>The council wishes to improve its current chargeback handling processes. The council wants a web based chargeback handling process that allows chargeback handling to be distributed across the council, with different teams allocated responsibility for chargebacks on different merchant account numbers. The council wants to be able to easily report on the performance in disputing chargebacks of teams. Ideally, benchmarks should be provided for other local authority customers so that performance can be compared.</p> <p>There is also a need for a training programme, so that key council teams understand how to most effectively dispute chargebacks.</p> <p>Please advise how your recommended solution meets this need.</p> <p>Any additional costs of the proposed solution should be captured in the pricing schedule.</p>	5%	4%	3.67%	3.33%
9. Value added services <p>Please advise any additional value added services that you could provide.</p>	5%	2.67%	2.67%	4%
Total:	60%	36.33%	39.02%	47.00%

COST TENDER EVALUATION GRID

		BIDDER WEIGHTED SCORE		
		A	B	C
	Weighting of 100%			
Price:	40%	40%	32.40%	23.68%

PART 2B – WEIGHTED COST/ QUALITY SCORES AND BIDDER RANKING

As stated within the ITT evaluation methodology, the quality scores for the quality element were added to the costs scores.

MANAGED SERVICES FOR MERCHANT ACQUIRING SERVICES

Service	Contractor Ref	Quality score (out of 60%)	Cost score (out of 40%)	TOTAL SCORE	RANK
Lot 1 – Merchant Acquiring Services	A	36.33%	40.00%	76.33%	1
	B	39.02%	32.40%	71.42%	2
	C	47.00%	23.68%	70.68%	3