

Appendix B

Evaluation Criteria, Sub-criteria and Scoring Methodology

The tender was evaluated based on a weighting of 50% Quality and 50% Price to identify the most economically advantageous tender.

Evaluation of Quality Criteria

1. Technical responses were evaluated using the quality evaluation methodology and evaluation criteria identified below.
2. Quality scores for each sub-criteria listed in section 1 and 2 in Table 2 were scored using the range of 0 – 4 using the scoring criteria identified in the scoring matrix in Table 1 below
3. Bidders were required to reach a minimum score of 2 (satisfactory) in each sub criteria. Bidders scoring less than 2 in any area were excluded from the competition
4. Scoring was undertaken independently by each member of the evaluation panel and where necessary a consensus score was then agreed at a moderation meeting.

Scoring Matrix (Table 1)

SCORE	ASSESSMENT
0	Unacceptable (fails to meet required standard)
	Response supplied fails to grasp/reflect core issues and requirements
1	Poor (Fails to meet the required standard)
	Response supplied reflects a very limited understanding of core issues and requirements with significant concerns
2	Satisfactory
	Response supplied reflects understanding of core issues and requirements with minimum concerns
3	Good
	Response supplied reflects good understanding of core issues and requirements with additional added value and no concerns
4	Excellent
	Response supplied reflects an excellent understanding of core issues and requirements with significant added value

Quality Evaluation Methodology:

The quality score for each sub-criteria was calculated as follows:

(Points scored / Total points available) x 100

This score was then multiplied by the % weighting to calculate the % weighted score. The aggregate sum of these scores represents the total quality score out of 50.

Quality Evaluation Criteria and Sub-Criteria with weightings to be applied (Table 2):

SECTION 1 CONTRACT MANAGEMENT (TOTAL 22% WEIGHTING)	WEIGHTING
Method Statement for Part 1:Contract Management	8%
Mobilisation of Services and Decommissioning of Services	2%
Continuous Improvement	5%
Environmental and Sustainability	1%
Off- site support	1%
Procedures for Communication and reporting standards	2%
Human Resources and Continuous Professional Development	1%
Risk	2%
SUB TOTAL	22%
SECTION 2 ABILITY TO MEET THE COUNCIL'S REQUIREMENTS – Method Statements for each of the following Parts (2-12) TOTAL 28%	
Part 2 Building & Asset Maintenance	5%
Part 3:Cleaning,waste removal and recycling	2%
Part 4: Security	3%
Part 5: Portering	2%
Part 6: Landscaping	2%
Part 7: Pest Control	2%
Part 8: Energy and Utilities	2%
Part 9: Helpdesk	3%
Part 10: Catering	2%
Part 11: Vehicle and Cycle parking	2%
Part 12: Function Management	3%
SUB TOTAL	28%
TOTAL QUALITY	50%

Evaluation of Price - Scoring Methodology

The scoring of Price was based on the percentage deviation from the mean evaluation model. This scoring methodology uses the average as a mean, with price allocated 50% of the total points available.

Bidders were asked to ensure that annual efficiency savings were applied across the annual costs to arrive at a Net Annual Contract Value for Years 2 to 5. All prices were then included in the total price.

The price evaluation for the fixed lump sum was calculated over the initial 5-year contract term. The price score was calculated without taking into account the possible pensions risk share option and without prices for the Library café and for new buildings such as Willesden Green Library Development.

Detailed Price Scoring Methodology

mean price minus bid price =x

x divided by the mean price=y

y multiplied by 100 = z(percentage difference)

z + 50 = Raw Score

Raw score multiplied by weighting (50%) = Weighted Score

An example scoring using this methodology:

	Price	Raw "Percentage" score	£ difference (x)	y (x ÷ Mean Price)	% difference = z (y x100)	Weighted Score
Supplier A	£3,250,000	46.00	-£125,000	-0.04	-4.00	23.00
Supplier B	£3,200,000	47.60	-£75,000	-0.02	-2.40	23.80
Supplier C	£3,100,000	50.80	£25,000	0.01	0.80	25.40
Supplier D	£2,950,000	55.60	£175,000	0.06	5.60	27.80
Mean Price	£3,125,000					