

Mini Tender Evaluation Results: Price

The mini tender evaluation determined the most economically advantageous tender [MEAT] by means of applying the following main criteria:

- 1. Quality 60%
- 2. Price 40%

Scoring

Mark out of:	Total 1-5
Question not answered	0
Very Poor – core issues and requirements not addressed or processes not acceptable	1
Poor – reflects a very limited understanding of core issues and requirements.	2
Minimum/ Satisfactory – adequate understanding of core issues and requirements.	3
Good – competent response, reflects good understanding of core issues and requirements.	4
Excellent – detailed response, with a high level of understanding of the core issues and requirements, of working practices and of quality measures required	5

The ‘overall “value” to the Council’ evaluation criterion (which carries a weighting of 20%) was scored as follows:

The Highest offer price will receive the maximum weighted score of 20.

Offers below the highest offer price will be scored as a proportional variance from the Highest offer price using the following formula:

$$\frac{\text{Offer price submitted}}{\text{Highest offer price}} \times 20\%$$

The resulting weighted score will be rounded up to two decimal places.

Developer 1 Standard Bid					
Section	Assessment Points	Max Score	Weighting	<u>Ardmore First Base</u>	
<i>Price / Finance (40%)</i>	<u>Finance section should only be evaluated by financial / technical advisors</u>			SCORE	Weighted Score
Financial proposals	Robustness of assumptions for Council Works, to include robustness of assumptions for Client Specific Fit Out Items.	5	14	2	5.6
	Robustness of assumptions for Developer Works	5	4	3	2.4
	Overage	5	2	4	1.6
	Overall "Value" to Council.		20		16.12
	Total				25.72

Developer 1 Variant Bid Options 1 & 2					
Section	Assessment Points	Max Score	Weighting	Ardmore First Base	
<i>Price / Finance (40%)</i>	<u>Finance section should only be evaluated by financial / technical advisors</u>			SCORE	Weighted Score
Financial proposals	Robustness of assumptions for Council Works, to include robustness of assumptions for Client Specific Fit Out Items.	5	14	2	5.6
	Robustness of assumptions for Developer Works	5	4	3	2.4
	Overage	5	2	4	1.6
	Overall "Value" to Council.		20		20
	Total				29.6

Developer 2 Standard Bid					
Price / Finance (40%)	<u>Finance section should only be evaluated by financial / technical advisors</u>			SCORE	Weighted Score
Financial proposals	Robustness of assumptions for Council Works, to include robustness of assumptions for Client Specific Fit Out Items.	5	14	4	11.2
	Robustness of assumptions for Developer Works	5	4	4	3.2
	Overage	5	2	3	1.2
	Overall "Value" to Council.		20		15.9
	Total				31.5

Developer 3 Standard Bid					
<i>Price / Finance (40%)</i>	<u>Finance section should only be evaluated by financial / technical advisors</u>			SCORE	Weighted Score
Financial proposals	Robustness of assumptions for Council Works, to include robustness of assumptions for Client Specific Fit Out Items.	5	14	3	8.4
	Robustness of assumptions for Developer Works	5	4	4	3.2
	Overage	5	2	3	1.2
	Overall "Value" to Council.		20		14.71
	Total				27.51

Developer 3 Variant Bid Options 1 & 2					
<i>Price / Finance (40%)</i>	<u>Finance section should only be evaluated by financial / technical advisors</u>			SCORE	Weighted Score
Financial proposals	Robustness of assumptions for Council Works, to include robustness of assumptions for Client Specific Fit Out Items.	5	14	3	8.4
	Robustness of assumptions for Developer Works	5	4	4	3.2
	Overage	5	2	3	1.2
	Overall "Value" to Council.		20		15.36
	Total				28.16