

APPENDIX 2

DN544729 – PUBLIC SECTOR DECARBONISATION SCHEME – ENERGY EFFICIENCY WORKS IN BRENT CORPORATE BUILDINGS (RE:FIT PROJECT) CONTRACT

Tender Evaluation Grid

Scoring Summary

Evaluation Criteria	Available Marks	Supplier A	Supplier B
Total for Quality	90%	76%	77%
Total for Price	10%	10%	0%
TOTAL	100%	86.00%	77.00%

Quality – (Available Score 0-5)

Criteria	Weighting	Scores obtained by Supplier A and reasons for score	Scores obtained by Supplier B and reasons for score
1. Project management	10%	Score: 4 (8%) A good example of a project plan but more detail could be provided on timelines.	Score: 5 (10%) Excellent detail in proposed project timeline. Provided several detailed case studies.
2. Analysis and design	20%	Score: 4 (16%) Provided a good detailed response in line with question. Answer could be tailored more towards Brent.	Score: 4 (16%) Provided a good detailed response, mentioned specific projects around Brent. IGP works table did not relate to costings.
3. Installation phase	15%	Score: 5 (15%) Provided detailed response and gave additional detail regarding stakeholders and flowcharts. Referred to specific policies in Brent. Gave confidence around short timelines.	Score: 4 (12%) Provided a good although slightly generic response, gave detail in line with question. Frequent HLA references without recognition that HLA will not be required in phase 1.
4. Performance delivery	15%	Score: 5 (15%) Provided specific detail on processes and annual reporting. Will ensure in house Brent staff training for maintenance. Face to face annual reporting.	Score: 5 (15%) Mentioned dashboards, answer provided specific details. Outstanding performance monitoring software.

Criteria	Weighting	Scores obtained by Supplier A and reasons for score	Scores obtained by Supplier B and reasons for score
5. Achieving strategic goals and wider benefits	10%	<p>Score: 5 (10%)</p> <p>Offered creative social values which aligned to the contract, including workshops for each building regarding energy and how they could reduce carbon emmissions including educate to the wider issues of climate change.</p> <p>Through accreditation training they are committed at least 20 people in order to help them to enhance their skills and therefore secure/sustain long term employment.</p> <p>Ameresco will provide technology upto a value of £30,000 and will work with the Council to identify how best to distribute these (for example through schools, outreach centres, direct to residents through housing associations etc.)</p>	<p>Score: 2 (4%)</p> <p>Could have provided much more detail on ideas suggested. Values could have been assigned more evenly, instead of assigning most of the value in the first section only.</p>
6. Pricing approach	20%	<p>Score: 3 (12%)</p> <p>Profit and overhead was in line with expected value</p>	<p>Score: 5 (20%)</p> <p>Profit and overhead was good value</p>
QUALITY TOTAL (out of 90%)		76%	77%

Price

Criteria	Weighting	Scores obtained by Supplier A and reasons for score	Scores obtained by Supplier B and reasons for score
Cost Submission	10%	10%	0%
PRICE TOTAL (out of 10%)		10%	0%*
TOTAL SCORE	100%	86%	77%

** “Any price of 20% more than the modified mean gets a mark of 0 and any price of 20% less than the modified mean will get a mark of 0.5 i.e. the maximum marks available for this question.
All prices which are between 20% less and 20% more than the modified mean shall be awarded a mark pro-rata relative to the modified mean.”*