IESE REGIONAL FRAMEWORK

Project Name	Park Lane School
Client	LB of Brent
Estimated Project Value	£2,600,000
Scope of Work	Refurb

Date of assessment	07-Jan
By	Don Joyce

APPENDIX 1

Note: a score of 1 in Questions 1, 3 or 4 will automatically remove a contractor from further consideration

	Contractor's:-	Client's Project-specific weighting	Mace Plus Score 1 to 5	Mace Plus Weighted Score	Warings Score 1 to 5	Warings Weighted Score	BAM Score 1 to 5	BAM Weighted Score	Mansell / BBCL Score 1 to 5	Mansell / BBCL Weighted Score	Kier Score 1 to 5	Kier Weighted Score	Morgan Sindall Score 1 to 5	Morgan Sindall Weighted Score	Willmott Dixon Score 1 to 5	Willmott Dixon Weighted Score	VolkerFitzpatrick Score 1 to 5	VolkerFitzpatrick Weighted Score	Costain Score 1 to 5	Costain Weighted Score	Wates Score 1 to 5	Wates Weighted Score
1	Preferred type of work	0.17		0.0	1	0.2		0.0	5	0.8	5	0.8	1	0.2	1	0.2		0.0			1	0.2
2	Relevant Experience	0.17		0.0	1	0.2		0.0	5	0.8	5	0.8	1	0.2	1	0.2		0.0			1	0.2
3	Capacity	0.17		0.0	1	0.2		0.0	5	0.8	5	0.8	1	0.2	1	0.2		0.0			1	0.2
4	Geographical location	0.17		0.0	1	0.2		0.0	5	0.8	5	0.8	1	0.2	1	0.2		0.0			1	0.2
5	Client's Preference	0.17		0.0		0.0		0.0		0.0		0.0		0.0		0.0		0.0		0		0.0
6	KPI Score	0.17		0.0		0.0		0.0		0.0		0.0		0.0		0.0		0.0		0		0.0
7	Management Structure / Costs	0.00		0		0		0		0		0		0		0		0		0		0
	Weighting to total 1.00	1.00	TOTAL	0.00	TOTAL	0.67	TOTAL	0.00	TOTAL	3.33	TOTAL	3.33	TOTAL	0.67	TOTAL	0.67	TOTAL	0.00	TOTAL	0.00	TOTAL	0.67
	% SCORE			0%		13%		0%		67%		67%		13%		13%		0%		0%		13%

Weighting Calculation

Preferred type of work	100	0.17
Relevant Experience	100	0.17
Capacity	100	0.17
Geographical location	100	0.17
Client Preference	100	0.17
KPI Score	100	0.17
Management Structure / Costs	0	0.00
TOTALS	600	1.00

Select the criteria of the greatest importance, and give it a score of 100. Take each criteria in turn and assess its' importance relative to 100. Is it half the importance? To ensure the best possible spread of weighting, it is often best to select the least important criteria second, and to try to give it a score first. The lower this score, the easier it is to weight the scores between as there are high and low comparisons.

SCORING PROMPTS

Preferred type of work (or desired type of new work)	5. Very strong preference for project. 4. Good fit with contractor's preferences 3. Contractor willing but not usual fit 2. Poor fit with contractor's preferences 1. No fit with contractor's preferences

Relevant Experience
    of sector
    or of site
    or "specialist" e.g. cladding
	5. Considerable (10+ similar projects)
	4. Some (5 - 9 similar projects)
	3. Little (1 - 4 similar projects)
	2. No recent experience (within 5 years)
	1. No experience

Capacity Management Team available Design Team available Speciallist supplier available	5. Experienced Project Team immediately available 4. Project Team immediately available 3. Project Team available within 1 month 2. Heavily committed to other work 1. Contractor unavailable
Geographical location Contractor has local presence Local supply chains Previous history of the area	5. In centre of area, (or in proximity to existing work) 4. Well within area of coverage 3. Within area of coverage 2. Slightly outside area of coverage 1. Significantly outside contractor's area
Client Preference Could be based on: Ongoing programme of work End user relationship Previous excellent delivery	5. Strong preference 4. Good working experience with contractor 3. No preference 2. Poor experience with contractor 1. Unacceptable to client
Carried forward from performance reviews of previous projects	
KPI Score Use Global KPI, or choose one of:- *Global* KPI *Sector* KPI (eg school, offices) *Specific* KPI (eg time, cost, quality)	5. 80+ 4. 70 to 79 3. 60 to 69 2. 50 to 59 1. Less than 50
Management Structure / Costs Proposed management team Relationship to ITT Allocation of personnel	5. Appropriate resources for the tasks 4. Good team proposals 3. Fair approach to proposed team 2. Poor team proposals, time based 1. Purely time based team proposals, no task considerations