

## TENDER EVALUATION PROCESS

The following information is based on the instructions issued to tenderers.

The overall weighting for this tender was 40% Quality, 60% Price.

### QUALITY ASSESSMENT

There were five questions that tenderers had to answer.

**Q1** Bidders were asked to set out the following:

- Their approach to delivery,
- Who will be involved in delivering the works Project; and
- What are, and how they will manage, the key interfaces – internally within the Project team, and externally.

**Q2** Bidders were asked to provide the following:

- Proposed programme with narrative.
- Key project risks and mitigating actions.

**Q3** Bidders were asked to provide the following:

- Description of approach and methodology to deliver the retaining wall and structural elements of the project (including management of the supply chain) as detailed in the Scope, and to achieve delivery to time, quality, and value for money.
- Consideration of what temporary works may be required, how these would be implemented and managed, and what control measures to monitor the performance of temporary works would be put in place.
- Consideration of potential Value Engineering initiatives, how these would be proposed for consideration, and the benefits and savings that might be achieved.

**Q4** Bidders were asked to set out:

- How they will communicate with the local communities to keep them up to date with progress
- How they will proactively engage with adjacent landowners through delivery.
- How they will engage with specialist and voluntary groups in demonstrating and highlighting the complex civil engineering involved in this project.
- How will you deliver a lasting legacy with community value in the area.

**Q5** Bidders were asked to:

- Demonstrate what approaches will be taken to minimise the carbon footprint of the works through the construction phase of project, and how this may have influence and impact beyond the delivery of the scheme.

All responses were limited to a maximum allowable number of pages. One page was considered the equivalent of one side of A4 at Arial font size 11 point excluding question reference.

All questions were given an individual weighting and questions were scored out of 5 with the maximum score for any question being 5. Bidders were asked to note that the responses to each element within a question would not be given an individual mark, rather they would be marked and assessed by the Council as one 'package' of information and a single mark per question would be awarded.

### **Scoring Criteria for Quality Submission**

The following scoring matrix was used when evaluating responses to the quality submission.

<b>Assessment</b>	<b>Interpretation</b>	<b>Score</b>
Deficient	A significantly deficient answer, the response provides no confidence of successful delivery <b>OR</b> a response has not been provided to this question.	0
Very Poor	A very poor answer that gives very little detail or evidence. The response does not show understanding of the requirement and provides little confidence of successful delivery.	1
Poor	A poor answer that only partially addresses the requirement. The response illustrates some understanding of the requirement but provides does not provide sufficient confidence of successful delivery.	2
Acceptable	An acceptable answer meeting the requirement with a sufficient level of detail and evidence. The response illustrates an understanding of the requirement and provides sufficient confidence of successful delivery.	3
Good	A good answer, with a comprehensive level of detail and strong evidence. The response illustrates a comprehensive understanding of the requirement and provides good confidence of successful delivery.	4
Excellent	An excellent answer with exceptional detail and evidence. The response illustrates an excellent understanding of the requirement and provides an excellent level of confidence of successful delivery.	5

The total score for the Quality evaluation was broken down as follows:

	<b>Subject</b>	<b>Percentage</b>
<b>Q1</b>	Organisation, Key People and Delivery	21%
<b>Q2</b>	Programme and project risk	33%
<b>Q3</b>	Construction Process	20%
<b>Q4</b>	Social value	16%
<b>Q5</b>	Minimising Carbon	10%

The Scores from the Quality Questions were converted into weighted scores as the following example demonstrates:

<b>Question</b>	<b>Weighting</b>	<b>Score (max 5)</b>	<b>Quality Score x Weighting</b>	<b>Weighted Score</b>
Q1	21%	4	$(4/5) \times (21)$	16.8
Q2	33%	5	$(5/5) \times (33)$	33.0
Q3	20%	4	$(4/5) \times (20)$	16.0
Q4	16%	4	$(4/5) \times (16)$	12.8
Q5	10%	3	$(3/5) \times (10)$	6.0
<b>Total Quality Score</b>	<b>100%</b>			<b>84.6</b>

If a Tenderer were to score 5/5 for every question, the sum of all their weighted scores would be 100 marks, since the sum of the questions weightings is 100 marks.

The tenderer with the highest total quality mark would receive a total score of 40%, with all other tenderers compared pro-rata as demonstrated in the table below:

<b>Contractor</b>	<b>Weighted Score (out of 100)</b>	<b>Quality Score (out of 40%)</b>
Contractor 1	81.0	38.30
Contractor 2	84.6	40.00
Contractor 3	75.2	35.56
Contractor 4	82.0	38.77

## PRICING ASSESSMENT

### Price Submission - Tender Price and Compensation Event Scenarios

The Total Price was the Tendered total the bidder's submitted Form of Tender and the Compensation Event (CE) Scenarios (calculated from rates and percentages submitted in a Tenderer's Contract Data Part Two) were assessed. A Compensation Event occurs when unplanned work, design changes or other events occur that vary the work required.

The total percentage weighting applied for these elements of the evaluation was 60%, broken down as follows:

	Element	Percentage
1	Tendered Total of the Prices	85% of 60% = 51%
2	Compensation Events Scenarios	15% of 60% = 9%

Tenderers are to keep their bid open until 1 June 2024.

Any Contractor risk values that the Tenderer considered necessary were to be allowed for within the total of the Prices. Such a value had to be allocated within the rates in the Price List and Tenderers must ensure that their submitted programme reflected any time issues due to the identified risks. The Tenderers had to include only mitigation, cost and time allowances for risks that were priced for in their Tender. Tenderers were not allowed to allocate risks to the Client.

### Evaluation Criteria

The lowest Tendered Total of the Prices for a response which met the pass criteria were awarded a score of 100. All other bids were scored on a pro rata basis in relation to the lowest price. For example:

- Bid 1 £100,000 scores 100
- Bid 2 £120,000, differential of £20,000 or 20% remove 20% from price scores 80
- Bid 3 £150,000, differential £50,000 remove 50% from price scores 50
- Bid 4 £175,000, differential £75,000 remove 75% from price scores 25.

The lowest score possible is 0. All scores were then subjected to a multiplier, these scores were weighted to the related percentage i.e., Compensation Events 9% and Tendered Price 51%.

Tenderers were required to complete the Activity Schedule included in the tender documentation. The Tenderers returned the Bill of Quantities in Excel format as provided without amendment. All prices quoted were inclusive of all costs associated in the delivery of this Contract but exclusive of VAT. All costs had to be included in this section, as costs appearing elsewhere in the proposal but not mentioned in the Pricing Schedule were presumed waived.

## Compensation Event Assessment

The evaluation of the financial element of the tender included an assessment of the rates the Tenderer submitted as set out in the Contract Data Part 2. This was accomplished by way of an evaluation of three potential Compensation Event Scenarios. These represented potential unplanned works or changes to the scheme. The profile of costs varied between the Scenarios as set out in the table below:

Item	Scenario 1	Scenario 2	Scenario 3
Works value (approximate)	£100,000	£100,000	£100,000
People cost (approximate - to be sourced from person categories)	£40,000	£45,000	£50,000
Equipment cost (published list excluding adjustment)	£30,000	£45,000	£25,000
Other cost elements	£30,000	£10,000	£25,000
Sub-total	£100,000	£100,000	£100,000
Fee (as tender submission)	TBA	TBA	TBA
Total	TBA	TBA	TBA

Using the information above, and the rates and fee percentages submitted in the Contract Data Part 2 submitted with the tenders, the total Compensation Event prices were calculated.

The prices from the three CE scenarios were converted into scores and weighted as the following example demonstrates:

Scenario	Contractor 1	Contractor 2	Contractor 3
CE Scenario 1	£105,350	£90,200	£108,120
CE Scenario 2	£102,663	£82,775	£106,000
CE Scenario 3	£107,500	£90,750	£111,300
Total value	£315,513	£263,725	£325,420
Score (max 100)	80.04	100.00	76.60
Weighted score (max 9)	7.24	9.00	6.90

The number of contractors shown is illustrative only, and assessment of all compliant tenders was undertaken.

All the scores attained for each area were combined resulting in overall score for Price.

## AWARD CRITERIA

The breakdown of questions and associated weightings from the Quality Questions and the Pricing Schedule are identified below:

No	Section 1 - Quality	Weighting (Out of 100%)
1	Organisation, Key People and Delivery	21%
2	Programme and project risk	33%
3	Construction Process	20%
4	Social Value	16%
5	Minimising Carbon/ Climate Emergency	10%
		<b>100%*0.4</b>
	<b>Sub-total</b>	<b>40%</b>
	<b>Section 2 - Price</b>	
n/a	Submitted Price (As submitted on Form of Tender derived from Activity Schedule - Volume 5)	51%
n/a	Compensation Event Assessment	9%
	<b>Sub-total</b>	<b>60%</b>
	<b>Total</b>	<b>100%</b>