

Tender Evaluation Procedure with Worked Example

4.1 Evaluation Stages

These stages should be undertaken sequentially, however for efficiency they may happen in parallel. The commencement of the evaluation of any Stage is not an indication that any previous Stage has been successfully passed.

Stage 1 – Verification

All responses will be checked to ensure that the expected documents have been submitted and are complete and the Form of Tender duly signed.

Stage 2 – Selection Criteria

The Standard Selection Questionnaire will be checked to ensure that there are no responses that are deemed to be a fail and lead to rejection of the Tender. The relevant assessment criteria are laid out in the Table at Annex 1 to Schedule 8.

Stage 3 – Quality and Price Evaluation

All completed tenders received will be evaluated by:

- Representatives from the Wiltshire and Oxfordshire Councils Highways teams, Procurement and Finance Teams and Wiltshire Councils Street Lighting Consultant WS Atkins, though they may seek support from other colleagues where they consider that necessary

Any Contract(s) awarded as a result of this procurement will be awarded on the basis of the offer that is the most economically advantageous to the Authorities.

Submissions will be evaluated against the following Award Criteria;

- 70% Quality of which %
 - 60% Quality Questions
 - 40% Demonstrations
- 30% Cost
 - Tendered Price from Schedule 10 Bill of Quantities tab “summary sheet” cell C 16 Total Tender Cost

4.2 Quality Evaluation

Quality Questions

There are pass/fail Mandatory Requirements in Schedule 2 – Specification, Section 2 *General Requirements for Wiltshire Council & Oxfordshire County Council* and Schedule 2 Section 3 *Core Business Requirements for Wiltshire Council and*

Oxfordshire County Council that require a response in Schedule 9 – Part 1. Any fails will lead to rejection of the Tender.

The mandatory requirements set out in Schedule 2 - Specification Section 2 *General Requirements for Wiltshire Council and Oxfordshire County Council* apply to the entire solution and all modules proposed by the tenderer.

The scoring scale for the Quality Question element is:

Assessment	Mark	Interpretation
Excellent	10	<i>Exceeds the requirement. Exceptional demonstration by the Tenderer of how they will meet this requirement by their allocation of skills and understanding, resources and quality measures. Response identifies factors that demonstrate added value, with evidence to support the response.</i>
	9	
Good	8	<i>Satisfies the requirement with minor additional benefits. Above average demonstration by the Tenderer of how they will meet this requirement by their allocation of skills and understanding, resources and quality measures. Response identifies factors that demonstrate added value, with evidence to support the response.</i>
	7	
Acceptable	6	<i>Satisfies the requirement. Demonstration by the Tenderer of how they will meet this requirement by their allocation of skills and understanding, resources and quality measures, with evidence to support the response.</i>
	5	
Minor Reservations	4	<i>Satisfies the requirement with minor reservations. Some minor reservations regarding how the Tenderer will meet this requirement by their allocation of skills and understanding, resources and quality measures, with limited evidence to support the response.</i>
	3	
Serious Reservations	2	<i>Satisfies the requirement with major reservations. Considerable reservations regarding how the Tenderer will meet this requirement by their allocation of skills and understanding, resources and quality measures, with little or no evidence to support the response.</i>
	1	
Unacceptable	0	<i>Does not meet the requirement. Does not comply and/or insufficient information provided to demonstrate how the Tenderer will meet this requirement by their allocation of skills and understanding, resources and quality measures, with little or no evidence to support the response.</i>

Tenderers are to provide their response to the questions in the tender documents where those questions appear in the tender document rather than simply cross-referring. If tenderers cannot fit a response into the form at that point, the answer

response space can be expanded to accommodate the response while adhering to limits set. If it is necessary for tenderers to cross-refer to another document that they are submitting with the tender, it is the tenderer's responsibility to make sure that this is done clearly, in a way that is easy to follow and identifies the document, the page and paragraph that deals with the question. If the reference is ambiguous or the Authorities cannot trace or follow an answer, that will be at the tenderer's risk, and is likely to have a detrimental effect on the evaluation of the tender. Evasive, unclear or hedged Tenders may be discounted in evaluation and may, at the Authorities discretion, be taken as a rejection by the Tenderer of the terms set out in this ITT.

When completing the questions tenderers must make sure that they answer what is being asked, but wherever possible tenderers should demonstrate how they will go further than what is being asked for, to add value.

Tenderers should also make sure that their answers inform not just what they will do, but how they will do it, and what their proposed timescales are (as relevant). It is useful to give examples or provide evidence to support your responses. The purpose should be to include as much relevant detail as required, so that the evaluation panel gets the fullest possible picture.

Scores are arrived at following the application of the Evaluation Criteria set out in the Annex 1 to Schedule 9 which shows a worked example of evaluating a question (2.1) to demonstrate the method, plus how the quality and demonstration scores are combined for a total quality score.

While the Demonstrations have their own scoring element, they will also be used to moderate the quality scores in relation to the written answers where it is considered by the Authorities that is necessary i.e. something emerges during the demonstrations that might mean a score is adjusted either upwards or downwards.

Appropriate representative(s) from each of the areas identified above will separately evaluate all relevant documentation submitted by tenderers' and will subsequently meet to discuss their scores, to agree a final moderated score for each question.

The moderated scores for Quality will be the same for Wiltshire Council and Oxfordshire County Council.

4.3 Software Demonstration

Tenderers will be required to demonstrate their proposed systems to the Authorities Tender Evaluation Panel (and potentially other representatives of the Authorities).

The demonstration will consist of four (4) scenarios to be performed in a live system environment and are to reflect the actual system functionality available from the contract start date. The scenarios will enable Tenderers to demonstrate complete end to end processes. The tenderers should demonstrate their understanding of the client's needs through their review of the Specification Schedule 2 to enable them to

complete the demonstration. An outline of each scenario will be provided (7) days before the interview date.

Where mobile software is to be used as part of the demonstration it must be conducted using local 3G /4G connectivity and a mobile/smart device.

The outcome of the demonstration will be scored and this score will form part of the overall Quality Score.

Scores are arrived at following the application of the Evaluation Criteria set out in Annex 1 to Schedule 9 that includes a worked example of how Q2.1 is evaluated to show the method applied to each quality question/demonstration, plus how the quality and demonstration scores are combined for a total quality score.

4.4 Price Evaluation

Separate Bills of Quantities have been produced one for Wiltshire Council's requirements and one for Oxfordshire County Council's requirements.

These Bills of Quantities will be evaluated separately by each Authority to determine the Price used for evaluation. The individual price score for each Authority will be added to the jointly evaluated Quality score to produce a total evaluation score for Wiltshire Council and a separate total evaluation for Oxfordshire County Council. This could result in each Authority awarding to a different contractor.

Scores are arrived at following the application of the Evaluation Criteria set out in the Annex to Schedule 10 that includes a worked example.

Any tender that is found to be too low to be credible will be excluded from further consideration. In this instance, the Authority will initially clarify with the tenderer whether the pricing is correct and has been interpreted correctly. As part of the clarification, evidence will be required to demonstrate that the charges are accurate, achievable and sustainable. If following the clarification, any charge is found to be abnormally low, that tender will be rejected in accordance with the Public Contract Regulations 2015 regardless of how many points it scores in all other aspects.

Any tender which is found to be too high to be acceptable will be excluded from further consideration. In this instance, the Authority will initially clarify with the tenderer concerned whether the pricing is correct and has been interpreted correctly. If following the clarification, any charge is found to be too high to be acceptable, that tender will be rejected in accordance with the Public Contract Regulations 2015 regardless of how many points it scores in all other aspects

4.5 Determining the final evaluated score

The final assessment of each compliant tender will be based on the aggregated score for the Quality/Price submission based on a ratio of 70:30. (Quality score x 70% + Price score x 30%).

The Tenderer receiving the highest combined Quality/Price score shall be awarded the Contract. The table below shows a worked example.

Wiltshire Council Final Evaluated Score

	Quality Marks	Best Quality Score (Q)	Price score	Combined Score (Q x 0.7) + (P x 0.3)
Tender A	63.03	83.48%	78.18%	81.89%
Tender B	65.40	86.62%	46.60%	74.61%
Tender C	71.90	95.23%	100.00%	96.66%
Tender D	75.50	100.00%	67.6%	90.28%

Tender C is the successful submission in the example.

Oxfordshire County Council Final Evaluated Score

	Quality Marks	Best Quality Score (Q)	Price score	Combined Score (Q x 0.7) + (P x 0.3)
Tender A	63.03	83.48%	86.79%	84.47%
Tender B	65.40	86.62%	61.54%	79.10%
Tender C	71.90	95.23%	100.00%	96.66%
Tender D	75.50	100.00%	79.28%	93.78%

Tender C is the successful submission in the example.