

Shakespeare Façade & EWI

**CRITERIA TO BE USED IN THE ASSESSMENT OF THE TENDER**

1. **Prices (70%)**

- a) Tenders are assessed on the basis of the Tender price. The Authority reserves the right to apply an Affordability threshold to the evaluation.
- b) The lowest total for 1 a) above is adjusted to 100 marks and all other totals have one mark deducted for each percentage point by which the total exceeds that of the lowest. Percentage calculations will be made to one decimal point. (e.g. a total 13.5% above the lowest will thus receive 86.5 marks).

2. **Quality (30%)**

- a) The information submitted by the Tenderer is assessed using two or more of the following criteria:

**Figure A Quality Scoring Criteria**

<b>QUALITY CRITERIA</b>	<b>(A) Typical Criterion Weighting</b>
<i>Each question is scored out of 10, apart from criterion E (Employment &amp; Skills Plan and Method Statement) which is scored as set out in 2b) below.</i>	
<p><b>A.</b> A1. Please provide an outline construction programme to show how you will implement this project. Please submit a construction programme which is compliant with clause 31.2 of the NEC 3 Engineering and Construction Contract. The construction phase of this project is anticipated to last no more than 12 months. Please indicate how long after contract award you will be able to commence works.</p> <p>Tender programme:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• to be supplied in MS Project Office format i.e. a “.mpp”file</li> <li>• to comply with clause 31 of the NEC3 Engineering and Construction Contract</li> </ul>	0
<b>B.</b> Outline method statement for the project to include:	0.8
B1. Please outline examples / experience where you have successfully worked in a similar environment to deliver render repairs, and or, the application of external wall insulation (EWI). You are required to explain the key issues that you would anticipate with such a project, such as (but not limited to) managing the public interface and separation; ensure appropriate standards of behaviour of your employees and sub-contractors and your strategy to mitigate these?	0.15

(Maximum 4 sides A4)	
B2. When you have carried out comparable projects please outline what the key issues were that you have experienced in carrying out works to a high rise domestic block and how you overcame them and how you will apply this in connection to this project. Please provide evidenced examples. (Maximum 4 sides A4)	0.15
B3. Please outline what are the issues in working within an occupied high rise residential building and how you would liaise with tenants and leaseholders to address issues. (Maximum 4 sides A4).	0.1
B4. One of the main objectives of the project is that the works are concluded in accordance with the programme to avoid reputational and financial consequences for the Council. Please set out your approach to your proposed resourcing structure to ensure delivery on time. Your response should include key resources and any key supply chain and elements that will be sub contracted. (Maximum 4 sides A4).	0.1
B5. Please outline your approach to stakeholder management and creating and maintaining good neighbour relations, including identifying key issues that you would anticipate, such as (but not limited to) on-site noise and disruption, site access and deliveries to the site. What is your strategy to mitigate these? (Maximum 4 sides A4).	0.1
B6. Please provide a project risk register for this project based on your experience of delivering comparable schemes. Please provide a method statement on the key project risks you anticipate on this scheme and your proposals to manage and mitigate these risks. (Maximum 3 sides A4 plus Risk Register 2 sides A3).	0.1
B7. Please outline your methodology for identifying and managing your supply chain and indicate how you would ensure their appointment will bring specialist expertise to the project. (Maximum 4 sides A4).	0.1
<p><b>C.</b> The proposed team to include their expertise, experience and qualifications relevant to the call-off. CVs for any persons proposed to be used as identified in NEC3 Contract Data. Each CV shall be a single page CV complying with the format below:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• <u>Name</u>:.....</li> <li>• <u>Base</u> (current normal operating base)</li> <li>• <u>Qualifications</u> including <u>dates</u> attained</li> <li>• <u>Experience with Firm</u>: Details of each position with firm with <u>dates</u>. Include outline details of achievements for each position.</li> <li>• <u>Previous Experience</u>: Details of each position with each previous employer with dates. Include outline details of achievements for each position.</li> </ul> <p>C1. Please provide detail of the organisation’s relevant experience in delivering this type of scheme including project related Curriculum Vitae’s for up to 6 of your construction and management team (this should include posts related to Site Management; Quantity Surveying; Project Management; Contracts Management, and Health and Safety). Please include their skills and experience in the development of this type of scheme. (Maximum 1 side A4 per CV)</p>	0.1
<b>D.</b> Not Used.	

<p><b>E.</b> Employment and Skills Plan &amp; method statement. Scored in accordance with 2b) below.</p> <p>E1. Tenderers are referred to clause 116 Employment and Skills in the Preliminaries. Tenders are asked to provide a written response to this to demonstrate how they will ensure compliance with these requirements and what outputs they anticipate to achieve / deliver on this contract. (Maximum 2 side A4)</p> <p>This section relates to the Corporate Social Responsibility (CSR) of the tender submission.</p>	0.1
<p>F. Not Used.</p>	
<p><b>Total (Initial Quality Score)</b></p>	<p><b>1.0</b></p>

- b) Apart from criterion 'E: Employment and Skills' each criterion listed in Figure A above is assessed out of 10 using the Quality Scoring Regime in Figure B below.
- c) The score for each question is multiplied by the weighting shown in Figure A and totalled.
- d) If a tenderer scores less than the minimum score threshold of 2/10 in any of the individual method statement questions, the Council reserves the right to reject that tenderer. The evaluation panel will highlight this in their report to the decision maker together with a recommendation to reject that tenderer. Tenderers must also achieve a minimum of 40% of the overall quality points available (i.e. 0.4 out of 1.0 total weighting available). Tenderers who do not meet this minimum overall quality threshold will be automatically eliminated from the evaluation process and not considered for the contract.
- e) The highest scored total for 2c) is adjusted to 100 and all other totals have one mark deducted for each percentage point by which the total is lower than that of the highest. Percentage calculations will be made to one decimal point. (e.g. a total 13.5% below the highest will thus receive 86.5 marks).
- f) Please do not answer questions by referring to other documents or to specific paragraphs within other documents as these will not be evaluated. You should be aware that any text over the page limit for the relevant method statements will be removed from the tender schedule before being issued to the evaluation panel.
- g) You should submit clear, concise and unambiguous statements that provide sufficient evidence as to how you will deliver the requirements of the council's specification and associated contract terms and conditions.
- h) It is important to ensure that any information submitted is relevant to the quality evaluation criteria. Information which is not relevant will not be taken into account and will not be evaluated.

- i) You should ensure that you do not exceed the maximum page limit given for each method statement detailed at figure A above. Font type Ariel and font size 12 should be used, as well as ‘normal’ margins (For the avoidance of doubt, ‘normal’ margins is defined as the associated option in Microsoft word, the Tender Schedule will be set up with these settings and bidders should not amend these). Any content exceeding these thresholds will not be evaluated. Appendices and additional documentation should not be referenced to as part of the method statement response.

### Figure B Quality Scoring Regime

#### Score Guide (0 – 10)

Score	Assessment
10	<b>Outstanding:</b> The response covers all elements of the criterion, and associated specified contract requirements and standards; and with a high level of relevant and detailed information, backed up with clear evidence; and demonstrates a robust and coherent understanding of the council’s requirements; and with no issues, weaknesses or omissions.
9	<b>Excellent:</b> The response covers all elements of the criterion, and associated specified contract requirements and standards; and with relevant and detailed information, backed up with clear evidence; but with limited minor issues, weaknesses or omissions in the information/evidence only.
8	<b>Very good:</b> The response covers all key elements and almost all of the other elements of the criterion, and associated specified contract requirements and standards; and with relevant and detailed information, backed up with clear evidence; with a few minor issues, weaknesses, or omissions in the information/evidence.
7	<b>Good:</b> The response covers all key elements and the majority of the other elements of the criterion, and associated specified contract requirements and standards; and with relevant information, backed up with evidence, but lacks detail in some areas; some minor issues, weaknesses, or omissions in some areas of information/evidence.
6	<b>Better than satisfactory:</b> The response addresses all key elements of the criterion, and associated specified contract requirements and standards; but is not fully detailed or fully backed up with clear evidence in some areas; a number of minor and/or one or two more significant issues, weaknesses, or omissions in some areas.
5	<b>Satisfactory:</b> The response addresses all key elements of the criterion, and associated specified contract requirements and standards; but is not fully detailed or fully backed up with clear evidence in some areas; with a large number of minor, and/or a number of significant weaknesses, issues or omissions in the detail/evidence.
4	<b>Less than satisfactory:</b> The response has some weaknesses, issues or omissions, lacking detail, clarity and/or evidence with regard to at least one key element of the criterion, and associated specified contract requirements and standards with respect to this criterion.
3	<b>Weak:</b> The response has some weaknesses, issues or omissions, lacking detail, clarity and/or evidence with regard to several key elements of the criterion, and associated

	specified contract requirements and standards.
<b>2</b>	<b>Poor:</b> The response has material weaknesses, issues or omissions, lacking detail, clarity and/or evidence with regard to many key elements of the criterion, and associated specified contract requirements and standards.
<b>1</b>	<b>Very poor:</b> The response does not meet the criterion, or does not include sufficient information or clarity or evidence or information in support, to determine whether the solution meets the council's requirements or standards.
<b>0</b>	<b>Unacceptable:</b> Failed to provide a response, or the response provided is wholly inconsistent with the council's specified contract requirements and standards with respect to this criterion.

### 3. Final Tender Assessment

- a) The price and quality scores for every Tender evaluated and not disqualified by virtue of 3a) above are aggregated using a prices / quality ratio of 70% Price and 30% Quality.
- b) Tenders are ranked for acceptance on the basis of their scores from 3a) above (highest score ranks first).
- c) The Authority reserves the right not to score quality submissions for any tenders that are so much higher in price than the lowest tender that they would not be able to score high enough overall marks to be awarded the contract even if the lowest tenderer were to receive a zero quality score and they obtained a maximum quality score.

