**Appendix 1**

Below is the outcome of the scoring process for the submitted tenders. An explanation of the evaluation process is also included

|  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| **Award Criteria Evaluation Spreadsheet**  |  |  |  |  |
|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| **Criteria** | **Weight** | **Croft** | **Contractor B** | **Contractor C** |
|   |   | Score | Score weighting | Score | Score weighting | Score | Score weighting |
| Case studies | 36% | 5 | 36 | 1 | 7 | 1 | 7 |
| CVs | 24% | 5 | 24 | 1 | 5 | 1 | 5 |
|   |   |   |   |   |   |   |   |
| **Total** | **60%** |  | **60** |  | **12** |  | **12** |
| Cost |   |   | 1334042 |   | 543019 |   | 862860 |
| Financial | 40% |   | 16 |   | 40 |   | 25 |
| **Total** | **100%** |   | **76** |  | **52** |  | **37** |

**The evaluation process**

The scoring framework shown below is used to evaluate qualitative aspect of tenders. The Tenderers response to each question is scored and the total pro-rated to give a percentage score out of the maximum percentage for that section

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
| **0** Unacceptable | Nil response, or Proposal is so incomplete or irrelevant that it is not possible to form a judgement  |
| **1** Poor | Almost unacceptable, response is limited or proposal is inadequate or substantially irrelevant. |
| **2** Unsatisfactory | Below expectation, proposal does not fully address the requirement and gives rise to a number of concerns about its potential reliability. |
| **3** Satisfactory | Satisfactory, proposal generally meets requirements, gives minor reservations about meeting some of the requirements. |
| **4**Good | Good, meets expectations, proposal provides detail that is directly relevant, gives confidence as to reliability to meeting all key aspects of the requirements. |
| **5** Excellent | Comprehensive, proposal exceeds expectations, gives high confidence that all key aspects of the proposal may be relied upon without reservation, offers added value and innovation that is relevant to requirement. |

The final scores for the qualitative and price elements of the tender are combined to give an overall final score for the submission.

With respect to financial criterion scoring each submission is awarded a weighting based on its relationship with the lowest priced quotation on the basis of the submitted lump sum fee. The Tender with the lowest lump sum fee is awarded the full weighting available.  Each of the remaining Tenders is awarded a weighting on a pro-rata basis according to the following calculation:

Lowest quotation price

\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_            x **40** % of weighting to be allocated

Tenderer price