
Appendix 1 - Evaluation Methodology

1 Purpose

This document defines the method of evaluation of tenders for the procurement of a Framework Agreement for Arboricultural Services.

2 Evaluation Approach

2.1 Principles

A Tender Evaluation Panel will be established to evaluate tenders based solely on the information provided in the tender documents submitted.

The members of the Tender Evaluation Panel will evaluate tenders in accordance with the process described in this document with the aim of establishing a preferred supplier for the Council's requirements and, if appropriate, submitting a recommendation to the Council's Executive to award a contract to this supplier.

2.2 Confidentiality

Information relating to the evaluation will not be divulged to anyone outside the Tender Evaluation Panel process as to do so may undermine the integrity of the contract award process

2.3 Guidance

The procurement is being undertaken in line with Best Practice guidelines, with an officer from Brent Council's Legal and Procurement Team involved in all steps of the procurement.

The Tender Evaluation Panel will conduct the evaluation in accordance with the award criteria set out in Section 3 below.

2.4 Decision Making Process

The Tender Evaluation Panel will evaluate bids against the Evaluation Criteria for Price and Quality, taking account of all of the information supplied in response to the Specification and Method Statements. The Evaluation Strategy will be strictly adhered to during the course of the evaluation process.

All tenders will be checked for completeness and to ensure they are fully compliant. All complete and compliant bids will then be evaluated in accordance with the tender evaluation criteria in terms of their ability to meet the technical requirements specified.

Following the completion of all stages of the evaluation process, the Tender Evaluation Panel will make a recommendation that will be presented to the Executive. Only following approval from the Executive will the bidders be notified of the decision.

3 Evaluation Criteria

3.1 Evaluation Criteria

Tenders will be evaluated on the basis of the most economically advantageous proposal using the following criteria. Each criterion has been assigned a weighting to reflect the relative importance of such criterion to the Evaluation Panel members.

Criteria	Sub Criteria	Weighting
Price	Total cost to deliver annualised works	60%
Quality	Demonstrated ability to provide the services required for this Contract	20%
	Proposed systems and working methods	10%
	Approach to customer care, client care and equalities	5%
	Approach to Environmental issues	5%

3.2 Detailed description of evaluation

a) Evaluation of 'Price'

Evaluation of 'Price' will be weighted according to the proportion of spend in each of the seven categories as per the below table.

Section	Description of Work	Total Weighting for section
1	Emergency Works	3%
2	Ground Works	8%
3	Reinstatements	2%
4	Tree Inspections	4%
5	Programme Works	38%
6	Tree Planting	3%
7	Miscellaneous	2%
	Total	60%

For each element of 'Price', a proportional scoring system will be used to award the full weighting to the lowest price tender. The remaining tenders will be awarded scores up to two decimal points to reflect their individual value in relation to that of the lowest price. The resulting scores are then weighted according to the table above.

For example, where the price bid by Company A for the Ground work element is £1,000 and for Company B is £600, Company B receives the maximum weighted score of 8 and Company A, a weighted score of 4.8, calculated as follows:

Lowest price bid (Company B)		£600		
Company A price	x Weighting		x 8 = 4.8%	
		£1,000		

Lowest price bid (Company B)		£600		
Company B price	x Weighting		x 8 = 8%	
		£600		

The resulting weighted scores for each element will be totalled to provide the total weighted Price score.

The total costs for each element will be calculated as follows:

Section one, total cost to supply 80 hours during standard hours and 20 out of office hours will be evaluated using a proportional scoring system to award the full score to the lowest priced submission.

Section two will be calculated by taking the annual cost, multiplied by four, minus any discounts offered to arrive at a figure for delivery over the four year term of the contract. This total cost will then be evaluated and a proportional scoring system will be used to award the full score to the lowest priced submission.

Section three will be calculated the cost for labour and materials per square metre on the basis of 60 square metres for temporary footway and 40 square metres of temporary footway with bitmac. The total cost to deliver the combination of the total 100 metres will be evaluated and a proportional scoring system will be used to award the full score to the lowest priced submission.

Section four will take a single average price of the four elements for evaluation, this price will then be evaluated and a proportional scoring system will be used to award the full score to the lowest priced submission.

Section five, for 5.1 through 5.21, a single average price of the four elements and the five different heights will be calculated for evaluation, this price will then be evaluated and a proportional scoring system will be used to award the full score to the lowest priced submission.

For 5.22, average price per hour for team will be evaluated and a proportional scoring system will be used to award the full score to the lowest priced submission. For 5.23, average price per tree will be evaluated and a proportional scoring system will be used to award the full score to the lowest priced submission.

Section six, average price of the five different sizes for containerised and bare root tree planting will be calculated, the total cost of the two average prices for both types will then be evaluated and a proportional scoring system will be used to award the full score of 3 to the lowest priced submission.

Section seven, a single average price of the five elements and the seven different sizes will be calculated for evaluation for each of the three elements. The total of the three averaged prices will then be evaluated and a proportional scoring system will be used to award the full score to the lowest priced submission.

b) Scoring of Qualitative Criteria

There are 4 qualitative evaluation criteria with a total weighting of 40% of the marks:

Section A- Demonstrated ability to provide the services required for this Contract – 20%

Section B- Proposed systems and working methods – 10%
 Section C - Approach to customer care, client care and equalities – 5%
 Section D - Approach to Environmental issues – 5%

Each evaluation criterion may attract up to a maximum of 4 marks as per the table below, the mark awarded will be multiplied by the weighting for each of the criteria to provide a total Quality score of out of the maximum score of 160. The total score will then be divided by 160 (maximum score) and then multiplied by the 40 (total weighting) to provide a percentage score in respect to quality.

Assessment	Score	Interpretation
Unacceptable	0	Fails to meet requirement - major omissions/weaknesses
Weak	1	Limited evidence of ability to meet requirement - omissions/weaknesses in key areas
Adequate	2	Meets requirement but with some minor omissions/weaknesses
Good	3	Fully meets requirement
Excellent	4	Fully meets requirement demonstrating added value in proposals for delivery of service

c) Scoring for Qualitative Criteria and ‘Price’

The score for Price will be added to those for the Qualitative aspects to provide a total score. The Final Scores will then be ranked with the highest scoring tender being recommended for contract award.

4 Evaluation Process

4.1 Price Evaluation

The Price evaluation will be carried out by one member of the Evaluation Panel and the scores will be verified by a member of the Finance Team.

4.1 Qualitative evaluation

Each member of Evaluation Panel will initially score the tenders in isolation.

4.2 Tenderers' Presentations

In order to assist in the evaluation process, all tenderers may be invited to present their tender submission to the Tender Evaluation Panel on a date/time to be advised. The presentation should last no longer than 20 minutes and a question and answer session of no longer than 20 minutes will follow to allow the Tender Evaluation Panel to clarify any issues arising from the tender or the presentation.

If presentations are required by the Council, tenderers must not include any new material not previously supplied in their tenders or vary any aspect of the tenders.

4.3 Evaluation Meeting – Consolidated Scores

The Tender Evaluation Panel will then meet to agree a single consolidated score for each qualitative criteria for each tender received. The scores and comments for each tender will be considered in order to reach a consensus on the final scores to be awarded to each tender.