



**Tender Reference Number
ONR/XXX**

**Schedule C
Tender Evaluation Process**

Title

Title

Evaluation Process

1 Overview

- 1.1 All submissions will be evaluated against the question set identified in Schedule B, (Tender Submission Form) Parts 1-2 and the specific procurement criteria identified in Schedule C (Evaluation Criteria, Annex 1), on the basis of Table 1 below:

Table 1 – Basis of Evaluation

Section		Evaluation	Mark
Part 1	Section 1	Potential Supplier Information	Not Scored
Part 2	Section 1	Insurance	Pass / Fail
Part 3	Section 1	Constraints	Pass / Fail
	Section 2	Response to Schedule A - Statement of Service Requirements (SSR)	Scored
	Section 3	Social Value	Scored
	Section 4	Commercial	Pass / Fail

- 1.2 Tender submissions will be evaluated by individual members of the Tender Evaluation Board (TEB), marked and scored independently of each other.
- 1.3 A moderating meeting will be held to agree consensus scores for each of the responses. The consensus scores will be multiplied by the relevant weighting to determine a weighted score for each response. The weighted scores will be added together to determine an overall score.

2 Compliance

- 2.1 Bids that are deemed by the Tender Evaluation Board to have satisfactorily passed through the Compliance and Constraints checks will proceed to the next stage in the evaluation process.

3 Quality Evaluation

- 3.1 Each bidder's response to the qualitative questions in Part 3 of Schedule B will be considered and scored using the Performance Standards detailed in Table 2 below. The score awarded for each response will be multiplied by the relevant weighting for that response to calculate an overall total score.

Table 2 – Performance Standards

Performance Standard	Scoring Range	Description
Fully Compliant, with some areas exceeding requirements	9-10	Fully compliant and exceeded in some or all areas with evidence of innovation and/or added benefit. The submission robustly and clearly demonstrates how the bidder proposes to provide the services as proposed.
Fully Compliant with requirements	7-8	Criteria met and evidence provided to support the bidder's submission, demonstrating how they propose to provide the services and the relevant ability, understanding, expertise, skills and/or resources to provide the services.
Partial compliance (minor areas of weakness)	5-6	The submission largely sets out a solution that addresses and meets the requirements, with some evidence provided in support; minor reservations in one or two areas of the proposal in respect of relevant ability, understanding, expertise, skills and/or resources to provide the services.
Partial compliance (some major areas of weakness)	3-4	Weak submission which does not set out a solution that meets the requirements: response may be minimal with little or no detail or with insufficient evidence provided to support and demonstrate that the bidder will be able to provide the services; some reservations as to the bidder's proposals in respect of relevant ability, understanding, expertise, skills and/or resources to provide the services
Unclear response (potential for some compliance but significant areas of weakness)	1-2	Unacceptable submission which fails in several significant areas to set out a solution that meets the requirements: little or no detail and/or evidence may have been provided to support and demonstrate that the bidder will be able to provide the services; considerable reservations as to the bidder's proposals in respect of relevant ability, understanding, expertise, skills and/or resources to provide the services
Complete Non-Compliance or No response	0	No response at all, or incomprehensible response which either does not address the requirements and/or does not propose a solution in any way.

- 3.2 Using the scoring mechanism and performance standards against the question set detailed in Schedule C, tender submissions will be evaluated where the maximum marks available shall be apportioned to the following elements:

Element	Description	Weighting
Compliance	- Completeness - Compliance - Constraints	Pass / Fail
Quality	- Technical	70 %
	- Social Value	10 %
Financial	- Rate Card Value for Money Assessment	20 %

- 3.3 If a bidder is awarded a maximum score of 10 for a response to each of the qualitative questions, the maximum weighted score achievable is **XXX** marks. However, ONR recognises that innovation or added benefit may not be possible against each criterion. Therefore, if a bidder is awarded a score of at least 7 against each question (which is deemed to fully meet ONR requirements), the weighted score possible is **XXX** marks. For this specific procurement ONR considers that an appropriate score to demonstrate the minimum required level of quality for delivery of the requirements is **XXX** marks. Scores will be weighted to a maximum award of 70%.
- 3.4 Any bidder that does not achieve the minimum required quality score or is awarded a score of 4 or less (prior to the weighting being applied) for any question will be eliminated and excluded from any further consideration within the process.
- 3.5 ONR may seek further assurances in relation to any reservations it has regarding the responses provided for service delivery.

4 Social Value

- 4.1 In line with the Government's agenda for promoting social value within all its commercial activities, all ONR procurement must consider details of how the proposed Contractor will provide any related and proportionate social value in delivery of their services to the subject matter of the proposed contract.
- 4.2 Using the Performance Standard and Scoring Criteria described in Schedule C, the maximum available score for this element is **10** marks. The evaluation scoring process described in 3.4 will also apply. Scores will be weighted to a maximum award of 10%.

5 Financial Evaluation

- 5.1 The costs provided on the Bidder's Financial Template will be reviewed and an affordability assessment determined. The lowest priced, acceptable bid received will be awarded the maximum 20% of the marks available. The remaining bids will be awarded a proportionate percentage mark against this bid. Any bid that is not deemed to offer value for money to ONR may be discarded from the procurement process..

6 Preferred Bidder Status

- 6.1 Following conclusion of the evaluation process, the percentage marks from both the Quality and Social Value evaluation will be added together to provide a Final Total Score achieved. Bids will be ranked accordingly in descending order. An affordability and Value for Money assessment will then be undertaken. The highest ranked bid which also offers value for money will be deemed to have submitted the **Most Advantageous Tender (MAT)** and identified as the preferred bidder.

7 Notification of Results

- 7.1 Following the conclusion of the procurement process you will be informed of the outcome via a message published through the ONR Procurement Portal.
- 7.2 If you are unsuccessful, you will be provided with a summary of the feedback agreed by the Tender Evaluation Board against the published evaluation criteria for both the technical and financial elements of the process, along with your overall score compared to that of the preferred bidder.

8 Award of Contract

- 8.1 Subject to affordability and internal governance approval, the preferred bidder will be awarded the contract for delivery of the required services.
- 8.2 The award of contract shall be subject to ONR Standard Terms and Conditions for the provision of services, or any mutually agreed negotiations to these terms.