

## **Scoring Matrix**

### **Specialist support to develop the Strategic Development Plan (SDP) Evidence Base for the North Wales Corporate Joint Committee**

#### **Evidence tasks 1 & 2**

**Reference:** CJC-SDP-SS-AR01

#### **Evaluation Methodology**

Tender evaluation takes place after receipt of a tender. The Evaluation Panel must ensure fairness, equality, and impartiality during the process.

All members of the Evaluation Panel must declare any conflicts of interest (which are then risk assessed and considered before the evaluation panel have sight of any submissions). If it is deemed that a Panel Member has declared an interest, which means they are unable to score an individual, they will be removed from the process as a whole and replaced with an appropriate officer.

Each Panel Member will score each Applicant and each question individually and then the average score will be used to provide a final score for each question. In the event of a Panel Member scoring extremely high or extremely low in comparison to other Panel Members, clarification will be sought from the individual Panel Members understanding of the question and answer as part of the scoring evaluation. The score can then be altered to reflect understanding before it is built into the final average score.

No scores can be changed once the final average score has been calculated.

#### **Tied Bid**

Definition of a tied bid:

A tied bid is where two or more Applicants' scores are equal to one decimal place. In the event of a tied bid (as defined above), the Applicant who has scored higher in the quality section of the tender will be awarded the contract. Should quality scores be equal a decision will be made to award to the Applicant who has submitted the lowest price from those applicants whose quality score is equal. In the event that the price submitted is within the same price banding as per scoring element the award will be made to the lowest price within that band.

#### **Award**



# Uchelgais Gogledd Cymru Ambition North Wales

The overall scores will be combined to give a final overall score.  
The highest tenderer will be awarded the tender.

## Tender Weightings

### Technical (Quality): 80%

- Proposal for delivering work -50%
- Evidence of similar work - 50%

### Commercial (Price): 15%

- Price -70%- **this will not be scored by the panel (see below).**
- Breakdown of costs - 30%

The scoring for the price element is calculated automatically by the scoring sheet by comparing the tenderer's price to the lowest compliant price.

Any tenders with incomplete pricing may not be considered. Any tenders with pricing above that noted within the tender document will not be considered.

### Social Value - 5%

## Scoring Methodology

The Evaluation Team will score each section or response. All questions will be evaluated in line with the methodology below and the score given will reflect the level of confidence instilled by the response(s) being considered. The generic interpretations of the criteria for the various levels of confidence are summarised in the following table:

**Table 1 – Scoring Methodology**

| Score | Performance  | Judgement    |
|-------|--|--------------|
| 5     | Information provided excels at meeting the requirements.   | Excellent    |
| 4     | Information provided meets the requirements for delivering the service.  | Good         |
| 3     | Information provided but concerns that the company may lack certain essential requirements to achieve the required standard of service delivery. | Satisfactory |
| 2     | Brief information provided but concerns that the company lacks the knowledge or provision for the service delivery.                              | Doubtful     |
| 1     | Information incomplete   | Poor         |
| 0     | Fails to provide any information / information totally inadequate.   | Fail         |