****

**EVALUATION CRITERIA**

**GOVERNANCE ASSESSMENT FOR AN ENERGY CENTRE IN BRASIL**

1. The tender process will be conducted to ensure that the tenders are evaluated fairly to ascertain the most economically advantageous tender from the point of view of the purchasing Authority.
2. Account will be taken of any factor emerging from the tendering process which impacts a Bidder’s suitability and relates to information previously provided by the Bidder as part of the pre-qualification process, in particular any additional information which comes to light in respect of its financial standing.

Your response to our requirement will be evaluated under the following headings based on an **70/30** split between the quality/technical aspects and pricing/commercial aspects. **Responses to all of the questions below should be submitted with your proposal to erika.gouveia@fco.gov.uk.**

1. Once bids have been evaluated, the Authority may invite bidders to clarification meetings to clarify aspects of their bids. In the event that the Authority exercises this right, all qualified bidders will be invited to present their clarifications. This may result in upward or downward moderation of the scores. Areas for clarification will be issued to each bidder accordingly by email along with meeting details.
2. No importance should be attached to the order in which these criteria are listed. Any tender that is not compliant with the Conditions of Contract may be rejected.
3. Bidders are requested to ensure their answers are concise and relevant to this specific contract, and refrain from uploading extensive generic corporate documentation or marketing literature. Excessive generic material may result in the bid being deemed unacceptable and excluded from the process.
4. The Authority will evaluate each response in line with the published scoring methodology and reserves the right detailed further.
5. The Authority wishes to advise all bidders that there is a limited budget for this work. All proposals will be assessed from both technical and commercial perspectives to ensure that best value for Tax Payer’s money is being achieved.

**EVALUATION CRITERIA**

|  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- |
| **1. Evaluation Criteria – Quality/Technical** | **Criteria Weighting** | **Evaluation Methodology** |
| **1.1 – Understanding of the brief and knowledge of subject matter**  Demonstration a thorough understanding of the requirement and evidence your knowledge in the subject matter within the context of energy market in Brazil. | 30 | 0 – 5 score |
| **1.2** **– Methodology**  Having reviewed the terms of reference and tender documents in detail, the proposal must consider the details of the methodology and sources to deliver the outputs and results expected according to the timeline proposed. | 15 | 0 – 5 score |
| **1.3** **– Experience**   * Similar programmes the bidder have been involved in setting up and running in the past. * Detail existing links with relevant energy stakeholders and previous programmes and collaboration with them that would be relevant to this project. | 30 | 0 – 5 score |
| **1.4 – Project Team**   * Outline the members of your proposed project team and Experts Group, and provide their CVs for further reading. Detail their expertise and experience, and their roles, responsibilities and level of participation in the project. * Demonstrate that the Experts and project team members possess a sufficient range of skills, expertise and experience to successfully achieve the aims of the project. | 15 | 0 – 5 score |
| **1.5 – Gender Inclusion**  Demonstration of gender inclusion in the project team and roles. | 10 | 0 – 5 score |
| **TOTAL – Quality/Technical** | **100** | **Max Score 500** |

|  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- |
| **2. Evaluation Criteria – Pricing & Commercial** | **Criteria Weighting** | **Evaluation Methodology** |
| **3.1** - Competitiveness of fee rates and overall project cost in relation to the market to demonstrate value for money. | 30 | 0 – 5 score |
| **TOTAL – Pricing & Commercial** | **30** | **Max Score 150** |

|  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- |
| **GRAND TOTAL EVALUATION CRITERIA** | **130** | **Max Score 650** |

**Assessment Score**

All tenders will be scored as above in accordance with the marking system set out below:

|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| **Score Key Assessment** | **Score** | **Interpretation** | |  |  |  |  |  |
| Excellent | 5 | Satisfies the requirement and demonstrates exceptional understanding and evidence in their ability/proposed methodology to deliver a solution for the required supplies/services. Response identifies factors that will offer potential added value, with evidence to support the response. Bidder has fully accepted FCO standard terms and conditions of contact. | | | | | | |
| Good | 4 | Satisfies the requirement with minor additional benefits. Above average demonstration by the Bidder of the understanding and evidence in their ability/proposed methodology to deliver a solution for the required supplies/services. Response identifies factors that will offer potential added value, with evidence to support the response. | | | | | | |
| Acceptable | 3 | Satisfies the requirement. Demonstration by the Bidder of the understanding and evidence in their ability/proposed methodology to deliver a solution for the required supplies/services. | | | | | | |
| Minor Reservations | 2 | Satisfies the requirement with minor reservations. Some minor reservations of the Bidder's understanding and proposed methodology, with limited evidence to support the response. Bidder has accepted FCO standard terms and conditions of contract. | | | | | | |
| Serious Reservations | 1 | Satisfies the requirement with major reservations. Major reservations of the Bidder's understanding and proposed methodology, with little or no evidence to support the response. | | | | | | |
| Unacceptable - Non compliant | 0 | Does not meet the requirement. Does not comply and/or insufficient information provided to demonstrate that the Bidder has the understanding or suitable methodology, with little or no evidence to support the response. Bidder has rejected FCO standard terms and conditions of contract. | | | | | | |
| Price / Commercial | 5 = most financially attractive to Authority | | Score awarded on inverse percentage difference from most financially attractive offer to the Authority\*  Abnormally Low Tenders may be removed from the evaluation process if the Authority deems them to be unacceptable. This is to prevent their commercial score skewing subsequent scoring | | | | | |

\* Prices will be benchmarked and scores awarded based on the lowest compliant bid. The most financially attractive offer to the Foreign & Commonwealth Office following detailed analysis will receive the maximum score available with the remaining bids awarded scores based upon an inverse percentage of the difference in price.