

7/11/11

Tender evaluation matrix

Bidder: Normeca

Evaluator Name:

Evaluation Panel

	Weight 1-3 (a)	Score 0-10 (b)	Weighted Score (a x b)	Comments:
Quality:				
1. Understanding of requirement	3	5	15	Did not easily understand - little evidence of e.g. Services Public Sensibilities. Some requirements not considered
2. Specification - buildings	5	7	35	No provision for corridors/venting. No pathway/tracking. Extra funding required (+40%) for 3m height.
3. Specification - services	5	5	25	No evidence - stated will meet requirement
4. Specification - ancillary service	5	5	25	" No detail supplied
5. Specification - delivery and recommissioning	5	7	35	
6. Approach to stakeholder management	3	4	12	Not mentioned. No evidence of any understanding of UK context.
7. Quality Staff (CVs)				
8. Technical ability	1	6	6	
9. Experience	2	7	14	
Risk:				
10. Management of perceived risks & approach	2	5	10	
Delivery:				
11. Perceived "achievability" of proposals	3	5	15	Doesn't meet requirement.
12. Time-table and milestones	2	4	8	
Assumptions:				
Grand Total:			200 / 360	

Very poor bid:

Bid v. bitty - collection of unconnected documents.
 Little evidence presented - collection of brochure pages (anaesthesia!) and assurance that plan can be achieved.
 No understanding of who stakeholders are, let alone how to manage.

Tender evaluation matrix Bidder: Field + Lawn Evaluator Name: Evaluation Panel

Quality:	Weighted Score (a)	Weighted Score (b)	Score (a x b)	Comments:
1. Understanding of requirement	3	5	15	Not covered body storage area can be reliably cluttered. Limited understanding of what needs to go in structure. Unacceptable approach to drainage. Don't seem certain
2. Specification - buildings	5	8	40	No provision of joining
3. Specification - services	5	8	40	Not covered in detail. But states all provided. Waste management + water supply unclear.
4. Specification - ancillary services	5	8	40	Lack of detail as to how delivered but all reqn.
5. Specification - delivery and decommissioning	5	6	30	It says they will take it down + put it up. No detail. Doubt about whether can be done in
6. Approach to stakeholder management	3	3	9	None specified. Not considered.
7. Quality Staff (CVs)	1	4	4	No evidence. Clearly experienced in the
- Technical ability	2	4	8	No evidence.
- Experience	2	4	8	No evidence.
Risk:				
8. Management of perceived risks & approach	2	3	6	None identified let alone management plan
Delivery:				
9. Perceived "achievability" of proposals	3	3	9	Exudes a lack of confidence in ability. Also credible in parts. Not convincing.
10. Time-table and milestones	2	5	10	Very sketchy. No experience of similar projects
Assumptions:				
Grand Total:			211 / 360	

Tender evaluation matrix Bidder: **LEEC**

Evaluator Name: **Evaluation Panel**

	Weight 1-3 (a)	Score 0-10 (b)	Weighted Score (a x b)	Comments:
Quality:				
Understanding of requirement	3	7	21	untested consortium approach. no evidence ^{plan to manage} that approach
Specification – buildings	5	9	45	Good & innovation. but improve No security fencing. Flexibility.
Specification – services	5	9	45	All considered - little bit unclear on waste-liquid Storage.
Specification – ancillary service	5	8	40	All considered but deployment plan not really clear. Need reassurance.
Specification – delivery and commissioning	5	8	40	Bit woolly. Decommissioning plan unclear. States it meets requirement.
Approach to stakeholder management	3	7	21	Main Stakeholders identified but not others.
Quality Staff (CVs)				
Technical ability				
Experience	1	6	6	No individuals identified. No CVs
Task:	2	4	8	No role to provide cohesion. No structure/hierarchy allocation of responsibility.
Management of perceived risks & approach	2	5	10	Have shown some understanding through design an untested approach plan but no clear assessment of risk nor responsibility for managing.
Delivery:				
Perceived "achievability" of proposals	3	5	15	Failure to identify their lack of experience as a risk does not inspire confidence. Overall though, it appears to meet
Time-table and milestones	2	4	8	None to speak of - more of a wish list.
Assumptions:				
Grand Total:			259 / 360	

Tender
Tender evaluation matrix Bidder: PKL

Evaluator Name: Evaluation Panel

	Weight 1-3 (a)	Score 0-10 (b)	Weighted Score (a x b)	Comments:
Quality:				
Understanding of requirement	3	6	18	Bit tight on space - autopsy. Nothing for autopsies or odour
Specification - buildings	5	7	35	Fairly viewing right next to embalming. Pre-constructed buildings seem a bit cramped. Not so flexible as demountable.
Specification - services	5	9	45	Extra funds required for generators & storage
Specification - ancillary service	5	8	40	Not enough toilets, showers, catering etc. offices.
Specification - delivery and commissioning	5	10	50	Good logistical understanding, cascading systems etc. Contingency
Approach to stakeholder management	3	6	18	Not really understood issues; lack of familiarity with issues / requirements
Quality Staff (CVs)				
Technical ability	1	8	8	
Experience	2	5	10	No experience of mortuary work. other relevant logistical experience
Skills:				
Management of perceived risks & approach	2	6	12	Have not identified many relevant risks.
Delivery:				
Perceived "achievability" of proposals	3	6	18	Don't believe what they've designed will do the job. Needs fundamental redesign (autopsies)
Time-table and milestones	2	8	16	Good.
Assumptions:				
Grand Total:			270 / 360	

Tender evaluation matrix Bidder: **KBR**

Evaluator Name: **Evaluation Panel**

	Weight 1-3 (a)	Score 0-10 (b)	Weighted Score (a x b)	Comments:
Quality:				
Understanding of requirement	3	8	24 24	Have not planned for scale of staff numbers
Specification - buildings	5	10	50 50	Not sure plan could work as set out - minor amendments.
Specification - services	5	10	50	(Strip + Search). Need changing facilities at Reception.
Specification - ancillary service	5	10	50	Need facilities for more people - up to 250 at HAC
Specification - delivery and commissioning	5	10	50	Heated water supply - implied but not clear
Approach to stakeholder management	3	5	15	Modular -
Quality Staff (CVs)				
Technical ability	1	8	8	
Experience	2	7	14	Have no direct mortuary experience but have brought in Kenyon
Management of perceived risks & approach	2	8	16	
Delivery:				
Perceived "achievability" of proposals	3	8	24	
Time-table and milestones	2	5	10	How long after contract signed will service be available?
Assumptions:				
Grand Total:			311 / 360	

Need an in part for phs download

Tender evaluation matrix Bidder: *De Soers*

Evaluator Name: *Evaluation Panel*

	Weight 1-3 (a)	Score 0-10 (b)	Weighted Score (a x b)	Comments:
Quality:				
Understanding of requirement	3	8	24	
Specification – buildings	5	10	50	
Specification – services	5	10	50	
Specification – ancillary service	5	10	50	
Specification – delivery and commissioning	5	10	50	
Approach to stakeholder management	3	7	21	<i>understanding is clear but approach is inadequate</i>
Quality Staff (CVs)				
Technical ability	1	8	8	
Experience	2	9	18	
Risk:				
Management of perceived risks & approach	2	7	14	
Delivery:				
Perceived “achievability” of proposals	3	8	24	
Time-table and milestones	2	9	18	
Assumptions:				
Grand Total:			<i>327 / 360</i>	