

**Modelling Change Evaluation Matrix**

Item	Weighting (%)	Very Poor			Poor					Fair					Good					Very Good			
		0	5	10	15	20	25	30	35	40	45	50	55	60	65	70	75	80	85	90	95	100	
<b>Assessment of worked examples and approach to change</b>	<b>10</b>	The Worked Examples do not provide clarity or detail on the approach taken to modelling Change. or No rationale for the changes is provided. or The level of change in the Financial Model outputs is not commensurate with the level of input changes.			The Worked Examples provides a clear account of the assumptions and processes employed in pricing Change, including a description of the impact of input changes on the entire Modelling Suite. or The Worked Examples include a commentary on the rationale for the inclusion/exclusion of each variable within the scope of the Change. and The level of change in the Financial Model outputs is commensurate with the level of input changes.					The Worked Examples provide a clear and detailed account of the assumptions and processes employed in pricing Change. and The Worked Examples trace the effect of a revised input through the Modelling Suite, providing an audit trail from output Franchise Payments back to input changes. The Worked Examples include a commentary on the rationale for the inclusion/exclusion of each variable within the scope of the Change, demonstrating the reasonableness of the revisions. and The level of change in the Financial Model outputs is commensurate with the level of input changes.					The Worked Examples provide a clear and detailed account of the assumptions and processes employed in pricing Change. and The Worked Examples trace the effect of a revised input through the Modelling Suite, providing an audit trail from output Franchise Payments back to input changes. The Worked Examples include a commentary on the rationale for the inclusion/exclusion of each variable within the scope of the Change, demonstrating the reasonableness of the revisions and offering a commercially or operationally attractive solution. and The level of change in the Financial Model outputs is commensurate with the level of input changes.					The Worked Examples provide a clear and detailed account of the assumptions and processes employed in pricing Change. and The Worked Examples trace the effect of a revised input through the Modelling Suite, providing an audit trail from output Franchise Payments back to input changes. The Worked Examples include a commentary on the rationale for the inclusion/exclusion of each variable within the scope of the Change, demonstrating the reasonableness of the revisions and offering a commercially or operationally attractive solution. and The level of change in the Financial Model outputs is commensurate with the level of input changes. and The response is of sufficient quality to form a template for the pricing of such Changes in practice.			
<b>Suitability of Record of</b>	<b>40</b>	The level of detail and granularity of data in the ROA is inferior to			The level of detail and granularity of data in the ROA					The level of detail and granularity of data in the ROA					The level of detail and granularity of data in the ROA					The level of detail and granularity of data in the ROA			

Item	Weighting (%)	Very Poor	Poor	Fair	Good	Very Good
<b>Assumptions</b>		<p>that contained in the Models. <i>or</i> The rationale underlying the assumptions and methodologies adopted is not clear. <i>or</i> The ROA does not provide a satisfactory level of usability - linkages to the Models are not clear and the narrative does not provide the user with sufficient information to assess the financial impact of price or volume changes within a reasonable timeframe.</p>	<p>is equivalent to that contained in the Models. <i>and</i> The rationale underlying the assumptions and methodologies adopted is clearly set out. <i>or</i> The ROA provides a satisfactory level of usability - linkages to the Models are clear and the narrative provides the user with sufficient information to assess the financial impact of price or volume changes within a reasonable timeframe.</p>	<p>is superior to that contained in the Models. <i>and</i> The rationale underlying the assumptions and methodologies adopted is clearly set out. <i>and</i> The ROA provides a satisfactory level of usability - linkages to the Models are clear and the narrative provides the user with sufficient information to assess the financial impact of price or volume changes within a reasonable timeframe.</p>	<p>is significantly superior to that contained in the Models, breaking down each model input into referenced source input data. <i>and</i> The rationale underlying the assumptions and methodologies adopted is clearly set out. <i>and</i> The ROA provides an enhanced level of usability - linkages to the models are clear and the narrative is enhanced by the use of tables which may be directly reconciled with the Models. Arriving at an estimate of the financial impact of a change in prices or volumes is aided by the quality of the narrative.</p>	<p>is significantly superior to that contained in the Models, breaking down each model input into referenced source input data and leaving no areas of uncertainty. <i>and</i> The rationale underlying the assumptions and methodologies adopted is clearly set out. <i>and</i> The ROA provides an enhanced level of usability - linkages to the models are clear and the narrative is enhanced by the use of tables which may be directly reconciled with the Models. The narrative provides clear guidance on the processes underlying the development of model inputs, and thought is given to how these will retain relevance as reference material for the pricing of Change during the Franchise Term.</p>
<b>Suitability of Financial Model for implementing changes</b>	20	<p>The Financial Model accurately executes the calculations as designed. <i>and</i> The Financial Model provides an appropriate level of granularity for populating templated outputs. <i>and</i> The Financial Model is not</p>	<p>The Financial Model accurately executes the calculations as designed. <i>and</i> The Financial Model provides an appropriate level of granularity for populating templated outputs. <i>and</i></p>	<p>The Financial Model accurately executes the calculations as designed, and provides confidence in its robustness and ability to price Change. <i>and</i> The Financial Model provides an appropriate level of granularity for populating</p>	<p>The Financial Model accurately executes the calculations as designed, and provides confidence in its robustness and ability to price Change. <i>and</i> The Financial Model provides an appropriate level of granularity for populating</p>	<p>The Financial Model accurately executes the calculations as designed, and provides confidence in its robustness and ability to price Change. <i>and</i> The Financial Model provides an appropriate level of granularity for populating</p>

Item	Weighting (%)	Very Poor	Poor	Fair	Good	Very Good
		sufficiently flexible to allow the pricing of Change without major alterations being made to the model's structure.	The Financial Model is not sufficiently flexible to allow the pricing of Change without some alterations being made to the model's structure.	templated outputs, and is sufficiently transparent to show changes clearly. <i>and</i> The Financial Model is sufficiently flexible to allow the pricing of Change without alterations being made to the model's structure.	templated outputs, and is sufficiently transparent to show changes clearly. <i>and</i> The Financial Model is geared to the pricing of Change, providing a level of flexibility and redundancy sufficient to facilitate adjustments with relative ease.	templated outputs, and is sufficiently transparent to show changes clearly. <i>and</i> The Financial Model provides a level of redundancy, flexibility and usability sufficient to allow informed users to run Change scenarios with ease.
<b>Suitability of Operational Models (including integrity of the modelling suite) for supporting the implementation of changes</b>	15	The Operational Models accurately execute the calculations as designed. <i>and</i> The Operational Models provide an appropriate level of granularity for generating Financial Model inputs. <i>and</i> The Operational Models do not permit the pricing of Change without their being replaced with new Models.	The Operational Models accurately execute the calculations as designed. <i>and</i> The Operational Models provide an appropriate level of granularity for generating Financial Model inputs. <i>and</i> The Operational Models do not permit the pricing of Change without alterations being made to the model structures.	The Operational Models accurately execute the calculations as designed, and provide confidence in their robustness and ability to price Change. <i>and</i> The Operational Models provide an appropriate level of granularity for generating Financial Model inputs, and are sufficiently transparent to show changes clearly. <i>and</i> The Operational Models are sufficiently flexible to allow the pricing of Change without alterations being made to the model structures.	The Operational Models accurately execute the calculations as designed, and provide confidence in their robustness and ability to price Change. <i>and</i> The Operational Models provide an appropriate level of granularity for generating Financial Model inputs, and are sufficiently transparent to show changes clearly. <i>and</i> The Operational Models are geared to the pricing of Change, providing a level of flexibility and redundancy sufficient to facilitate adjustments with relative ease.	The Operational Models accurately execute the calculations as designed, and provide confidence in their robustness and ability to price Change. <i>and</i> The Operational Models provide an appropriate level of granularity for generating Financial Model inputs, and are sufficiently transparent to show changes clearly. <i>and</i> The Operational Models provide a level of redundancy, flexibility and usability sufficient to allow informed users to run Change scenarios with ease.
<b>Improvements to profit sharing/ thresholds</b>	15	Up to 15% of the remaining available weighting points will be awarded for bids that offer improvement on either or both of the profit sharing levels or profit sharing thresholds, to the extent that Bidders' financial and/or other bid submissions commit to any such improvements. These proposals should be laid out clearly in the Record of Assumptions (or elsewhere that is clearly identified in the Executive Summary) and that those committed offerings are appropriately reflected in the Bidder's Financial Model.				

Deliver Plans Scoring Matrix

Category	RADAR response attributes	Very poor					Poor					Fair					Good					Very good				
<b>Approach</b>	<p><b>Sound</b> – approach has a clear rationale, defined processes, and focuses on stakeholder needs;</p> <p><b>Integrated</b> – approach supports policy and strategy, and is linked to other approaches as appropriate.</p>	Materially fails to meet the requirements of the ITT in a significant number of areas which may compromise the achievement of DfT’s objectives for the franchise.					Some of the proposed outcomes fail to meet the requirements of the ITT or the bid fails to present adequate evidence that the current position is understood and that the proposed outcomes are therefore appropriate.					Presents evidence of an understanding of the strengths / weaknesses of the existing operation and outputs. Using this, the bid describes the outcomes to be achieved and evidence that these are integrated with the objectives in the ITT and appropriate to the operation.					Credible & valuable additional outcomes provided which contribute to meeting the DfT’s objectives, or particularly thorough evidence in support of proposed approach.					Significantly and credibly exceeds ITT requirements which contribute to meeting the DfT’s objectives, and particularly thorough evidence in support of proposed approach.				
<b>Score range</b>				0	5	10	15	20	25	30	35	40	45	50	55	60	65	70	75	80	85	90	95	100		
<b>Deployment</b>	<p><b>Implementable</b> – evidence approach can be implemented, especially where innovation or improvement is proposed;</p> <p><b>Systematic</b> – approach is deployed in a structured way with the method used for deployment being planned and executed soundly.</p>	Either fails to provide evidence of ability to implement outcomes or fails to present a structured deployment plan such that certainty in the achievement of DfT’s objectives for the franchise is materially compromised.					Some omissions in the demonstration of ability to implement outcomes, or in the description of resources and delivery timescales.					Presents evidence of ability to implement the outcomes specified in the Approach. The bid describes the system for implementation including who is responsible for achieving the outcomes, the resources (skills / financial) required, evidence that these are appropriate, and a clear implementation timescale.					Particularly thorough provision of evidence of ability to implement approach, and systematic approach to doing so, in a number of areas.					Consistently thorough provision of evidence of ability to implement approach, and systematic approach to doing so, across the plan.				
<b>Score range</b>				0	5	10	15	20	25	30	35	40	45	50	55	60	65	70	75	80	85	90	95	100		
<b>Assessment and refinement</b>	<p><b>Measurement</b> – regular measurement of the effectiveness of the approach and deployment;</p> <p><b>Learning</b> is used to identify best practice and improvement opportunities;</p>	Material omissions amongst KPIs or in the consideration of risk and monitoring / contingency plans.					Some omissions amongst KPIs or in the consideration of risk and monitoring / contingency plans.					Presents evidence of appropriate KPIs, processes for assessment and learning based on these KPIs through the organisation; that key risks are identified and understood; and appropriate contingency					Valuable additional KPIs or monitoring processes, and/or thorough evidence of understanding of risk and development of contingency and mitigation plans.					Particularly valuable additional KPIs or monitoring processes, and particularly thorough evidence of understanding of risk and development of contingency and mitigation plans.				

Category	RADAR response attributes	Very poor					Poor					Fair					Good					Very good										
	<b>Improvement</b> – output from measurement and learning is analysed and used to identify, prioritise, plan and implement improvements.											plans and mitigation process.																				
<b>Score range</b>				0	5	10	15	20	25	30	35	40	45	50	55	60	65	70	75	80	85	90	95	100								

Note: Where Delivery Plans include promises for specific revenue spending, enhancement investment, or achievement of accreditation standards these should generally not receive credit unless they are linked to appropriate Committed Obligations, include a time limit for delivery, and a proportionate Committed Obligation Payment Adjustment (“COPA”).