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General Information

1. Overview
   1. This Volume 4 – Tender Response Requirements and Evaluation Model sets out:
      1. the information that Tenderers are required to provide in their Tenders; and
      2. how Tenders will be evaluated;
   2. It is important that Tenderers read this Volume [4] carefully in conjunction with Volumes [] before submitting their Tender to gain a clear understanding of the Contract, the submission process and the evaluation methodology. Tenderers shall submit any clarification questions in line with the process set out in Volume 2 (*Instructions and Guidance to Tenderers)*].
2. Evaluation Overview
   1. GBN will evaluate Tenders in accordance with the process described in paragraph [of Volume 2 (*Instructions and Guidance to Tenderers*).]
   2. Each Tender must contain the following:
      1. The **Technical Envelope**– comprising the completed Technical Tender Submission which includes all Tender Response Documents (TRDs);
      2. The **Social Value Envelope** – comprising the completed Social Value Tender Submission; and
      3. The **Commercial Envelope** – comprising the completed Commercial Tender Submission, including the Financial Response Template.
   3. A summary table of the criteria to be applied at the ITT Stage is set out in **Table 1:** **Summary table of evaluation criteria in ITT Stage** below.
   4. The Tender Evaluation Criteria which will be applied, and their weightings are set out in **Table 2: Tender Evaluation Criteria** in paragraph ‎7 of this Volume [4].

| **Table 1: Summary table of evaluation criteria in ITT Stage** | |
| --- | --- |
| **Evaluation Criteria** | **Sub-Criteria** |
| **Technical Criteria** | |
| **Case Studies and Relevance to GBN Requirements** | T1.1 Owner’s Engineer Case Study |
| T1.2 Nuclear Licensed Site Case Study |
| T1.3 Light Water Reactor Case Study |
| **Approach to Delivery and Core Team** | T2.1 Scope Delivery |
| T2.2 Key Personnel |
| **Management Approach** | T3.1 Mobilisation |
| T3.2 Service Plan |
| T3.3 Managing Review Points |
| T3.4 Innovation |
| T3.5 Behaviours |
| T3.6 Management |
| **Conflict of Interest** | T4.1 Tenderer Conflict of Interest |
| **Placeholder: Potential Skills and Capabilities Delivery Question** | |
| **Social Value Criteria** | |
| **Skill Development** | SV.1 Skills Development MAC 2.3 |
| **Supply Chain** | SV.2 Supply Chain MAC 3.1 |
| **Equal Opportunity** | SV.3 Equal Opportunity MAC 6.2 |
| **Commercial Criteria** | |
| **Rate Card** | C1 Rate Card assessed on Blended Rates |
| **Basis of Fee Estimate (6-month Activity)** | C2 Basis of Fee Estimation for First 6 Months |
| **Fee at Risk %** | C3 Fee at Risk % (based on KPI Performance) |

* 1. Following the evaluation and scoring of Tenders, the [first and second Tenderers with the highest Total Score (up to 2 Tenderers)] will be selected by GBN as the Preferred Bidder(s).

Evaluation Model

1. Tender Evaluation Overview
   1. This paragraph outlines how the Tender will be evaluated and scored.
   2. The Tender will be scored out of 100% and is split across as follows:
      1. **Technical Envelope (60%) –** Technical Envelope Questions [available in Jaggaer] in the Technical Envelope.
      2. **Social Value Envelope (10%) –** Social Value Envelope Questions [available in Jaggaer] in the Technical Envelope.
      3. **Commercial Envelope (30%) –** Commercial (including pricing) Envelope Questions [available in Jaggaer] in the Commercial Envelope.
   3. All Envelopes add up to a total of 100% in accordance with paragraph 3.2 above. Each Envelope is split into multiple sections. All sections add up to 100%. Each section within each Envelope is split into multiple questions. All questions within a section add up to 100%.
   4. All documents and Responses must be duly completed/submitted in all material respects by Tenderers in accordance with the instructions and timelines set out in Volume [2].
   5. GBN reserves the right to allow a Tenderer to remedy a minor omission or administrative error in their Tender Submission in accordance with paragraph [] of Volume 2 (Instructions and Guidance to Tenderers).
   6. GBN has identified a Minimum Threshold Requirement as being fundamental to the success of an OE.  In accordance with Volume 2, paragraph 1.4.6, this Minimum Threshold Requirement will be evaluated first as part of the Tenderer’s Tender.  If a Tender Submission in respect of the Technical Envelope questions is moderated in accordance with paragraph [18] of Volume 2, to a Total Technical Envelope Score less than 50%, this will result in the Tenderer being excluded and rejected from the remainder of the Procurement and GBN will not be required to evaluate any further aspects of their Tender Submission. For completeness, all the questions in the Technical Envelope (T1.1 to T3.6) are included in the evaluation of Minimum Threshold Requirement.
   7. Following the evaluation process, the Tenderer’s total Technical, Social Value and Commercial Scores will be combined, giving the Tenderer a Total Score out of 100%. The Total Score for each Tender will be calculated using the following formula:

**Total Score** = Total Technical Score+ Total Social Value Score + Total Commercial Score.

* 1. Compliant Tenders will be ranked in order from the highest Total Score to the lowest Total Score. GBN intends to award up to two (2) Contracts which will be awarded to the highest-ranking Tenderer(s). GBN reserves the right to decide the number of awards.
  2. GBN reserves the right to perform a consistency and alignment check to ensure that the Technical, Social Value and Commercial Responses within each Tenderer’s Final Tender Submission are aligned and consistent. Where any inconsistency is identified, GBN may issue a clarification request in accordance with paragraph ‎‎[18.3].
  3. In the event that two or more winning Tenderers have the same total score, then GBN will use a tiebreaker to determine a differentiation between the scores.
  4. The application of the tiebreaker will be as follows:
     1. GBN will compare the Tenderers who have the same Total Score on each of the metrics below (in order, as listed), until one of the Tenderers has a superior score in one of the categories listed below:
        1. Step 1: Highest Total Technical Score
        2. Step 2: Highest Total Commercial Score
        3. Step 3: Highest Total Social Value Score
  5. The total score will be calculated to 2 decimal places.

1. Tender Evaluation Criteria and Sub-Criteria
   1. The Tender Evaluation Criteria which will be applied, and their weightings are set out in **Table 2: Tender Evaluation Criteria** below.

| **Table 2: Initial Tender Evaluation Criteria** | | | |
| --- | --- | --- | --- |
| **Evaluation Criteria (Section)** | **Evaluation Criteria (Section) Weighting** | **Evaluation Sub-Criteria (Question)** | **Evaluation Sub-Criteria (Question) Weighting or Assessment Methodology** |
| **Award Criteria – Technical Envelope (60% weighting)** | | | |
| **Case Studies and Relevance to GBN Requirements** | 40% | T1.1 Owner’s Engineer Case Study | 40% |
| T1.2 Nuclear Licensed Site Case Study | 30% |
| T1.3 Light Water Reactor Case Study | 30% |
| **Approach to Delivery and Core Team** | 30% | T2.1 Scope Delivery | 50% |
| T2.2 Key Personnel | 50% |
| **Management Approach** | 30% | T3.1 Mobilisation | 10% |
| T3.2 Service Plan | 20% |
| T3.3 Managing Review Points | 20% |
| T3.4 Innovation | 15% |
| T3.5 Behaviours | 20% |
| T3.6 Management | 15% |
| **Conflict of Interest** | Pass/Fail | T4.1 Tenderer Conflict of Interest | Pass/Fail |
| **Placeholder: Skills and Capabilities Delivery Question** | | | |
| **Award Criteria – Social Value Envelope (10% weighting)** | | | |
| **Skill Development** | 40% | SV.1 Skills Development MAC 2.3 | 100% |
| **Supply Chain** | 40% | SV.2 Supply Chain MAC 3.1 | 100% |
| **Equal Opportunity** | 20% | SV.3 Equal Opportunity MAC 6.2 | 100% |
| **Award Criteria – Commercial Envelope (30% weighting)** | | | |
| **Rate Card** | 70% | C1 Rate Card assessed on Blended Rates | 100% |
| **Basis of Fee Estimation (6-month Activity)** | 15% | C2 Basis of Fee Estimation for given first 6 Months Activity Schedule | 100% |
| **Fee at Risk %** | 15% | C3 Fee at risk % (based on KPI Performance) | 100% |
| **Financial Response Template** | For information | Completed Financial Response Template | For information |

Technical Envelope

1. Technical Envelope Requirements
   1. This paragraph outlines the objectives, expected content and format requirements for each of the defined TRDs.
   2. **Technical Section T1**: **Case Studies and Relevance to GBN Requirements (40%)**
      1. The Technical Envelope Questions within Technical Section T1 (“Case Studies and Relevance to GBN Requirement”) are intended to allow Tenderers to provide an overview of the relevance of their experience to SMR project and demonstrate its compliance with overall project requirements.

|  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- |
| **Section: Technical: T1 Case Studies and Relevance to GBN Requirements (40%)** | | |
| **Question Number:** | **Question Title:** | **Question Weighting:** |
| T1.1 | Owner’s Engineer Case Study | 40% |
| **Question:** | The Tenderer shall provide a case study for a power plant or nuclear engineering and construction project in the last 13 years where the Tenderer has acted as the Owner’s Engineer. The Tenderer must explain the relevance of the case study(ies) to GBN requirements, and/or describe in terms of scale and scope how their experience will be applied to this contract.  The Tenderer’s Response must provide:  1.  Summary of case study scope, contractual arrangements (including contract type) and resources mobilised  2.  Location(s) of the project  3.  Client organisation details (name, contact name, email address and telephone number)  4.  Contract start date (date contract signed and date delivery commenced)  5.  Contracted completion date (at contract award)  6.  Actual completion date  7.  Contract value at contract award  8.  Actual contract value at completion  9.  Sub-contractors/sub- consultants utilised  10. Technical Skills Areas covered (as per skills matrix provided in the Appendix to Vol 4 –Response Template)  11. Details of the project addressing all aspects below:  a) How the Tenderer contributed to delivering the project safely and to quality, cost and schedule, including considerations for an appropriate safety organisational culture, Sensitive Nuclear Information (if applicable) and Export Control Information.  b) How the Tenderer managed a significant multi-disciplinary work scope across multiple parties, including additional specialist resources from the wider supply chain, along with how they were successfully integrated within their team(s)/ organisation delivery.  c) How the Tenderer managed technical review and oversight of design, procurement, construction and commissioning activities and managed engineering support to the future licensee. | |
| **Evaluation Method:** | Questions 1-10 are for information. Question 11 is evaluated.  Evaluation will be undertaken pursuant to the Technical Scoring Matrix.  In assessing answers, evaluators may take account of the following where appropriate when determining the confidence they have in the Response:   * consistency and alignment of responses, claims and the rationale on which the Tenderer's Response is based, across the entirety of this question’s Response; * evidence base (including, but not limited to, benchmarking, previous examples of work undertaken/case studies which support the proposal); * the identification and explanation of specific and relevant risks and mitigations control measures. | |
| **Prescribed Format** | The Tenderers are required to provide the response in the given template in Appendix to Vol 4 and must follow the format guidance as per the document. | |

|  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- |
| **Section: Technical: T1 Case Studies and Relevance to GBN Requirements (40%)** | | |
| **Question Number:** | **Question Title:** | **Question Weighting:** |
| T1.2 | Nuclear Licensed Site Case Study | 30% |
| **Question:** | The Tenderer shall provide two case studies of projects delivered in the last 5 years where the Tenderer (or member of consortium/sub-contractors) has been the lead engineering services provider delivering nuclear engineering services for which the related construction and commissioning has been successfully completed at a United Kingdom nuclear licensed or authorised site. The Tenderer must explain the relevance of the case study(ies) to GBN requirements, and/or describe in terms of scale and scope how their experience will be applied to this contract.  The Tenderer’s Response must provide:  1.  Summary of case study scope, contractual arrangements (including contract type) and resources mobilised  2.  Location(s) of the project  3.  Client organisation details (name, contact name, email address and telephone number)  4.  Contract start date (date contract signed and date delivery commenced)  5.  Contracted completion date (at contract award)  6.  Actual completion date  7.  Contract value at contract award  8.  Actual contract value at completion  9.  Sub-contractors/sub- consultants utilised  10. Technical Skills Areas covered (as per skills matrix provided in the Appendix to Vol 4 –Response Template)  11.Details of the project addressing all aspects below:  a) How the Tenderer contributed to delivering the project safely and to quality, cost and schedule, including considerations for an appropriate safety organisational culture, Sensitive Nuclear Information (if applicable) and Export Control Information.  Note: Case study must include experience of the United Kingdom nuclear regulatory environment and how this is of comparable scale and substance to GBN. | |
| **Evaluation Method:** | Questions 1-10 are for information. Question 11 is evaluated.  Evaluation will be undertaken pursuant to the Technical Scoring Matrix.  In assessing answers, evaluators may take account of the following where appropriate when determining the confidence they have in the Response:   * consistency and alignment of responses, claims and the rationale on which the Tenderer's Response is based, across the entirety of this question’s Response; * evidence base (including, but not limited to, benchmarking, previous examples of work undertaken/case studies which support the proposal); * the identification and explanation of specific and relevant risks and mitigations control measures. | |
| **Prescribed Format:** | The Tenderers are required to provide the response in the given template in Appendix to Vol 4 and must follow the format guidance as per the document. | |

|  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- |
| **Section: Technical: T1 Case Studies and Relevance to GBN Requirements (40%)** | | |
| **Question Number:** | **Question Title:** | **Question Weighting:** |
| T1.3 | Light Water Reactor Case Study | 30% |
| **Question:** | The Tenderer shall provide two case studies of projects in the last 13 years where the Tenderer has supported the design, engineering, construction/modification, commissioning and/or engineering support to operations of civil Light Water Reactor (LWR) type plant. The Tenderer must explain the relevance of the case study(ies) to GBN requirements, and/or describe in terms of scale and scope how their experience will be applied to this contract. The Tenderer’s Response must provide:  1.  Summary of case study scope, contractual arrangements (including contract type, plant/equipment engineered) and resources mobilised  2.  Location(s) of the project  3.  Client organisation details (name, contact name, email address and telephone number)  4.  Contract start date (date contract signed and date delivery commenced)  5.  Contracted completion date (at contract award)  6.  Actual completion date  7.  Contract value at contract award  8.  Actual contract value at completion  9.  Sub-contractors/sub- consultants utilised  10.  Technical Skills Areas covered (as per skills matrix provided in the Appendix to Vol 4 –Response Template)  11.Details of the project addressing all aspects below:  a) How the Tenderer contributed to delivering the project safely and to quality, cost and schedule, including considerations for an appropriate safety organisational culture, Sensitive Nuclear Information (if applicable) and Export Control Information.  b) How the Tenderer managed interfaces across multiple organisations, including additional specialist resources from the wider supply chain, along with how they were successfully integrated within their team(s)/ organisation delivery. | |
| **Evaluation Method:** | Questions 1-10 are for information. Question 11 is evaluated.  Evaluation will be undertaken pursuant to the Technical Scoring Matrix.  In assessing answers, evaluators may take account of the following where appropriate when determining the confidence they have in the Response:   * consistency and alignment of responses, claims and the rationale on which the Tenderer's Response is based, across the entirety of this question’s Response; * evidence base (including, but not limited to, benchmarking, previous examples of work undertaken/case studies which support the proposal); * the identification and explanation of specific and relevant risks and mitigations control measures. | |
| **Prescribed Format:** | The Tenderers are required to provide the response in the given template in Appendix to Vol 4 and must follow the format guidance as per the document. | |

* 1. **Technical Section T2: Approach to Delivery and Core Team (30%)**
     1. The Technical Envelope Questions within Technical Section T2 (“**Approach to Delivery and Core Team”)** are intended to allow Tenderers to demonstrate the ability of the team to deliver the scope of work.

|  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- |
| **Section: Technical: T2 Approach to Delivery and Core Team (30%)** | | |
| **Question Number:** | **Question Title:** | **Question Weighting:** |
| T2.1 | Scope Delivery | 50% |
| **Question** | Based on the Tenderer’s understanding of Volume 3 GBN Requirements Document and drawing on Tenderer’s relevant experience, knowledge, and skills, outline how the Tenderer would deliver on this scope. The Tenderer’s response shall use the same section numbering as contained within Volume 3 GBN Requirements Document. | |
| **Evaluation Method:** | Evaluation will be undertaken pursuant to the Technical Scoring Matrix.  In assessing answers, evaluators may take account of the following where appropriate when determining the confidence they have in the Response:   * consistency and alignment of responses, claims and the rationale on which the Tenderer's Response is based, across the entirety of this question’s Response; * evidence base (including, but not limited to, benchmarking, previous examples of work undertaken/case studies which support the proposal); * the identification and explanation of specific and relevant risks and mitigations control measures. | |
| **Prescribed Format:** | The Tenderers are required to provide the response in the given template in Appendix to Vol 4 and must follow the format guidance as per the document. | |

|  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- |
| **Section: Technical T2 Approach to Delivery and Core Team (30%)** | | |
| **Question Number:** | **Question Title:** | **Question Weighting:** |
| T2.2 | Key Personnel | 50% |
| **Criterion:** | Provide details of the key people the Tenderer plans to assign to the contract in the core team, describing their role, skills and relevant experience.  The Tenderer may provide details of non-key personnel, or those from other departments within Tenderer’s organisation that may be used to support successful contract delivery. Where they are non-key personnel, please clearly indicate this.  The Tenderer must include details of how the Tenderer will manage the allocation of people and resources over the lifetime of the contract.  Supporting CVs (2-page limit per CV) may be provided to support the response to this section and will not be included in the overall page count. | |
| **Evaluation Method:** | Evaluation will be undertaken pursuant to the Technical Scoring Matrix.  In assessing answers, evaluators may take account of the following where appropriate when determining the confidence they have in the Response:   * consistency and alignment of responses, claims and the rationale on which the Tenderer's Response is based, across the entirety of this question’s Response; * evidence base (including, but not limited to, benchmarking, previous examples of work undertaken/case studies which support the proposal); | |
| **Prescribed Format:** | The Tenderers are required to provide the response in the given template in Appendix to Vol 4 and must follow the format guidance as per the document. | |

* 1. **Technical Section T3:** **Management Approach (30%)**
     1. The Technical Envelope Questions within Technical Section T3 (**Management Approach**) are intended to allow Tenderers to demonstrate the plan and processes to be implemented to ensure the adequate management of the project from contract award, mobilisation through to Owner’s Engineer operation.

|  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- |
| **Section: Technical: T3 Management Approach (30%)** | | |
| **Question Number:** | **Question Title:** | **Question Weighting:** |
| T3.1 | Mobilisation | 10% |
| **Question:** | Please detail how the Tenderer would ensure that it will be prepared to mobilise at pace and operate effectively from day one on the contract.  The Tenderer must set out a mobilisation plan and how it will manage any risks to ensure effective mobilisation to deliver the team, the first Service Plan, and the Specification.  During the delivery of the contract, describe how the Tenderer would mobilise to deliver ad hoc tasks at short notice. | |
| **Evaluation Method:** | Evaluation will be undertaken pursuant to the Technical Scoring Matrix.  In assessing answers, evaluators may take account of the following where appropriate when determining the confidence they have in the Response:   * consistency and alignment of responses, claims and the rationale on which the Tenderer's Response is based, across the entirety of this question’s Response; * evidence base (including, but not limited to, benchmarking, previous examples of work undertaken/case studies which support the proposal); and * the identification and explanation of specific and relevant risks and mitigations control measures. | |
| **Prescribed format:** | The Tenderers are required to provide the response in the given template in Appendix to Vol 4 and must follow the format guidance as per the document. | |

|  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- |
| **Section: Technical: T3 Management Approach (30%)** | | |
| **Question Number:** | **Question Title:** | **Question Weighting:** |
| T3.2 | Service Plan | 20% |
| **Question:** | The Tenderer must explain its approach to developing the annual Service Plan, ensuring that timescales are met.  Explain the approach to executing the annual Service Plan, including reference to any tools or methodologies that Tenderer shall use.  Explain key risks in the development of the Service Plan and appropriate mitigations. | |
| **Evaluation Method:** | Evaluation will be undertaken pursuant to the Technical Scoring Matrix.  In assessing answers, evaluators may take account of the following where appropriate when determining the confidence they have in the Response:   * consistency and alignment of responses, claims and the rationale on which the Tenderer's Response is based, across the entirety of this question’s Response; * evidence base (including, but not limited to, benchmarking, previous examples of work undertaken/case studies which support the proposal); and * the identification and explanation of specific and relevant risks and mitigations control measures. | |
| **Prescribed format:** | The Tenderers are required to provide the response in the given template in Appendix to Vol 4 and must follow the format guidance as per the document. | |

|  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- |
| **Section: Technical: T3 Management Approach (30%)** | | |
| **Question Number:** | **Question Title:** | **Question Weighting:** |
| T3.3 | Managing Review Points | 20% |
| **Question:** | The Tenderer must explain its approach to implementing effective and robust arrangements for managing project gateway reviews and the progression through the plant lifecycle (design, procurement, construction, commissioning, operation, decommissioning) via potential Licensee hold points as the Owner’s Engineer. | |
| **Evaluation Method:** | Evaluation will be undertaken pursuant to the Technical Scoring Matrix.  In assessing answers, evaluators may take account of the following where appropriate when determining the confidence they have in the Response:   * consistency and alignment of responses, claims and the rationale on which the Tenderer's Response is based, across the entirety of this question’s Response; * evidence base (including, but not limited to, benchmarking, previous examples of work undertaken/case studies which support the proposal); and * the identification and explanation of specific and relevant risks and mitigations control measures. | |
| **Prescribed format:** | The Tenderer are required to provide the response in the given template in Appendix to Vol 4 and must follow the format guidance as per the document. | |

|  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- |
| **Section: Technical: T3 Management Approach (**30**%)** | | |
| **Question Number:** | **Question Title:** | **Question Weighting:** |
| T3.4 | Innovation | 15% |
| **Question** | The Tenderer must explain its approach to innovation to add value over the course of the contract, including any activities to support innovation as the Owner’s Engineer. | |
| **Evaluation Method:** | Evaluation will be undertaken pursuant to the Technical Scoring Matrix.  In assessing answers, evaluators may take account of the following where appropriate when determining the confidence they have in the Response:   * consistency and alignment of responses, claims and the rationale on which the Tenderer's Response is based, across the entirety of this question’s Response; * evidence base (including, but not limited to, benchmarking, previous examples of work undertaken/case studies which support the proposal); and * the identification and explanation of specific and relevant risks and mitigations control measures. | |
| **Prescribed format:** | The Tenderers are required to provide the response in the given template in Appendix to Vol 4 and must follow the format guidance as per the document. | |

|  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- |
| **Section: Technical: T3 Management Approach (30%)** | | |
| **Question Number:** | **Question Title:** | **Question Weighting:** |
| T3.5 | Behaviours | 20% |
| **Question:** | The Tenderer must explain how it will identify, develop, deliver and maintain positive behaviours over the course of the contract.  The Tenderer must describe how the Tenderer will ensure effective communication between the allocated staff members, client staff, other programme or project delivery partners, and any other stakeholders.  Outline how the Tenderer will ensure communication is relevant, timely, and minimises overlap or duplication.  Describe how the Tenderer will facilitate knowledge management, including transfer and retention.  Describe how the Tenderer assesses, trains, develops, manages and maintains the capabilities for successfully delivering an Owner’s Engineer role, as described in the Specification. | |
| **Evaluation Method:** | Evaluation will be undertaken pursuant to the Technical Scoring Matrix.  In assessing answers, evaluators may take account of the following where appropriate when determining the confidence they have in the Response:   * consistency and alignment of responses, claims and the rationale on which the Tenderer's Response is based, across the entirety of this question’s Response; * evidence base (including, but not limited to, benchmarking, previous examples of work undertaken/case studies which support the proposal); and * the identification and explanation of specific and relevant risks and mitigations control measures. | |
| **Prescribed format:** | The Tenderers are required to provide the response in the given template in Appendix to Vol 4 and must follow the format guidance as per the document. | |

|  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- |
| **Section: Technical: T3 Management Approach (30%)** | | |
| **Question Number:** | **Question Title:** | **Question Weighting:** |
| T3.6 | Management | 15% |
| **Question:** | The Tenderer shall describe the key features of how the management arrangements (including Leadership and Management for Safety) will be deployed as part of the delivery of an Owner’s Engineer role, including:   * Working under control and guidance of the Licensee’s future management arrangements, * Working under control and guidance of the Tenderer’s management arrangements, and, * Support to other organisations working under the control and guidance of the Owner’s Engineer’s management arrangements. | |
| **Evaluation Method:** | Evaluation will be undertaken pursuant to the Technical Scoring Matrix.  In assessing answers, evaluators may take account of the following where appropriate when determining the confidence they have in the Response:   * consistency and alignment of responses, claims and the rationale on which the Tenderer's Response is based, across the entirety of this question’s Response; * evidence base (including, but not limited to, benchmarking, previous examples of work undertaken/case studies which support the proposal); and * the identification and explanation of specific and relevant risks and mitigations control measures. | |
| **Prescribed format:** | The Tenderers are required to provide the response in the given template in Appendix to Vol 4 and must follow the format guidance as per the document. | |

|  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- |
| **Section: Technical:** T4 C**onflict of Interest** (Pass/Fail) | | |
| **Question Number:** | **Question Title:** | **Question Weighting:** |
| T4.1 | Tenderer Conflict of Interest | Pass/Fail |
| 1. Is the Tenderer aware of any actual, potential, or perceived Conflicts of Interest as defined in paragraph [1.8] of Volume [2] of the ITT? 2. The Tenderer is also required to complete the 'Bid Team' template in the form set out in Appendix A so that GBN can verify the Tenderer's response to Question T4.1. 3. If the Tenderer is aware of any actual, potential, or perceived Conflicts of Interest as defined in paragraph [1.8] of Volume [2] of the ITT, the Tenderer is required to upload a statement explaining the nature of the Conflict of Interest and the Tenderer’s proposed mitigation measures to satisfy the requirements of [paragraph 1.8] of Volume [2] of the ITT.   Response requirements:   1. The Tenderer is required to complete and submit the Bid Team Template set out at Appendix [] to the ITT. 2. If the Tenderer has confirmed that an actual, potential, or perceived Conflict of Interest exists, the Tenderer is required to prepare and submit a statement explaining the nature of any Conflicts of Interest and the Tenderer’s proposed mitigation measures to satisfy the requirements of [paragraph 1.8] of Volume [2] of the ITT. | | |
| **Evaluation** | **Pass**  The following criteria must be met:   1. ‘Bid Team’ template in the form set out at Appendix [] has been completed in full; and 2. In response to Question [T4.1], the Tenderer has either: 3. confirmed on an unqualified basis that no Conflict of Interest exists; or 4. indicated that an actual, potential, or perceived Conflict of Interest exists and has provided evidence in its response that demonstrates to GBN's satisfaction that its proposed mitigation measures meet the requirements of paragraph [] of Volume [2] of the ITT. | |
| **Fail**  One or more of following criteria apply:   1. In response to Question T4.1 the Tenderer has indicated that an actual or potential Conflict of Interest exists, but it has failed to provide evidence in its response that demonstrates to GBN's satisfaction that its proposed mitigation measures meet the requirements of paragraph [1.8] of Volume [2] of the ITT; and/or 2. In response to Question T4.1, the Tenderer has indicated that an actual or potential Conflict of Interest exists and, notwithstanding any mitigation measures that have been proposed, GBN otherwise considers that the Conflict of Interest cannot be effectively remedied. 3. In response to Question T4.1, the Tenderer has not confirmed on an unqualified basis that no Conflict of Interest exists. 4. A ‘Bid Team’ template in the form set out at Appendix [A] has not been completed in full. | |
| **Prescribed Format** | 1. Conflict of Interest response 2. Bid Team Template 3. If the Tenderer has confirmed that an actual, potential or perceived Conflict of Interest exists   The collated response in respect of (a) and (c) must not exceed 5 A4 double sided  File Format – PDF | |

1. Technical Envelope Scoring Guidance
   1. Tenderers will only be assigned exact scores of 0%, 15%, 30%, 50%, 75%, or 100%. No intermediate scores can be awarded.
   2. Responses to individual Technical Envelope Questions will be scored in the range of 0-100%, based on the Technical Scoring Matrix outlined below in paragraph 6.3 of this Volume 4. The relevant Question weighting will then be applied to the score received (e.g., if the Question was weighted 10% and the Response scored 75%, the Tenderer would receive a weighted score of 7.5%). Weighted scores will be added together for each Technical Section e.g. T1, T2, T3 and the Technical Section weighting will then be applied to produce a weighted score for each Technical Section. The weighted scores for each Technical Section will then be added together to produce a Total Technical Envelope score out of 100%. The Technical Envelope weighting of 60% will then be applied to the Total Technical Envelope score to arrive at the Total Technical Score.
   3. Scoring Matrix for Technical Questions

|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| **Score** | **0% - Unacceptable** | **15% - Very low confidence** | **30% - Low confidence** | **50% - Moderate confidence** | **75% - High confidence** | **100% - Very high confidence** |
| **Response characteristics** | Based on the Response, GBN has no confidence that the Tenderer will meet the stated criterion for the question because one or more of the following applies:   * No Response is received; or the Response fails to address any of the topics which Tenderers were asked to cover. * The explanation, detail and/or evidence in the Response does not provide GBN with confidence that the Tenderer will meet the stated criterion. | Based on the Response, GBN has very low confidence that the Tenderer will meet the stated criterion for the question.  Either of the following factors may weigh in favour of such a conclusion:   * The explanation, detail and/or evidence provided to show compliance with the criterion is/are poor. * There are multiple major gaps in the Response’s coverage of the topics which the Tenderers were asked to cover. | Based on the Response, GBN has low confidence that the Tenderer will meet the stated criterion for the question.  Either of the following factors may weigh in favour of such a conclusion:   * The explanation, detail and/or evidence provided to show compliance with the criterion is/are somewhat poor. * There is a major gap and/or multiple moderate gaps in the Response's coverage of the topics which the Tenderers were asked to cover. | Based on the Response, GBN has moderate confidence that the Tenderer will meet the stated criterion for the question.  Either of the following factors may weigh in favour of such a conclusion:   * The explanation, detail and/or evidence to show compliance with the criterion is/are moderately good. * There are no major gaps in the Response’s coverage of the topics which the Tenderers were asked to cover, but there is/are one or more moderate gaps. | Based on the Response, GBN has high confidence that the Tenderer will meet the stated criterion for the question.  Either of the following factors may weigh in favour of such a conclusion:   * The explanation, detail and/or evidence to show compliance with the criterion is/are good. * There are no major or moderate gaps in the Response’s coverage of the topics which the Tenderers were asked to cover, but there is/are one or more minor gaps. | Based on the Response, GBN has very high confidence that the Tenderer will meet the stated criterion for the question.  Either of the following factors may weigh in favour of such a conclusion:   * The explanation, detail and/or evidence to show compliance with the criterion is/are excellent. * There are no gaps in the Response’s coverage of the topics which the Tenderers were asked to cover, or any gaps are negligible. |

Social Value Envelope

1. Social Value Envelope Requirements
   1. This paragraph outlines the objectives, expected content and format requirements for each of the Social Value Envelope Questions.
   2. Tenderers are invited to provide a proposed approach that meets the Policy Outcome for each Question, including all of the sub criteria identified for that Question.
   3. Tenderers may refer to the Cabinet Office Social Value Model (for background information only) when drafting their Responses to the Social Value Envelope Questions against the Model Award Criteria. The Cabinet Office Social Value Model is available at the following link: [Social-Value-Model-Edn-1.1-3-Dec-20.pdf](https://assets.publishing.service.gov.uk/government/uploads/system/uploads/attachment_data/file/940826/Social-Value-Model-Edn-1.1-3-Dec-20.pdf)
   4. Tenderers are not required to propose commitments against each of the illustrative examples, the purpose of the examples is to provide some context around the types of activities that could support delivery of the sub-criteria.
   5. GBN have designed the question requirements with the aim of improving the long-term health of the nuclear industry as a whole and mitigating risks to current and future GBN projects by broadening the nuclear ecosystem and workforce for the benefit of the UK. GBN have chosen theme 2 ‘Tackling economic inequality’ and theme 4 ‘Equal opportunities.
   6. **Social Value Section SV1: Skills Development (40%)**

|  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- |
| **Section: SV 1 Tackling economic inequality - Skills Development (40%)** | | |
| **Question Number:** | **Question Title:** | **Question Weighting:** |
| SV.1 | Skills Development MAC 2.3 | 100% |
| **Policy Outcome**: Create new businesses, new jobs and new skills.  GBN seeks to mitigate risks to the SMR programme by supporting educational attainment and training opportunities to address critical skills gaps and shortages within the industry. This contract should provide meaningful opportunities for skills development and educational attainment  **Award Criteria:** Support educational attainment relevant to the contract, including training schemes that address skills gaps and result in recognised qualifications local to the SMR site\*.  **Sub Criteria:**   1. Drive educational attainment in the nuclear industry relevant to the contract, including the development of training schemes that address skills gaps such as those associated with the contract resulting in recognised qualifications with commitments focused on three critical skills gaps within capability areas identified within the contract 2. Activities to stimulate relevant sector related skills growth and sustainability in the contract workforce. Illustrative examples include careers talks, curriculum support, literacy support, safety talks and volunteering 3. Delivery of work experience opportunities, apprenticeships, traineeships and T Level, graduate opportunities, industry placement opportunities (Entry Level, Level 1, 2, 3 and 4+) in relation to the contract 4. Delivery of programmes designed to also address skills, education and training issues relating to the contract in respect of groups underrepresented in the workforce (including but not limited to prison leavers, disabled people, care leavers, homeless people, people who have experienced homelessness, refugees, people who have recently immigrated or are seeking asylum, people in low-income households, people with limited access to transport and/or who are located in deprived areas)   **Question:**  Describe the commitments your organisation will make to ensure that opportunities under the contract provide a tangible increase in impact and scope beyond the Tenderer’s existing initiatives to deliver the Policy Outcome, Model Award Criteria and Sub Criteria. The response should include:   * your ‘Method Statement’, stating how you will achieve this and how your commitment meets the Policy Outcome, Model Award Criteria and Sub Criteria * a timed project plan and process, including how you will implement your commitment and by when * how you will monitor, measure and report on your commitments/the impact of your proposals. You should include but not be limited to:   + - timed action plan     - use of metrics     - tools/processes used to gather data     - reporting     - feedback and improvement     - transparency   **Minimum Metrics:**   1. Number of training opportunities (Entry Level, Level 1, 2, 3 and 4+) created or retained under the contract 2. Number of people-hours of learning interventions delivered under the contract   Minimum metrics are provided above to which Tenderer’s commitments should align. If the Tenderer believes that alternative metrics will be more effective at achieving the Theme / measure, these should be outlined in the Tenderer’s proposal with a clear explanation of the comparable benefit. Each of the commitments proposed by the Tenderer should be aligned to a SMART metric and so Tenderers are requested to propose additional metrics that will demonstrate a commitment to achieving a high level o  to the | | |
| **Evaluation Method:** | Evaluation will be based on GBN’s Social Value Scoring Matrix at paragraph 8 of this Volume 4 document. | |
| **Prescribed Format:** | 4-page narrative total, including any tables, diagrams or infographics.  *Response to be developed in Word and submitted as a PDF.* | |

* 1. **Social Value Section SV2: Supply Chain (40%)**

|  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- |
| **Section: SV2 Tackling economic inequality - Supply Chain (40%) -** | | |
| **Question Number:** | **Question Title:** | **Question Weighting:** |
| SV.2 | Supply Chain MAC 3.1 | 100% |
| **Policy Outcome:** Increase supply chain resilience and capacity  GBN seeks to derisk the SMR programme through measures that develop and sustain a nuclear ecosystem which includes supply markets that are diverse, resilient and capable of servicing the needs of current and future GBN programmes.  **Award Criteria:** Create a diverse supply chain to deliver the contract including new businesses and entrepreneurs, start-ups, SMEs, VCSEs and mutuals.  **Sub Criteria:**   1. Activities to identify opportunities to open sub-contracting under the contract to a diverse range of businesses, including new businesses, entrepreneurs, start-ups, SMEs, VCSEs and mutuals 2. Plans for engaging a diverse range of businesses in engagement activities prior to appointing supply chain members (including activities prior to award of the main contract and during the contract term) 3. Activities that demonstrate a collaborative way to work with a diverse range of businesses as part of the supply chain. Illustrative examples: co-design and co-creation of services; collaborative performance management; appropriate commercial arrangements; inclusive working methods; and use of inclusive technology 4. Structuring of the supply chain advertising and selection process in a way that ensures fairness (e.g. anti-corruption) and encourages participation by a diverse range of businesses, including with regard to new businesses, entrepreneurs, start-ups, SMEs, VCSEs and mutuals 5. Delivery of programmes designed to remove capability gaps within the UK nuclear supply chain such as those associated with the contract through initiatives designed to address three critical skills gaps within capability areas identified within the contract   **Question:**  Describe the commitments your organisation will make to ensure that opportunities under the contract provide a tangible increase in impact and scope beyond the Tenderer’s existing initiatives to deliver the Policy Outcome, Model Award Criteria and Sub Criteria. The response should include:   * your ‘Method Statement’, stating how you will achieve this and how your commitment meets the Policy Outcome, Model Award Criteria and Sub Criteria * a timed project plan and process, including how you will implement your commitment and by when * how you will monitor, measure and report on your commitments/the impact of your proposals. You should include but not be limited to:   + - timed action plan     - use of metrics     - tools/processes used to gather data     - reporting     - feedback and improvement     - transparency   **Minimum Metrics:**   1. Number of supply chain opportunities created or retained under the contract by size and type of company 2. Viable solutions and/or commitments proposed to help address capability gaps within supply chains for UK nuclear projects as outlined in requirement.   Minimum metrics are provided above to which Tenderer’s commitments should align. If the Tenderer believes that alternative metrics will be more effective at achieving the Theme / measure, these should be outlined in the Tenderer’s proposal with a clear explanation of the comparable benefit. Each of the commitments proposed by the Tenderer should be aligned to a SMART metric and so Tenderers are requested to propose additional metrics that will demonstrate a commitment to achieving a high level of performance throughout the contract period. A SMART metric is a metric which is specific, measurable, achievable, realistic and timebound | | |
| **Evaluation Method:** | Evaluation will be based on GBN’s Social Value Scoring Matrix at paragraph 8 of this Volume 4 document. | |
| **Prescribed Format:** | 4-page narrative total, including any tables, diagrams or infographics.  *Response to be developed in Word and submitted as a PDF.* | |

* 1. **Social Value Section SV3: Equal Opportunity (20%)**

|  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- |
| **Section: SV 3 Equal opportunity - Tackle workforce inequality (20%)** | | |
| **Question Number:** | **Question Title:** | **Question Weighting:** |
| SV.3 | Equal Opportunities MAC 6.2 | 100% |
| **Policy Outcome:** Support in-work progression to help people, including those from disadvantaged or minority groups, to move into higher paid work by developing new skills relevant to the contract.  **Award Criteria:** Support in-work progression to help people, including those from disadvantaged or minority groups, to move into higher paid work by developing new skills relevant to the contract.  **Sub Criteria:**   1. Measures to tackle inequality in employment, skills and pay in the contract workforce. 2. Measures to support in-work progression to help people in the contract workforce, to move into higher paid work by developing new skills relevant to the contract. Illustrative examples include but are not limited to:  * Inclusive and accessible recruitment practices, and retention-focussed activities. * Offering a range of quality opportunities with routes of progression if appropriate. * Working conditions which promote an inclusive working environment and promote retention and progression. * Demonstrating how working conditions promote an inclusive working environment and promote retention and progression. * Including multiple women, or others with protected characteristics, in shortlists for recruitment and promotions. * Using skill-based assessment tasks in recruitment. * Using structured interviews for recruitment and promotions. * Introducing transparency to promotion, pay and reward processes. * Positive action schemes in place to address under-representation in certain pay grades. * Collection and publication of retention rates, e.g. for pregnant women and new mothers, or for others with protected characteristics * Regular equal pay audits conducted * Measures to tackle inequality in employment, skills and pay in the contract workforce.  1. Measures to support GBN’s aspiration of 50% female representation by 2030 within its supply chain workforce   **Question:**  Describe the commitments your organisation will make to ensure that opportunities under the contract provide a tangible increase in impact and scope beyond the Tenderer’s existing initiatives to deliver the Policy Outcome, Model Award Criteria and Sub Criteria. The response should include:   * your ‘Method Statement’, stating how you will achieve this and how your commitment meets the Policy Outcome, Model Award Criteria and Sub Criteria * a timed project plan and process, including how you will implement your commitment and by when * how you will monitor, measure and report on your commitments/the impact of your proposals. You should include but not be limited to:   + - timed action plan     - use of metrics     - tools/processes used to gather data     - reporting     - feedback and improvement     - transparency   **Minimum Metrics:**   1. % increase in gender balance, ethnic diversity and disability. (Note that Tenderers should include the most up-to-date baseline data available in their response) 2. Total percentage of full-time equivalent (FTE) people from the following protected groups in the workforce employed under the contract: gender, ethnicity and physical ability   Minimum metrics are provided above to which Tenderer’s commitments should align. If the Tenderer believes that alternative metrics will be more effective at achieving the Theme / measure, these should be outlined in the Tenderer’s proposal with a clear explanation of the comparable benefit. Each of the commitments proposed by the Tenderer should be aligned to a SMART metric and so Tenderers are requested to propose additional metrics that will demonstrate a commitment to achieving a high level of performance throughout the contract period. A SMART metric is a metric which is specific, measurable, achievable, realistic and timebound | | |
| **Evaluation Method:** | Evaluation will be based on GBN’s Social Value Scoring Matrix at paragraph 8 of this Volume 4 document. | |
| **Prescribed Format:** | 4-page narrative total, including any tables, diagrams or infographics.  *Response to be developed in Word and submitted as a PDF.* | |

1. Social Value Envelope Scoring Guidance
   1. The Evaluation Panel will score the Social Value Responses in accordance with the Social Value Scoring Matrix in paragraph 10.3 of this Volume [4].
   2. Responses to individual Social Value Envelope Questions may only be assigned exact scores of 0%, 15%, 30%, 50%, 75%, or 100% (no intermediate scores can be awarded), based on the Social Value Scoring Matrix outlined in paragraph 8.3 of this Volume 4. The relevant Question weighting will then be applied to the score received (e.g., if the Question was weighted 10% and the Response scored 75%, the Tenderer would receive a weighted score of 7.5%). Weighted scores will be added together for each Social Value Section e.g. SV1, SV2, SV3 and the Section weighting will then be applied to produce a weighted score for each Social Value Section. The weighted scores for each Social Value Section will then be added together to produce a Total Social Value Envelope score out of 100%. The Social Value Envelope weighting of 10% will then be applied to the Total Social Value Envelope score to arrive at the Total Social Value Score.
   3. Social Value Scoring Matrix

| **Score** | **0% - Unacceptable** | **15% - Very low confidence** | **30% - Low confidence** | **50% - Moderate confidence** | **75% - High confidence** | **100% - Very high confidence** |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| **Response characteristics** | Based on the Response, GBN has no confidence that the Tenderer’s proposed approach demonstrates capability to deliver the policy outcome, award criteria and sub-criteria outlined in the relevant Social Value Envelope Question, because one or more of the following applies:  no Response is received from the Tenderer.   * + - the Response completely fails to meet the Social Value Envelope Question requirements.     - the Response fails to address any of the minimum metrics nor offers suitable alternatives. | Based on the Response, GBN has a very low degree of confidence that the Tenderer’s proposed approach will deliver the policy outcome, award criteria and sub-criteria outlined in the relevant Social Value Envelope Question  One or more of the following factors may weigh in favour of such a conclusion:   * + - the Response is of poor quality, providing very limited and/or irrelevant detail and is totally unconvincing.     - there are several significant issues and/or gaps in the Response.     - proposal does not demonstrate any understanding of the Social Value Envelope Question requirements nor competence to address them.     - the Response fails to address any of the minimum metrics nor offers suitable alternatives. | Based on the Response, GBN has a limited degree of confidence that the Tenderer’s proposed approach will deliver the policy outcome, award criteria and sub-criteria outlined in the relevant Social Value Envelope Question.  One or more of the following factors may weigh in favour of such a conclusion:   * + - the Response provides insufficient and/or irrelevant detail and is unconvincing.     - there is at least one significant area of concern needing considerable attention. There may also be several minor issues.     - the proposal does not clearly demonstrate sufficient understanding of the Social Value Envelope Question requirements nor competence to address them.     - the Response fails to adequately address the minimum metrics/ proposed alternatives are not suitable. | Based on the Response, GBN has an adequate degree of confidence that the Tenderer’s proposed approach will deliver the policy outcome, award criteria and sub-criteria outlined in the relevant Social Value Envelope Question.  One or more of the following factors may weigh in favour of such a conclusion:   * + - the Response provides detail for most of the requirements, proposals are of sufficient quality and demonstrate some insight into the relevant issues.     - there are no significant areas of concern, although there may be several minor issues.     - the proposal demonstrates understanding of Social Value Envelope Question requirements and sufficient competence to address them through relevant evidence.     - the Response adequately addresses the minimum metrics/ offers suitable proposed alternatives. | Based on the Response, GBN has a high degree of confidence that the Tenderer’s proposed approach will deliver the policy outcome, award criteria and sub-criteria outlined in the relevant Social Value Envelope Question  One or more of the following factors may weigh in favour of such a conclusion:  - the Response is detailed and mostly complete, providing good proposals demonstrated through relevant evidence and considerable insight into the relevant issues.   * + - there are no significant areas of concern, although there may be limited minor issues.     - proposal clearly demonstrates very good understanding of the Social Value Envelope Question requirements and considerable competence to address them through relevant evidence.     - the Response comprehensively addresses the minimum metrics/ offers meaningful proposed alternatives. | Based on the Response, GBN has a very high degree of confidence that the proposed approach will deliver the policy outcome, award criteria and sub-criteria outlined in the relevant Social Value Envelope Question.  One or more of the following factors may weigh in favour of such a conclusion:   * + - the Response is very detailed and complete, providing excellent proposals demonstrated through relevant evidence and excellent insight into the relevant issues.     - there are no areas of concern. Any potential element that may be missing is considered to be negligible.     - proposal clearly demonstrates excellent understanding of the Social Value Envelope Question requirements and full competence to address them.     - the Response comprehensively addresses the minimum metrics/ offers meaningful proposed alternatives. |

Commercial Envelope

1. Commercial Envelope Requirements
   1. The Commercial Envelope Questions will evaluate the rates and commercial criteria to test commercial viability to assess the most advantageous Tenders. Tenderers are required to submit a Response for each of the Questions set out in the Commercial Envelope. The Commercial Envelope Questions and associated evaluation methodology are listed below
   2. **Commercial Section C1: Rate Card (70%)**
      1. The Rate Card section represents 70% of the Commercial Envelope.

|  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- |
| **Section: Rate Card (70%)** | | |
| **Question Number:** | **Question Title:** | **Question Weighting:** |
| C1 | Rate Card | 100% |
| **Question:**  The Rate Card will be assessed based on a Final Blended Rate calculated using the Discipline Rates (Project Management and Technical & Design) submitted for each type of Rate Card. Two types of Rate Card are:   * Core Team Rate Card (80% weight) – Tenderers submit monthly rate for proposed team. The expectation is that the core team is available full time. GBN is paying for the availability of the core team over the full month. Rate includes base salary, cost to employ, overheads (including Travel and Subsistence) costs and profit. * Specialist Team Rate Card (20% weight) – Tenderers submit daily rate for proposed team. This Rate includes base salary, cost to employ, overheads (excluding Travel and Subsistence) costs and fee/profit. Specialists are resources required for specific tasks in Service Plan or Ad-Hoc Tasks with specific capabilities/skills. These could be employed on a part-time or full-time basis.   GBN expects to use all the grades/roles at any point of time during the Contract. Any rate submitted in the FRT shall be used in the Contract. Tenderers must submit the rates in accordance with the market. The currencies available for quoting within the FRT will be limited to GBP only.  Tenderers are required to submit the Final Blended Rate (Monthly) on Jaggaer. This figure must be the same figure from the FRT worksheet “5.EvaluationOutput”, Cell K13". Tenderers should follow the guidance notes in the Instructions worksheet of the FRT and refer to Appendix 1 – Guidance on Rate Card Structure in the Schedule of Cost Components in Volume X or completion of the section. | | |
| **Evaluation Method** | The evaluation of the Rate Card will be conducted in line with [paragraph ‎12.3 of this Volume 4 document] | |
| **Prescribed Format:** | *Tenderers are required to submit the Final Blended Rate in the Financial Response Template.* | |

* + 1. Tenderers should note that the figure submitted for the Rate Card assessment Final Blended Rate will be subject to verification during the evaluation phase to ensure its accuracy and compliance with the FRT.
    2. GBN reserves the right to clarify with the Tenderer any inconsistencies between the FRT and the figure submitted for the Rate Card assessment and Tenderers may be required to make necessary rectifications before evaluation can be completed.
  1. Evaluation of the Rate Card:
     1. The Blended Rate for each Rate Card will be computed in accordance with the following formula:

**Core Team Blended Rate = [(Discipline Rate1\*GradeWeight1) + (Discipline Rate2\*Weight2) + …+ (Discipline Rate\*Weighting)]**

**Specialist Team Blended Rate = [(Discipline Rate1\*GradeWeight1) + (Discipline Rate2\*Weight2) + …+ (Discipline Rate\*Weighting)]**

* + 1. The Final Blended Rate will be computed in accordance with the following formula:

**Final Blended Rate (monthly) = (80% \* Core Team Blended Rate) + (20% \* Specialist Team Blended Rate \* 22 working days)**

* + 1. The role and grade descriptions are given in Appendix 1 “GUIDANCE ON RATE CARD GRADING STRUCTURE” to Schedule of Cost Components in Vol [5] [Agreement].
    2. The associated weights for each role are given below for both types of Rate Cards.

|  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- |
| **Discipline** | **Grade** | **Role** | **Weight** |
| Project Management | Grade 1 | Executive | 4% |
| Project Management | Grade 2 | Projects director | 5% |
| Project Management | Grade 3 | Senior project manager | 10% |
| Project Management | Grade 4 | Project manager | 9% |
| Project Management | Grade 5 | Project analyst | 6% |
| Project Management | Grade 6 | Junior analyst | 4% |
| Project Management | Grade 7 | Administration | 2% |
| Technical and Design | Grade 1 | Executive | 5% |
| Technical and Design | Grade 2 | Director | 8% |
| Technical and Design | Grade 3 | Engineering manager | 14% |
| Technical and Design | Grade 4 | Principal engineer | 13% |
| Technical and Design | Grade 5 | Engineer | 13% |
| Technical and Design | Grade 6 | Junior engineer | 4% |
| Technical and Design | Grade 7 | Administration | 3% |

**Worked example:**

The following figures are for illustrative purposes only. Assuming Tender 1 submitted Core Team Rate Card and Specialist Team Rate Card in GBP (£) in the FRT, the Final Blended Rate for the submitted Rate Card is £19,261.

Core Team Blended Rate = {[(£39,600\*4%) +(£26,400\*5%) +(£22,000\*10%) +(£17,600\*9%) +(£9,900\*6%) +(£6,600\*4%)+ (£5,500\*2%)]+[(£39,600\*5%)+(£26,400\*8%)+(£22,000\*14%)+(£17,600\*13%)+(9,900\*13%)+ (£6,600\*4%)+(£5,500)\*3%)]} = £18,832

Similarly, Specialist Team Blended Rate is calculated as £953.5 per day and converted to monthly rate (assuming 22 working days) that is £20,977

**Final Blended Rate = [(£18,832\*80%) +(£20,977\*20%)] = £19,261**

|  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| **Core Team Rate Card (Monthly Rate)** |  |  |  |  |
| **Discipline** | **Grade** | **Weight** | **Amount** | |
| Project Management | Grade 1 | 4.00% | 39,600 | |
| Project Management | Grade 2 | 5.00% | 26,400 | |
| Project Management | Grade 3 | 10.00% | 22,000 | |
| Project Management | Grade 4 | 9.00% | 17,600 | |
| Project Management | Grade 5 | 6.00% | 9,900 | |
| Project Management | Grade 6 | 4.00% | 6,600 | |
| Project Management | Grade 7 | 2.00% | 5,500 | |
| Technical and Design | Grade 1 | 5.00% | 39,600 | |
| Technical and Design | Grade 2 | 8.00% | 26,400 | |
| Technical and Design | Grade 3 | 14.00% | 22,000 | |
| Technical and Design | Grade 4 | 13.00% | 17,600 | |
| Technical and Design | Grade 5 | 13.00% | 9,900 | |
| Technical and Design | Grade 6 | 4.00% | 6,600 | |
| Technical and Design | Grade 7 | 3.00% | 5,500 | |
| **Core Team Blended Rate** |  |  | **18,832** | |
|  |  |  |  |  |
|  |  |  |  | |
| **Specialist Team Rate Card (Daily Rate)** |  |  |  | |
| **Discipline** | **Grade** | **Weight** | **Amount** | |
| Project Management | Grade 1 | 4.00% | 1,900 | |
| Project Management | Grade 2 | 5.00% | 1,300 | |
| Project Management | Grade 3 | 10.00% | 1,100 | |
| Project Management | Grade 4 | 9.00% | 900 | |
| Project Management | Grade 5 | 6.00% | 550 | |
| Project Management | Grade 6 | 4.00% | 400 | |
| Project Management | Grade 7 | 2.00% | 300 | |
| Technical and Design | Grade 1 | 5.00% | 1,900 | |
| Technical and Design | Grade 2 | 8.00% | 1,300 | |
| Technical and Design | Grade 3 | 14.00% | 1,100 | |
| Technical and Design | Grade 4 | 13.00% | 900 | |
| Technical and Design | Grade 5 | 13.00% | 550 | |
| Technical and Design | Grade 6 | 4.00% | 400 | |
| Technical and Design | Grade 7 | 3.00% | 300 | |
| **Specialist Team Blended Rate** |  |  | **953.5** | |
| **Specialist Team Blended Rate (Monthly)** |  |  | **20,977** | |

* + 1. The lowest Blended Rate will automatically score 100%. Thereafter each other submission is compared against the lowest Blended Rate submitted in accordance with the following formula to arrive at a score to two decimal point:

(A÷B) \* C = X

Where:

A = the lowest submitted Blended Rate of all submissions

B = the Blended Rate submitted by Tenderer

C = the maximum percentage score for the Rate Card (100%)

X = the score for the Rate Card question

**Worked example:** Using a notional figure for illustrative purposes only of £20,000 for the lowest Blended Rate and using the formula set out in paragraph ‎[X] above, the lowest Final Blended Rate would be awarded a score of 100% for the Rate Card evaluation and each other Tenderer would be scored as follows to two decimal places:

|  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- |
| Tenderer | Final Blended Rate | Score for Rate Card |
| 1 | £22,000 | (£20,000/£22,000) \* 100% = 90.90% |
| 2 | £23,400 | (£20,000/£23,400) \* 100% = 85.47% |
| 3 | £20,000 | (£20,000/£20,000) \* 100% = 100.00% |

* + 1. Tenderers are required to provide Rate Cards by Sub-contractors relating to each of the two Disciplines (Project Management and Technical and Design). The Rate Cards for Sub-contractors will be used for information only. The Sub-contractors Rate Cards will provide the context and further information needed to understand the make-up of the associated each Rate Card (use of Sub-contractors).
  1. **Commercial Section C2: Basis of Fee Estimate (6-month Activity)** 
     1. The **Basis of Fee Estimate (6-month Activity)** represents 15% of the Commercial Envelope.

|  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- |
| **Section: C2 6-month Activity Fee Estimation (15%)** | | |
| **Question Number:** | **Question Title:** | **Question Weighting:** |
| C2 | **Basis of Fee Estimate (6-month Activity)** | 100% |
| **Question:**  Based on the sample of activities provided for the first 6 months, the Tenderer will develop a Basis of Fee Estimate. This must include:   * A detailed description of the OE’s cost (Fee) estimate, scope, basis of estimation, exclusions and dependencies for each activity given in the activity schedule in Vol.[3], Para[x] * Application of an appropriate estimating methodology * Relevant risks and their control measures are identified and described. * Clear ownership and accountability for the estimate. * Confirmation that the estimate has been conducted by suitably qualified and experienced personnel in a collaborative environment.  |  |  | | --- | --- | | **Item** | **Scope** | | **Project Document – TP** | | | Estimate Management Plan | 25 – 40 pages | | Project Execution Plan | 250 – 400 pages | | **Technical Document – TP Management** | | | Master Information Delivery Plan | Excel document with ~200 document entries; includes name, scope, delivery date, interfaces, governance, assurance | | Health & Safety Management Plan | 50 – 75 pages | | Consents Schedule | 15 – 30 pages | | Information Management Strategy | 25 – 50 pages | | Design Management Plan | 100 – 150 pages | | **Technical Document – TP Design** | | | Plant Layout | 2 – 5 pages | | Generic Site Layout | 1 – 3 pages | | Design Risk Registers | Top 10 technical design risks | | | |
| **Evaluation Method** | The evaluation will be conducted in line with [paragraph ‎12.2.X of this Volume 4 document] | |
| **Prescribed Format:** | *Tenderers are required to submit the Basis of Estimate in a separate document* | |

* + 1. Responses will be scored in the range of 0-100%, based on the scoring matrix set out for Technical Questions in paragraph ‎6.3. Tenderers will only be assigned exact scores of 0%, 15%, 30%, 50%, 75%, or 100%. No intermediate scores can be awarded. The Question weighting will then be applied to the score received (e.g., if the Question has a weighting of 15% and the Response is given a score of 50%, the Tenderer will receive a weighted score of 7.5% for that Question).
  1. **Commercial Section C3: Fee at Risk %**
     1. The Fee at Risk % section represents 15% of the Commercial Envelope.

|  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- |
| **Section: C3 Fee at Risk % (15%)** | | |
| **Question Number:** | **Question Title:** | **Question Weighting:** |
| C3 | Fee at Risk % | 100% |
| **Question:**  In line with the draft OE Contract Appendix [X] (Incentive Schedule) in Volume [X], a proportion of Tenderer’s Fee shall be allocated to OE performance. Fee here refers to the total billable costs of OE including overheads and profit and rates based on Rate Card submitted. The “At risk" amount shall be reconciled every quarter (Assessment Period) against annual Service Plan and KPI outcomes. Failure to achieve these will result in loss of payments associated with the related outcome in form of Service Credits.  Tenderers are required to submit the percentage (%) of Fee at Risk they will put forward for the project. This figure must be the same figure from the FRT worksheet “5.EvaluationOutput”, [cell K18].  Tenderers are advised that the minimum acceptable threshold for the Fee at Risk is 5%. | | |
| **Evaluation Method** | The evaluation of the Fee at Risk % will be conducted in line with paragraph ‎[X]of this Volume [x] document. | |
| **Prescribed Format:** | Tenderers are required to submit their Fee at Risk % in the Financial Response Template. | |

* + 1. Tenderers should note that the minimum allowable threshold for the Fee at Risk is 5%. Tenderers who submit a figure below the minimum threshold will not be further considered and will be rejected from the Procurement.
    2. GBN reserves the right to clarify with the Tenderer any inconsistencies between the FRT and the figure submitted for Fee at Risk % and Tenderers may be required to make necessary rectifications before evaluation can be completed.
  1. Evaluation of Fee at Risk %:
     1. The evaluation of the Fee at Risk % question will take account of the full range of submissions (in percentages) received for this question.
     2. The highest Fee at Risk percentage will automatically score 100%. Thereafter each other submission is compared against the highest Fee at Risk percentage submitted in accordance with the following formula to arrive at a score to two decimal points:

(A÷B) \* C = X

Where:

A = the Fee at Risk percentage submitted

B = the highest submitted Fee at Risk percentage of all submissions

C = the maximum percentage score for the Fee at Risk (100%)

X = the score for the Fee at Risk question

**Worked example:**

Using a notional figure for illustrative purposes only of 10% for the highest Fee At Risk percentage and using the formula set out in paragraph 12.6.2above, the highest Fee At Risk percentage would be awarded a score of 100% for the Fee At Risk % evaluation and each other Tenderer would be scored as follows:Using a notional figure for illustrative purposes only of 10% for the highest Fee at Risk percentage and using the formula set out in paragraph 12.6.2above, the highest Fee at Risk percentage would be awarded a score of 100% for the Fee at Risk % evaluation and each other Tenderer would be scored as follows:

|  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- |
| Tenderer | Fee at Risk % | Score for Fee at Risk % |
| 1 | 10% | (10%/10%)\*100% = 100.00%(10%/10%) \*100% = 100.00% |
| 2 | 7% | (7%/10%)\*100% = 70.00%(7%/10%) \*100% = 70.00% |
| 3 | 5% | (5%/10%)\*100% = 50.00%(5%/10%) \*100% = 50.00% |

1. Commercial Envelope Scoring Guidance
   1. The Evaluation Panel will score the Commercial Responses in accordance with the paragraph 12 of this Volume [4].
   2. The relevant Question weighting will be applied to the respective score received (e.g., if the Question was weighted 10% and the Response scored 75%, the Tenderer would receive a weighted score of 7.5%). Weighted scores will be added together for each Commercial Section e.g. C1, C2, C3 and the Section weighting will then be applied to produce a weighted score for each Commercial Section. The weighted scores for each Commercial Section will then be added together to produce a Total Commercial Envelope score out of 100%. The Commercial Envelope weighting of 30% will then be applied to the Total Commercial Envelope score to arrive at the Total Commercial Score.