

Tender Quality Questions

Question 1: Personnel

Provide details of the project team, their experience, role, and responsibilities.

Provide a project team organisational chart. Include:

- Name and job title
- Project role
- Reporting lines

Provide details of the project lead and principal point of contact. Provide details of the escalation process.

Provide a CV for each project team member. Include:

- Further education
- Employment history
- Professional memberships
- Responsibilities within the project and work elements to be completed
- Roofing works experience (related to Question 2. Case Studies were possible)

Where it may differ from Question 2. Case Studies, provide details of where the proposed project team has worked together previously to successfully deliver multi-element projects of this type.

Word Limit: 500 for team particulars and 500 per CV.

Question 2: Case Studies

Provide 3no case studies for completed projects comparable to the scheme proposed at Oswaldtwistle Theatre in terms of size, complexity including scaffolding /access arrangements and capital costs.

Provide client referee contact details.

Word Limit: 500 per case study

Question 3: Project Programme

Provide an outline project delivery programme. Include:

- Key project dates and work element milestones, including: any statutory notices required, erection of scaffolding, stripping off roof coverings, new roof covering as required, rainwater goods , and removal of scaffolding
- Technical submissions review and commentary periods
- Regular meetings and reporting

Provide all necessary commentary to fully describe the programme, the key work stages, details of the information to be submitted, and information required. Provide an overview of the main risks to the programme.

Word Limit: 500

Tender Evaluation Criteria

The tender submission will be evaluated on a 40% price and 60% quality weighting.

Tenderers are to submit a full cost for the services.

The scoring for the price will be based on the following criteria:-

The total weighting for the Pricing section is 40%.

- The tenderer with the lowest cost will be awarded full marks
- Remaining prices from other tenderers will be compared with the lowest cost and awarded the relevant proportion/percentage of the possible score.

Price scoring example:

If Tenderer A offers a price of £100,000, Tenderer B £120,000 and Tenderer C £130,000. The allocated scores would be as follows:-

Tenderer A: $\text{£100,000} / \text{£100,000} \times 40 = 40.00$ marks

Tenderer B: $\text{£100,000} / \text{£120,000} \times 40 = 33.33$ marks

Tenderer C: $\text{£100,000} / \text{£130,000} \times 40 = 30.77$ marks

Tender prices will remain fixed for the duration of the contract period.

All prices are to be submitted in Pounds Sterling (GBP) and to exclude VAT.

Hyndburn Borough Council will not accept liability for any costs omitted from the tendered price/s that the Tenderer has not declared in their Tender submission as falling payable by Hyndburn Borough Council.

Prices will not be amended after acceptance of the ITT, save as a result of variations or clarifications issued by Hyndburn Borough Council.

The Quality Questions will be evaluated and scored. The total score for each section within the Quality Questionnaire will be multiplied by the relevant weighting to produce the final weighted score.

Scores will be awarded from 0-5 as defined by the scoring system set out below:-

Score	Definition	Interpretation
5	Excellent	The response by the Tenderer provides a very high degree of assurance of being able to support the achievement of the intended outcomes of the Project. The response is fully detailed with appropriate explanations and supporting evidence, there are a limited number of minor issues and no major issues. The response demonstrates many more strengths than weaknesses, that desired standards will be exceeded in most respects
4	Good	The response by the Tenderer provides a high degree of assurance of being able to support the achievement of the intended outcomes of the Project. The response is detailed with appropriate explanations and supporting evidence, there are a number of minor issues and a limited number of major issues. The response demonstrates more strengths than weaknesses and that desired standards will be achieved.
3	Acceptable	The response by the Tenderer provides an acceptable degree of assurance of being able to support the achievement of the intended outcomes of the Project. The response is sufficiently detailed with some appropriate explanations and supporting evidence, there are a number of minor issues and a limited number of major issues. The response demonstrates more strengths than weaknesses and that desired standards are likely to be achieved.
2	Concern	The response by the Tenderer gives rise to some concerns about being able to support the achievement of the intended outcomes of the Project.
1	Poor	The response by the Tenderer gives rise to many concerns about being able to support the achievement of the intended outcomes of the Project.
0	Unacceptable	Response by Tenderer is non-compliant and gives rise to many concerns about being able to support the achievement of the intended outcomes of the Project. The response has insufficient detail with virtually no appropriate explanations and supporting evidence, there are many minor issues and a high number of major issues. The response demonstrates more weaknesses than strengths, that any desired standards are highly unlikely to be met.