



LINC with Sellafield

Opportunity 134 – Evaluation Criteria

Title: Horizon Scanning



Evaluation Criteria

Sellafield Ltd will evaluate submissions against the criteria below to identify the most economically advantageous submission to the set requirements.

The criteria is categorised into technical and price elements and are as follows:

Technical:

Technical Weighting - 70%		
Qu. Ref.	Question	%'age of Score
1.	Provide a statement demonstrating your understanding of the Statement of Requirements, how it is envisaged and how they will be delivered and why you believe you are best placed to support Sellafield Ltd on this opportunity. No more than 4 sides of A4	30%
2.	Demonstrate the ability to provide tailored data analysis and regional information relevant to Sellafield Ltd, to support the understanding of the Statement of Requirements. No more than 4 sides of A4	20%
3.	Provide details of outline methodology for the ad-hoc report, showing: 1) depth of analytical expertise available within your organisation 2) your approach to covering the breadth of the potential topics surrounding our anticipated business needs (as described on the Opportunity document) 3) clear quality assurance of the report No more than 4 sides of A4	20%

Submissions will be assessed individually and scored on the basis of the above weightings and criteria below. Where a submission scores an average of less than 2 against all of the questions, that submission will be deemed not to be technically compliant and will not be considered further.

Responses will be scored in accordance with the table detailed below:

Score	Assessment	Reason
(5)	Excellent	A response that addresses all elements of the criterion in an exceptional manner. Such a response would normally be evidenced by significant strengths, no significant weaknesses, and present a high level of successful performance expectation. In general, the response would be described as excellent or superior.
(4)	Good	A response that addresses a majority of the elements of the criterion. Such a response would normally be evidenced by significant strengths, few if any significant weaknesses, and present an above average level of successful

Score	Assessment	Reason
		performance expectation. In general, the response would be described as conscientious, competent or complete.
(3)	Satisfactory	A response that adequately addresses the elements of the criterion. Such a response would normally be evidenced by few if any significant strengths, few if any significant weaknesses, offsetting strengths and weaknesses, and present a moderate level of successful performance expectation. In general, the response would be described as suitable or sufficient.
(2)	Marginal	A response that addresses a few elements of the criterion. Such response would normally be evidenced by few if any strengths, many significant weaknesses, and present a low level of successful performance expectation. In general, the response would be described as faulty or substandard.
(1)	Unsatisfactory	A response that completely or almost completely fails to address the elements of the criterion. Such a response would normally evidence no strengths of any kind and many significant weaknesses and/or deficiencies. In general, the response would be described as unsatisfactory or without merit.

Price:

Commercial Weighting 30%			
Ref	Question	%age of Score	Benchmark for Assessment
3.	A proposed maximum budgeted cost for all deliverables. The provided pricing template must be completed.	30%	Scores by deviation from lowest

Pricing submissions will be individually assessed on the basis of price submitted as set out below:

The submission offering the lowest technically compliant price shall receive a score of 5. The scores of the remaining technically compliant submissions will be factored so that they are awarded a percentage score which takes into account their scores relative to that of the lowest priced submission.

The calculation that will be performed in factoring the price scoring of the other tenderers is as follows:

$$\text{FinancialScore} = 5 - \left[\left(\frac{(\text{Tenderer's Price} - \text{LowestPrice})}{\text{LowestPrice}} \right) \times 5 \right]$$

Calculation of Final Score

The final weighted submission score and the final weighted price score will be added together to provide the tenderer's total score.

The submissions achieving the highest score shall be deemed to be the preferred submission and the proposer will be contacted to progress the opportunity further.

Feedback

No written feedback is provided. All bidders will be entitled to verbal feedback via telephone.