

ATTACHMENT 2 – INFORMATION FROM BIDDERS & EVALUATION CRITERIA



Foreign & Commonwealth Office

CPG/2440/2017 – SCOPING STUDY FOR A CHINA PROSPERITY FUND SKILLS PROGRAMME

1. The tender process will be conducted to ensure that the tenders are evaluated fairly to ascertain the most economically advantageous tender from the point of view of the purchasing Authority.
2. Account will be taken of any factor emerging from the tendering process which impacts a Bidder's suitability and relates to information previously provided by the Bidder as part of the pre-qualification process, in particular any additional information which comes to light in respect of its financial standing.
3. Your response to our requirement (as detailed in Attachment 6) will be evaluated under the following headings based on an **80:20** split between the quality/technical aspects to your tender and the pricing thereof: **Responses to all of the questions below should be submitted via the BravoSolution e-Procurement portal. Bids not submitted via the BRAVO portal will not be considered.**
4. Following completion of the Quality/Technical evaluation, the highest 4 scoring bidders may be invited to make a 1 hour presentation to the Authority provided that they also achieve a technical score of at least 480, which represents an average score of "acceptable" across all questions.
5. The presentation will be used to address any issues/concerns with the bids that arose during the evaluation and moderation stage and may result in upward or downward moderation of the scores. Shortlisted bidders will be provided with a summary of their technical score along with comments from the evaluation panel so that they can understand where the concerns are.
6. No importance should be attached to the order in which these criteria are listed. Any tender that is not compliant with the Conditions of Contract may be rejected.
7. Bidders are requested to ensure their answers are concise and relevant to this specific contract, and refrain from uploading extensive generic corporate documentation or marketing literature. Excessive generic material may result in the bid being deemed unacceptable and excluded from the process.
8. The Authority will evaluate each response in line with the published scoring methodology and reserves the right to exclude any bid that scores either;
 - a) a "Fail" against question 2.1.6,
 - b) an "Unacceptable-Non compliant" for any question or
 - c) scores two (2) or more "Serious Reservations"
7. **Please note:** The Bravo online system requires that where indicated a separate document is attached against each specific question within the technical envelope. If you would prefer to upload a single document answering all questions, you may do so but please answer the questions in the correct sequence and clearly identify which question is being answered

ATTACHMENT 2 – INFORMATION FROM TENDERERS & EVALUATION CRITERIA

8. There is a separate section within the technical envelope for your commercial response – pricing element. **It is mandatory that this is submitted in a separate document to the technical answers.** This is to ensure that your pricing does not influence the scoring of the technical component. Failure to submit your pricing in the correct location will deem your bid non-compliant and will be removed from the evaluation process.

9. Should the Authority require interviews, the shortlisted bidders will be given sufficient notice to make the necessary preparations.

ATTACHMENT 2 – INFORMATION FROM TENDERERS & EVALUATION CRITERIA

Assessment Score

All tenders will be scored as above in accordance with the marking system set out below:

Score Key Assessment	Score	Interpretation
Excellent	5	Satisfies the requirement and demonstrates exceptional understanding and evidence in their ability/proposed methodology to deliver a solution for the required supplies/services. Response identifies factors that will offer potential added value, with evidence to support the response. Bidder has fully accepted FCO standard terms and conditions of contact.
Good	4	Satisfies the requirement with minor additional benefits. Above average demonstration by the Bidder of the understanding and evidence in their ability/proposed methodology to deliver a solution for the required supplies/services. Response identifies factors that will offer potential added value, with evidence to support the response.
Acceptable	3	Satisfies the requirement. Demonstration by the Bidder of the understanding and evidence in their ability/proposed methodology to deliver a solution for the required supplies/services.
Minor Reservations	2	Satisfies the requirement with minor reservations. Some minor reservations of the Bidder's understanding and proposed methodology, with limited evidence to support the response. Bidder has accepted FCO standard terms and conditions of contract.
Serious Reservations	1	Satisfies the requirement with major reservations. Major reservations of the Bidder's understanding and proposed methodology, with little or no evidence to support the response.
Unacceptable - Non compliant	0	Does not meet the requirement. Does not comply and/or insufficient information provided to demonstrate that the Bidder has the understanding or suitable methodology, with little or no evidence to support the response. Bidder has rejected FCO standard terms and conditions of contract.
Price / Commercial	5 = most financially attractive to Authority	Score awarded on inverse percentage difference from most financially attractive offer to the Authority*

* Prices will be benchmarked and scores awarded based on the lowest compliant bid. The most financially attractive offer to the Foreign & Commonwealth Office following detailed analysis will receive the maximum score available with the remaining bids awarded scores based upon an inverse percentage of the difference in price.

[example: Bid A = £120K = 200 pts, Bid B = £150K = 160 pts (£120K/£150K x 200)]. The weighting will then be applied to the scores.]

ATTACHMENT 2 – INFORMATION FROM TENDERERS & EVALUATION CRITERIA

EVALUATION CRITERIA

1. Qualification Envelope (Questions 1.1 – 1.7)	
Evaluation Criteria	Criteria Weighting
<p>Satisfactory completion of all aspects of Qualification Envelope. This includes:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Acceptance of FCO terms and conditions as detailed in Attachment 4; • Signature of Attachment 7 – Certificate of Bona Fide Tendering • Signature of Attachment 8 – Declaration by Tenderer • Satisfactory demonstration of financial health. The FCO reserves the right to seek and act upon independent legal, financial or market advice to corroborate information provided or to assist in its evaluation. 	Mandatory

2. Evaluation Criteria – Quality/Technical (Questions 2.1.1 – 2.1.6)	Criteria Weighting	Evaluation Methodology
<p>2.1.1 – Experience Please</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • provide background information on your organisation, highlighting expertise and experience that are relevant to the scope of the project • provide examples of projects of similar nature that you have delivered which met or exceeded client expectations (up to three) 	30	0 – 5 score
<p>2.1.2 – Methodology and Understanding of the Objectives Please</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • provide a clear statement outlining your understanding of the objectives of the project and China context in which this project will be delivered • outline your approach to achieving the project objectives and delivering the outputs detailed in the Terms of Reference, including how you intend to acquire the intelligence, resources and data that will be required 	60	0 – 5 score
<p>2.1.3 – Project Plan & Risk Management Please</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • provide a project plan referring to the Terms of Reference, detailing milestones, deliverables, and timescales. • outline major risks to the project (both technically and operationally) and explain how they will be managed. • Indicate how the project will be monitored and reported to the Authority to ensure it is delivered in terms of quality, timeliness and cost. • Indicate the level of support that will be required from the Authority to complete the project. 	20	0 – 5 score
<p>2.1.4 – Project Team Please provide</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Profile of the key members of your project team, including their relevant skills, expertise and experience essential to the delivery of this project. • Outline of the roles, responsibilities and level of participation of the project team members. • Demonstrate sufficient specialist expertise and staff to undertake analysis, including evidence of staff and expertise located in country where necessary. 	30	0 – 5 score

ATTACHMENT 2 – INFORMATION FROM TENDERERS & EVALUATION CRITERIA

<p>2.1.5 – Resource Plan</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Provide an uncosted resource plan proposing the number of chargeable hours you expect each team member to undertake in delivering this project. <p>PLEASE NOTE: any reference to pricing in your response may invalidate your proposal. Pricing must be submitting via the commercial envelope (3.1) only.</p>	20	0 – 5 score
<p>2.1.6 – Duty of Care</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Please refer to the Duty of Care section within the Terms of Reference. Outline how you will fulfil your obligations under this requirement and provide all necessary statements 	Pass / Fail	Pass /Fail
TOTAL – Quality/Technical	160	Max Score - 800

3. Evaluation Criteria – Pricing & Commercial	Criteria Weighting	Evaluation Methodology
<p>3.1 - Competitiveness of fee rates and overall project cost in relation to the market to demonstrate value for money.</p>	40	0 – 5 score
TOTAL – Pricing & Commercial	40	Max Score - 200
GRAND TOTAL EVALUATION CRITERIA	200	Max Score 1000