



## **Report to Transport, Environment and Climate Change Select Committee - Appendices**

Author: Martin Dickman

Date: 20<sup>th</sup> January 2022

## Table of Contents

---

<b>Report to Transport, Environment and Climate Change Select Committee - Appendices....</b>	<b>1</b>
<b>Appendix 1 .....</b>	<b>3</b>
Quality Evaluation Methodology .....	3
Financial Evaluation Methodology.....	5

## Appendix 1

The total evaluation score for each bid is derived from adding the weighted Quality score and weighted Price score to provide a total score to identify the most economically advantageous tender (MEAT) and the preferred bidder. For further details see Table 1, Table 2, Table 3

Table 1: Evaluation Criteria

Evaluation Area	Weighting
Quality	60%
Finance	40%
Total	100%

### Quality Evaluation Methodology

The Method Statement Questions all had weightings attached to them to reflect their relative importance (Table 2) to the Council (including the project team). This information was provided to bidders.

Table 2: Method Statement weightings

Criteria weighting (%)	Sub-Criteria Weighting (%)
Method Statement 1 – Contract Management - 20%	MS 1.1 Staffing and sub-contractors - 6%
	MS 1.2 Contract Management Portal (CMP)/Information and data management - 6%
	MS 1.3 Liaison with the Council and Stakeholders - 2%
	MS 1.4 Business Continuity including Emergency Closure and Opening Plan - 6%
Method Statement 2 – Health and Safety - 5%	Not applicable
Method Statement 3 – Contract Mobilisation & Expiry Plan – including Early Termination - 5%	Not applicable
Method Statement 4 – HRC Management - 30%	MS 4.1 Management of HRCs - 9%
	MS 4.2 Security of the HRCs and associated Plant, Equipment - 2%
	MS 4.3 Provision, repair and maintenance of Vehicles, Containers, Plant and Equipment - 6%
	MS 4.4 Transportation and transport management - 8%
	MS 4.5 Operation of HRCs' WAAP - 5%
Method Statement 5 – Materials Management Plan – including Recycling/increased Diversion and Treatment & Disposal - 25%	MS 5.1 –Materials marketing and end destinations of all Waste streams and on- going management of the agreements/arrangements - 6%
	MS 5.2 – Management and minimisation of

	Contamination of the Waste streams - 4%
	MS 5.3 –Recycling and Reuse through operational Diversion Incentive/s and other methods and for maximising Diversion from Disposal - 7%
	MS 5.4 –Adherence to Producer Compliance Schemes and other relevant Legislation - 4%
	MS 5.5 –Disposal and Treatment of Non-Hazardous Waste and Hazardous Wastes - 4%
Method Statement 6 – Customer Care - 5%	Not applicable
Method Statement 7 – Communications - 3%	Not applicable
Method Statement 8 – Social Value - 3%	Not applicable
Method Statement 9 – Environmental Management - 4%	Not applicable

In addition to the weightings there was an agreed scoring methodology used to evaluate the bidders Method Statement responses. Table 3 provides the scoring methodology.

Table 3: Summary of Scoring Methodology

Rating	Definition	Score
Excellent	The response provides sufficient information to assess the quality of the answer, with excellent Evidence provided within the response. The Bidder will provide an excellent quality service against this criterion being assessed, with no concerns regarding delivery. The response demonstrates activities and methods that will be certain to provide Added Value. The answer is excellent in all respects.	5
Good	The response provides sufficient information to assess the quality of the answer, with good Evidence provided within the response. The Bidder will provide a good quality service against this criterion being assessed, with no concerns regarding delivery. The answer is good in all respects.	4
Acceptable	The response provides sufficient information to assess the quality of the answer with some reasonable Evidence provided within the response. The Bidder will provide an acceptable quality of service against this criterion being assessed, but with three or fewer minor concerns.	3
Minor Concerns	The response provides sufficient information to assess the quality of the answer but with a lack of provision of Evidence and /or contains several minor concerns regarding the Bidder's response. The answer provides only a low level of confidence that the Bidder will provide an acceptable quality of service against this criterion.	2
Major Concerns	The response provides sufficient information to assess the quality of the answer but with a significant lack of provision of Evidence and one or more major concerns regarding the Bidder's response. The answer does not give confidence that the Bidder will provide an acceptable quality of service against this criterion.	1

Unacceptable	The response does not meet the requirements of the specific individual criterion being assessed. It does not provide sufficient information and there is a significant lack of Evidence and / or the response contains several major concerns. The answer does not give confidence that the Bidder has the ability, understanding, experience, skills, resources or quality measures required to provide the service.	0
--------------	-----------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------	---

Each sub-criterion (or criteria where there was no sub-criteria) was evaluated using the 0-5 scoring system. The weighted quality score for each criterion was calculated as:

$$\text{Method Statement score} / \text{maximum criterion score (i.e. 5)} \times \% \text{ criterion weighting} = \text{weighted quality score}$$

Each weighted quality score for each criterion was added together and multiplied by 60% to provide the overall weighted quality score.

### Financial Evaluation Methodology

The tender documents published how bidders would be scored related to their price submissions.

The nominal Annual Service Costs includes, but not limited to the following: management of all HRCs, all transport movements, brokering of contract waste, some additional services including Bill of Quantity rates, and income is included as a net figure of the total cost of the service. The Net Present Cost is calculated by discounting the Annual Service Costs of the evaluated services for each Contract Year from 1st April 2022 using the nominal Treasury Discount Rate of 6.09%.

- a) Each bidder's price score was obtained by dividing the lowest Net Present Cost of all bidders by the bidder's Net Present Cost being evaluated. The result was then multiplied by 100 to obtain the price score for the bidder being evaluated. This approach is represented by the equation below:
  - i. 
$$\text{Price score for Bidder} = (\text{Lowest price} / \text{Bidder price being evaluated}) \times 100$$
- b) Each bidder's price score was multiplied by 40% to provide the weighted price score for each bidder.