



Homes &
Communities
Agency

INVITATION TO TENDER

DELIVERY PARTNER PANEL 2

**HCA Tender Reference HCAP13001
OJEU Reference 2012/S 64-103639**

XXXX Lot

CONTENTS

SECTION

- 1.0 Delivery Partner Panel 2 (DPP2)
- 2.0 Procurement Process
- 3.0 Framework Agreement
- 4.0 Completing The Tender
- 5.0 Tender Evaluation and Award Criteria

APPENDICES

- 1 Acknowledgement of Receipt
- 2 Framework Agreement
- 3 The HCA Building Lease
- 4 DPP2 Development Agreement
- 5 Case Study
- 6 Evaluation Matrix

CHECKLIST FOR BIDDERS

Failure to provide all of the items in the checklist may cause your Tender to be non-compliant and not considered. Tenders must be submitted by the deadline 1.00pm Thursday 22nd November 2012.

	Format	Item	Date
1.	email	Return Acknowledgement of receipt to dpp2@hca.gsi.gov.uk	5.00p.m. on 3 rd October 2012
2.	email	Submit any questions you have on the tender process to dpp2info@hca.gsi.gov.uk See section 2.3	12.00 noon on 2 nd November 2012
3.	Submitted on a memory stick, DVD or CD that is clearly labelled with your Bidder number	Completed Tender Response	1.00p.m. on 22 nd November 2012
4.		Site Layout and Site Analysis	
5.		Completed DAT Model	
6.		Additional Company Financial Information	
7.	Submitted as a single hard copy	One copy of completed Tender Response submitted in hard copy printed at A4 and stapled	
8.		Site Analysis and Site Plan drawings submitted in hard copy and printed at A3	
9.		3 page summary of the DAT model, included in a separate envelope marked with the Bidder's number and labelled as 'Financial Bid'	
10.		Signed Form of Tender – Appendix G	

1.0 DELIVERY PARTNER PANEL 2 (DPP2)

For background and general information on the Delivery Partner Panel 2 (DPP2) and its proposed usage by the Homes and Communities Agency (HCA) and other Public Sector Bodies, please refer to the Memorandum of Information and Prequalification Questionnaire previously issued to all Bidders. Further information is provided below.

1.1 Transition between the current DPP and DPP2

The HCA's current Delivery Partner Panel (DPP) will run until the end of December 2013. As soon as DPP2 commences no new opportunities will be offered by the HCA to the current DPP and all new opportunities will be offered to DPP2. The HCA expects DPP2 to commence in April 2013.

Mini Competitions that have been offered to the current DPP, where procurement has commenced prior to the start of DPP2, will continue to appointment of a developer from the current DPP. Other Public Sector Bodies who have signed up with the HCA to use the current DPP or DPP2 will be advised to adopt the same approach regarding transition between the two panel arrangements.

1.2 Procurement of Works through DPP2

Development works procured through the panel for specific sites will be subject to Mini Competition procedure. The Mini Competition process is detailed at Schedule 6 of the DPP2 Framework Agreement (see Appendix 2) and is summarised below.

DPP2 Mini Competitions will commence with an Expression of Interest and where there is sufficient interest a high level Sifting Brief will be used to efficiently identify a tender list. The HCA expects tender lists for each site to consist of no more than five Panel Members. Development works procured through the panel will be subject to a separate project specific, or drawdown contract, that will be put in place at the conclusion of the Mini Competition. Once in place, the project contract will be the primary contract by which the HCA will manage the development of the site. The form of project specific contract to be used for individual sites will be one of:

- The HCA Building Lease
- Development Agreement
- JCT Design and Build Contract

Copies of the HCA Building Lease and the DPP2 Development Agreement can be found at Appendices 3 and 4 of this document. The JCT Design and Build form of contract can be found at http://www.jctcontracts.com/contracts/view_contracts.jsp?familyId=4

Evaluation criteria used for the case study within this Invitation to Tender (ITT) will be carried forward to Mini Competitions for development and construction work procured through this panel.

However, Tenderers attention is drawn to the fact that evaluation criteria used in Mini Competitions may be varied to suit the nature of the individual construction or development projects procured through the panel, but will remain broadly consistent with those used to evaluate the case study within this ITT. The table below details the approach to this.

Within the table we have converted the evaluation criteria for the ITT case study to 100%, within the ITT the case study is awarded 85% with the remaining 15% being awarded for 'Your Role as a Panel Member'. Evaluation for 'Your Role as a Panel Member' will not be carried forward to Project Specific Tenders evaluation.

The exact weightings of the evaluation criteria and sub-criteria to be used will be detailed within each Project Specific Invitation to Tender. The following illustrates some of the factors that may influence the weightings defined:

- Where qualitative factors have less overall importance, financial offer may be weighted higher;
- Where qualitative factors have greater importance, financial offer may be weighted lower;
- Where the relative importance of the qualitative factors change, the evaluation criteria may be varied to reflect this;

Table showing extent of variability of evaluation criteria from ITT to Mini Competition

Evaluation	ITT Case Study weighting	Project Specific Tender weighting range
Quality		
Quality and Employer's requirements Design approach	15%	10-25%
Project management & resources Programme Approach to gaining planning Construction approach and technical proposal Risk assessment Health & safety	35%	20-45%
Total Quality	50%	30-70%
Financial Offer	50%	30-70%
Total Score	100%	100%

The figures provided for build costs, sales values, overheads and profit in response to this ITT will be included in the Framework Agreement and will be carried forward to individual Project Specific Tenders.

Financial evaluation at Project Specific Tender stage will focus on the land value rather than on the constituent parts i.e. build costs, sales values and overheads and profit. Build costs, sales values and overheads and profit provided will, however, be interrogated, as they normally would be at Project Specific Tender Stage and any significant difference in the costs, values and overheads and profit provided within this ITT will need to be justified and understood.

We recognise that regional variations across the Lot may occur, together with variations in specification required to meet the Employer's requirements.

See Section 5.0 of this ITT and Schedule 6 of the Framework Agreement.

The HCA will advise other Public Sector Bodies who procure through DPP2 to adopt the Mini

Competition process and project specific contract forms detailed above.

1.3 Mini Competition e–procurement system

The HCA proposes to use a simple web-based e-procurement system to manage all Mini Competitions procured through DPP2. All opportunities offered to Panel Members from the HCA or other Public Sector Bodies, will be offered via this system, which will support the efficient sharing of information, asking and answering of questions and submission of expressions of interest, Sifting Brief and tender responses. Panel Members must not accept Mini Competition opportunities unless they are offered through the DPP2 e-procurement system. Schedule 6 of the DPP2 Framework Agreement at (Appendix 2) details this.

1.4 Key Performance Indicators (KPIs)

The HCA also intends to collect a number of KPIs relating to work procured through the panel. One of the KPIs the HCA views as a priority is information on the use of smaller companies as sub-contractors to DPP2 Panel Members. This Tender requires Bidders to make a statement on collection of KPIs. This statement will be appended to the DPP2 Framework Agreement of successful Bidders and the HCA will monitor progress of the Panel Member against this statement. Please see question 7 in the Tender Response and Schedule 11C of the Framework Agreement.

1.5 Schedule of Works

The Schedule of Works is included in Schedule 2 of the Framework Agreement. For avoidance of doubt, only works covered by the Schedule can be procured through DPP2.

1.6 Consortia and Sub-contracting

Appointed Panel Members must lead all Mini Competition bids for work procured through the panel and will be responsible for the delivery of all works procured through the panel.

However, Panel Members will be able to propose other sub-contractors at Mini Competition stage for a specific Mini Competition opportunity. Panel Members are expected to put together the most efficient and effective supply-chain to deliver a project procured through the DPP2. However, whilst sub-contracting is permitted, DPP2 Panel Members must not sub-contract large and/or significant elements of a project to another developer. For avoidance of doubt, a DPP2 Panel Member must not act, or be seen to act, as a 'conduit' to non-DPP2 members, where significant or material amounts of the contract will be delivered by the non-member.

2.0 PROCUREMENT PROCESS

DPP2 Panel Members will be appointed through an OJEU-compliant two-stage restricted procedure. The HCA has completed the first pre-qualification stage and has invited successful organisations to tender.

The Panel will enable the HCA and other Public Sector Bodies to “call-off” against all aspects of the scope of services and works (Schedule 2 of the Framework Agreement) under the following four Lots:

- Northern Lot
- Midlands Lot
- South East Lot
- South West Lot

The letter accompanying this Invitation to Tender (ITT) confirms which Lot(s) the Bidder has been invited to tender for. If invited to tender for more than one Lot, a separate Tender must be submitted for each Lot. Following assessment of the Tenders received for each Lot, successful Bidders will be selected for a place on the panel.

The intention is to appoint twenty-five (25) organisations to each Lot. It is possible that organisations have pre-qualified to tender for more than one Lot. If that is the case, the organisation could be appointed to more than one Lot. However, if an organisation is successful in one Lot, this does not mean they will be successful in another - each Tender evaluation is entirely separate.

The Tender evaluation process for appointment to the Panel is set out in Appendix 6 of this document and appointments will be made on the results of that evaluation

The number of organisations invited to tender in each Lot and the number of Panel Members the HCA expects to appoint to each Lot is shown in the table on the following page. However, where the scoring between Bidders at tender stage is extremely close, the HCA reserves the right to include additional Panel Members where it would otherwise be unreasonable to exclude one or more Bidders.

Similarly, if fewer than 25 Tenders are received for one or more Lots, or the bids received are

incomplete, non-compliant or clearly of insufficient quality, then the HCA reserves the right to appoint fewer than 25 to the panel.

Geographic Lot	Number of Bidders	Number of Panel Members
Northern Lot	30	25
Midlands Lot	32	25
South East Lot	33	25
South West Lot	31	25

2.1 Acknowledgement of Receipt of Invitation to Tender

Bidders must email the “Acknowledgment of Receipt” to dpp2@hca.gsi.gov.uk no later than 5.00p.m. on 3rd October 2012. The receipt document can be found in Appendix 1.

It is the Bidder’s responsibility to ensure that all the documents listed in the covering letter to this ITT have been received and are complete.

2.2 Further information and amendments

The HCA reserves the right to issue supplementary documentation at any time during the tender process to clarify any issue or amend any aspect of this ITT. All such further documentation that may be issued shall be deemed to form part of the ITT and shall supplement and/or supersede any part of the ITT to the extent indicated.

Bidders must obtain for themselves at their own expense all information necessary for the preparation of their Tenders.

2.3 Questions

Any clarification questions regarding the tender process must be submitted by email to the following address: DPP2info@hca.gsi.gov.uk no later than 12.00 noon on 2nd November 2012. However, please note questions should be submitted as soon as possible and will be answered as soon as possible.

Bidders must specify whether they wish the clarification question to be considered as confidential between themselves and the HCA. The HCA will consider any such request and will either respond on a confidential basis or give the Bidder the right to withdraw the clarification question. If the Bidder does not elect to withdraw the question and the HCA considers the clarification question to be of material significance, both the question and the

response will be communicated, in a suitably anonymous form, to all Bidders.

2.4 Programme

The following dates are provisional only and the HCA reserves the right to change these:

Stage	Date(s)/time
Issue of Invitation to Tender	28 th September 2012
Bidder to return acknowledgement of receipt	5.00p.m. on 3 rd October 2012
Deadline for Questions	12.00 noon on 2 nd November 2012
Submission of Tenders	1.00pm on 22 nd November 2012
Notification of result of evaluation	27 th March 2013
Standstill period ends	6 th April 2013
Expected date of award of Contract	8 th April 2013
Framework Agreements signed by	30 th April 2013
DPP2 Commences	30 th April 2013

The award of the DPP2 Contract will be subject to the mandatory 10 day standstill period in accordance with the Public Contracts Regulations 2006 (SI 2006 No 5).

2.5 Bidder contact point

Bidders are asked to provide a single point of contact for their organisation in Section 2 of the Tender Response. The HCA shall not be responsible for contacting the Bidder through any route other than the nominated contact. The Bidder must therefore, undertake to promptly notify the HCA of any changes to its contact point.

2.6 Transparency

This procurement and award is subject to the transparency arrangements adopted by the UK Government. These arrangements include the publication of tender documentation issued by the HCA and the Framework Agreement between the HCA and the appointed Panel Members. At tender stage, Bidders should highlight any areas they consider commercially

sensitive in order for the HCA to be able to honour its transparency obligations without undermining the Bidder's commercial interests. Commercially sensitive information may be redacted.

2.7 Freedom of Information

Bidders are advised that the HCA is subject to the Freedom of Information Act 2000 ('the Act'). If a Bidder considers that any of the information supplied as part of this procurement procedure should not be disclosed because of its commercial sensitivity, confidentiality or otherwise, they must, when providing this information, clearly identify the specific information they do not wish to be disclosed and clearly specify the reasons for its sensitivity.

The HCA shall consider such statements in the event that it receives a request pursuant to the Act, which relates to the information provided by the interested party. Please note that it is insufficient to include a statement of confidentiality encompassing all the information provided in the response.

2.8 Bribery and Corruption

The HCA takes a zero-tolerance approach to bribery and corruption and sets high standards of impartiality, integrity and objectivity in relation to the stewardship of public funds and the management of its activities. The principles contained within this policy apply to both internal and external audiences, including anyone wishing to undertake business or engage with the HCA. Please refer to the HCA's Anti-bribery and Corruption Policy: <http://www.homesandcommunities.co.uk/sites/default/files/hca-anti-bribery-policy-may2011.pdf> for further information.

2.9 Confidentiality

During the Tender process all information supplied by the HCA in connection with this ITT shall be treated as confidential by prospective Bidders and shall not be revealed to any person or organisation except for the purposes of the preparation and submission of this Tender. Bidders are required to maintain confidentiality around their Bidder status. Similarly, the HCA will not make the list of Bidders available to any person or organisation. Once Panel Members are appointed, the HCA will publicise the list of Panel Members and Panel Members may then undertake their own publicity with the approval of the HCA; See 2.11.

2.10 Copyright

Copyright of the documents comprising the Contract is vested in the HCA. If Bidders are unable or unwilling to comply with this requirement, they are required to return this ITT and all associated documents immediately and not to retain any electronic or paper copies.

2.11 Publicity

No Bidder will undertake any publicity activities with any part of the media in relation to the Contract or this ITT process without the prior written agreement of the HCA, including agreement on the format and content of any publicity.

2.12 Warranty

This ITT is made available in good faith. No warranty is given as to the accuracy or completeness of the information contained in it and any liability or any inaccuracy or incompleteness is therefore expressly disclaimed by the HCA and its advisers.

2.13 Cancellation of tender process

The HCA reserves the right to cancel the tender process at any point. The HCA is not liable for any costs resulting from any cancellation of this tender process or for any other costs incurred by those tendering for this Contract.

2.14 Public Contract regulations

Bidders are deemed to understand fully the processes that the HCA is required to follow under relevant European and UK legislation, particularly in relation to the Public Contracts Regulations 2006.

2.15 Tender Acceptance

The Tender will be deemed to remain open for acceptance or non-acceptance for not less than ninety (90) days after the date of receipt of Tenders. The HCA may accept a Tender at any time within this prescribed period.

If the HCA has not accepted the Tender within the specified period then the Tender shall remain in force without variation, but the Bidder may at any time thereafter give seven days' notice in writing to the HCA, by hand delivery, registered post, recorded delivery or email to DPP2@hca.gsi.gov.uk that the Tender is to be withdrawn.

The Tender must not be qualified in any way and must be submitted strictly in accordance with the requirements of this ITT. The HCA's decision on whether or not a Tender is

acceptable will be final. Any signatures must be made by a person who is authorised to commit the Bidder to the DPP2 Framework Agreement.

3.0 FRAMEWORK AGREEMENT

All Bidders who are appointed as Panel Members will sign up to a Framework Agreement with the HCA. The full Framework Agreement is included at Appendix 2.

Bidders should read the Framework Agreement carefully as the HCA will not accept any **material** amendments to this agreement and Bidders will not be able to participate as full Panel Members until they have signed the Framework Agreement. This Framework Agreement will also cover usage of DPP2 by other Public Sector Bodies.

Further information concerning the operation and management of the panel can be found in the Schedules of the Framework Agreement (see Appendix 2). In particular, Bidders should refer to the following:

- The project tendering procedure as detailed in Schedule 6 of the Framework Agreement.
- Details of the Panel Management arrangements are set out in Schedule 11 of the Framework Agreement Documents. Responses provided by Bidders at Section 4.0 of this Tender will be incorporated in their individual Framework Agreements at Schedule 11 part B.

The Framework Agreement will be subject to English law and the exclusive jurisdiction of the English Courts.

3.1 Project Specific Contract

Works procured through the panel will be subject to separate Project Specific Contracts and these are referred to in Schedule 4 of the Framework Agreement (see Appendix 2). The HCA will, in general, use its Building Lease (Appendix 3) to develop sites procured through the panel. The Development Agreement (Appendix 4) and JCT Design and Build Contract are provided primarily as Project Specific Contracts for use by other Public Sector Bodies using the panel. The Development Agreement is provided as a base document and it is expected that this will be tailored by partners for their own use.

4.0 COMPLETING THE TENDER

Bidders are required to submit a completed Tender Response. It is essential that the Bidder provides a submission that is set out as indicated in the Tender Response. It is a requirement of this tender process that the submissions comply with the word and page limits and document sizes specified below and in the Tender Response. Failure to do either of these may reduce a Bidder's capacity to gain marks and could result in rejection of the Tender.

The overall quality of a Bidder's submission, based on the use of plain concise English, clarity of diagrams, legibility, ease of reference, structure, layout and clarity of communication can impact positively on scores achieved. Pricing must be in pounds sterling (GBP).

The Tender must be received by the HCA in accordance with the following instructions no later than 1.00p.m. on 22nd November 2012.

All of the documents listed below should be submitted on a **single memory stick, CD or DVD** labelled with the Bidder's unique reference number as detailed in the covering letter:

- The Tender Response submitted as a single document and saved as a pdf of no more than 5Mb in size. Any larger and it will be rejected.
- Drawings to accompany the case study response. One Site Plan drawing and one Site Analysis drawing. These can be included as separate files on the Bidder's memory stick if necessary and will not be counted against the 5Mb, but should be clearly named as 'Site Plan' and 'Site Analysis'.
- The Development Appraisal Tool (DAT) Model populated in relation to the case study should be saved as an Excel file, which should **not** be password protected. Your Bidder Number, which can be found on the covering letter to this ITT should be added as 'Input 1' (Site!B15) in your DAT model. You should also save your DAT model using your Bidder Number.
- Supplementary financial information as detailed in the Tender Response.

The following information should be submitted in **hard copy**:

- A single copy of the Tender Response, printed double sided and stapled; do not submit in a bound form or in a ring binder.
- The Site Analysis and Site Plan drawings should be printed at A3.

- The three page summary of the DAT model; this should be included in a separate envelope, again marked with the Bidder's unique reference number and labelled as 'Financial Bid'.
- Signed Tender Response.

Bidders are asked to maintain the format of the Tender Response as far as possible. Significant changes in layout and format make it more difficult for markers to find the information they require and may reduce marks awarded.

Bidders will be provided with a label to attach to the envelope in which they return the whole of their Tender. All of the above information should be sent to:

Tendering Opening Panel
Homes and Communities Agency
Central Business Exchange II
406-412 Midsummer Boulevard
Central Milton Keynes
MK9 2EA

Supplementary information to the above requirements cannot be submitted under any circumstances.

Where an organisation is bidding for a place on more than one Lot, a separate and independent Tender submission will be required for each Lot. Bidders must not cross-reference between Lot submissions or refer to other sources of information not included in the submission, as these will always be ignored.

Only one Tender per geographical Lot is permitted from each Bidder. In the event that more than one is submitted by a Bidder, the one with the latest time of submission (subject to that being within the stated deadline for submissions) will be evaluated and the other(s) disregarded.

Bidders can choose to illustrate their answers with examples of how they have undertaken these activities on other projects, but Bidders must ensure the answer is relevant to housing development and the Schedule of Works (Schedule 2 of the Framework Agreement) for DPP2.

Tenders must be written in the English language. Bidders must adhere to word and page limits stated in the Tender Response Form. Additional material provided beyond that requested will not be assessed and the Bidder may therefore reduce the opportunity to attain

the best marks possible. Failure to follow the above requirements may result in a loss of marks and possibly rejection of a Tender.

5.0 TENDER EVALUATION AND AWARD CRITERIA

5.1 Acceptance

The HCA does not guarantee to accept any Tender.

5.2 Evaluation

Each Tender will be checked initially for compliance with all requirements of the ITT. The Tenders are to be evaluated against the following pre-determined award criteria, summarised below but set out in full in the Evaluation Matrix in Appendix 6.

Evaluation Criteria Summary			
1.0	Mandatory Elements	Confirmation of Contracting Party	Pass / Fail
2.0		Contact Details	
3.0		Details of Bidder's Organisation	
4.0		Nature of Contracting Party	
5.0	Quality		42.5%
5.1 and 5.2		Employers Requirement and Design Approach	15%
5.3		Project Management and Resources	5%
5.4		Programme	5%
5.5		Approach to Gaining Planning Permission	7.5%
5.6		Construction Approach and Technical Proposal	5%
5.7		Project Risk Assessment	2.5%
5.8		Project Health and Safety Assessment	2.5%
6.0		Financial	
6.1		Sales Values: Market Sale Homes	5%
6.2		Sales Values: Affordable Homes	5%
6.3		Construction Costs: Market Sale Homes	5%
6.4		Construction Costs: Affordable Homes	5%
6.5		Land Value	12.5%
6.6		Overheads and Profit	10%
			15%
7.0	Your Role as Panel Member	Lead and Deputy Contact	Pass / Fail
		Role as an Active Panel Member	5%
8.0		Collection of KPIs	5%
9.0		Improving Housing Delivery	5%
10.0	Company Financial Information		Pass / Fail

5.3 Clarification

The HCA reserves the right to seek clarification from Bidders following receipt of Tenders for matters of ambiguity, misstatement, or error and for representations the HCA considers unsustainable or unrealistic.

Following receipt of updated information any provisional scores already established will be subject to revision and update. The HCA reserves the right for numerous clarifications to enable full understanding of submissions and fair evaluation.

In evaluating the financial aspects of the case study, the HCA will seek to evaluate the reasonableness of the financial assumptions in order to avoid accepting what are clearly unsustainably high values and unsustainably low cost assumptions. Value and costs will need to be consistent and if qualitative representations are not adequately reflected in the DAT model, the tender will be marked down.

The HCA reserves the right to seek clarification of financial aspects (in conjunction with other matters of clarification for values and costs it believes to be unsustainable or unusual (either too high or too low) and seek further explanation, revision, correction or withdrawal. Where the HCA considers values or costs unsustainable and where clarification has been unable to resolve this opinion sufficiently and the bidder refuses to co-operate further, then the submission will be considered non-compliant and removed from the competitive process.

5.4 Carry Forward of Financial Information to the Framework Agreement

The evaluation of the financial elements of the case study includes those key financial aspects (build costs, sales values and overheads and profit), which are to be carried forward into the Framework Agreement as baseline figures for future reference. Overheads and Profit will also be carried forward converted to a percentage of gross development value.

This approach is being adopted to ensure that the key financial aspects that will become part of the Framework Agreement are assessed at ITT stage rather than just overall land value created in response to the case study. At Mini Competitions stage the overall land value will become the major aspect of the financial evaluation, but build costs, sales values and overheads and profit provided will be interrogated as they normally would be at Project Specific Tender Stage and any significant difference in the costs, values and overheads and profit within this ITT will need to be justified and understood.

5.5 Financial information

Continued inclusion in the bidding process is dependent upon a satisfactory financial vet. An initial financial vet was undertaken as part of the PQQ assessment. However, Bidders are asked to submit further relevant financial information with their Tender as detailed at Section 10.0 of the Tender Response. Bidders should refer to Schedule 11 of the Framework Agreement (see Appendix 2) with regards to the on-going arrangements for financial vetting for DPP2.

5.6 Collusion

Bidders must provide a completed and signed copy of the Non-Collusion and Non-Canvassing Certificate set out in the Tender Response.

5.7 Anti-Competitive Behaviour

Bidders must provide evidence of their internal compliance policies or programmes, setting out how these ensure that their staff are aware of their competition law obligations, as set out in the Tender Response.

APPENDICES

Appendix 1

Acknowledgement of Receipt

Tender for Delivery Partner Panel 2 ACKNOWLEDGEMENT OF RECEIPT

Please email this acknowledgement of receipt of these Tender Documents by 5.00p.m. on 3rd October 2012.

To: Delivery Partner Panel Team

email: DPP2@hca.gsi.gov.uk

Provider Management Team
The Homes and Communities Agency

We acknowledge receipt of the Tender Documents in respect of the above.

Date of Receipt: _____

Company: _____

Name: _____

Signed: _____

Position: _____

Appendix 2

Framework Agreement

Refer to separate document.

Appendix 3

The HCA Building Lease

Refer to separate document.

Appendix 4

DPP2 Development Agreement

Refer to separate document.

Appendix 5

Case Study

Refer to Separate Document

Appendix 6
Evaluation Criteria

Section	Question	Score	Scoring methodology
Mandatory Elements			
1.0	Confirmation of Contracting Party	Pass/Fail	All information requested is provided and is consistent with that provided at PQQ stage. Any material change to the proposed contracting party will mean that the tender will be rejected.
2.0	Contact Details	Pass/Fail	All information requested is provided.
3.0	Details of Bidder's Organisation	Pass/Fail	All information requested is provided and is consistent with that provided at PQQ stage. Any material change to the proposed contracting party will mean that the tender will be rejected.
4.0	Nature of Contracting Party	Pass /Fail	Information only required if a JV is proposed otherwise section should be marked as N/A. Full information that proposes a sound and clear legal entity that is consistent with, and builds on, that proposed at PQQ stage. Any material change to the proposed contracting party will mean that the tender will be rejected.

Section	Question	Maximum score available	Demonstrated By	Scoring Methodology
Site Based Case Study				
5.0	Quality	42.5%		
5.1 and 5.2	Employer's Requirements and Design Approach Site Layout and Site Analysis	15%	Submission of Site Plan layout and Site Analysis. Demonstration of understanding of quality standards and design approach required by the Local Authority and demonstration of how these will be met. Design approach is considered, well thought through and consistent with these. Demonstrates an understanding of good urban design principles. Site Plan and Site Analysis drawings show requested notes and information and demonstrate how the proposal integrates into the locality, is site specific and responds to local features. Answer is supplemented with reference to other similar approaches made on other sites. Drawn information provided is consistent with that provided in other areas of the response and with that shown in the DAT model.	<p>10%-15% All information requested is provided in an integrated proposal and all information is consistent with that provided in other areas of the response and with that shown in the DAT model and a good understanding of urban design principles is demonstrated and proposals are suitable to the locality.</p> <p>5%-10% The majority of the information requested is provided and information is generally consistent with that provided in other areas of the response and with that shown in the DAT model and a reasonable understanding of urban design principles is demonstrated and proposals are broadly suitable to the locality or generally a good response but some areas missing.</p> <p>0%-5% Significant areas of information requested are missing and / or information is inconsistent with that provided in other areas of the response and with that shown in the DAT model and / or little understanding of urban design principles is demonstrated or proposals are unsuitable for the locality.</p>

Section	Question	Maximum score available	Demonstrated By	Scoring Methodology
5.3	Project Management and Resources	5%	Identification of an appropriate consultant team, disciplines and / or subcontractors. Definition of appropriate means to manage the project during the design and planning phases and through to construction. Demonstration that suitable resources are available to manage the project. Information of key sub-contractors proposed and means to work effectively with them. Defined and clear communication routes between design and construction team and to the client.	<p>4%-5% All information requested is provided. Clear definition of appropriate resources required and clear practical means are described to manage the design and construction and clear management structures and communication processes are described. Answer is consistent with information provided elsewhere in the tender submission.</p> <p>2%-3% The majority of the information requested is provided. Reasonable definition of appropriate resources required and means are described to manage the design and construction and management structures and communication processes are described. Generally a good response but areas may be missing or unclear or may be areas of inconsistency with information provided elsewhere in the tender submission.</p> <p>0%-1% Significant areas of information requested are missing and / or little definition of appropriate resources required and/or means are not adequately described to manage the design and construction and/or management structures and communication processes are not detailed or are impractical and /or proposals are inconsistent with those shown elsewhere in the tender submission.</p>

Section	Question	Maximum score available	Demonstrated By	Scoring Methodology
5.4	Programme	5%	Programme covering the development is provided to show key stages of planning, design, construction, completion and marketing. Timescales are reasonable and consistent with the rest of the case study proposal.	<p>4%-5% Clear programme covering the main stages of pre-construction and construction work. Timescales are reasonable and programme links with, supports and is consistent with other areas of the case study submission. All information is consistent with that provided in other areas of the response and with that shown in the DAT model.</p> <p>2%-3% Programme covering the main stages of pre-construction and construction work. Timescales are reasonable and programme links with, supports and is, in general, consistent with other areas of the case study submission and with the DAT model. Some areas of information may be missing or inconsistent with the remainder of the proposal and/or assumptions may be unreasonable and not justified.</p> <p>0%-1% Programme is missing or is incomplete and /or timescales are unreasonable and not justified and /or information is inconsistent with other areas of the response and with the DAT model.</p>
5.5	Approach to Gaining Planning Permission	7.5%	Clear simple approach that demonstrates an understanding of the required process; actively addresses likely issues and details necessary communications.	<p>5%-7.5% Clear simple approach that demonstrates an understanding of the required process that is appropriate to local conditions and requirements and actively addresses likely issues and details necessary communications. All information is consistent with that provided in other areas of the response and with that shown in the DAT model.</p> <p>2%-4% Approach that demonstrates understanding of the required process and is in general appropriate to local</p>

Section	Question	Maximum score available	Demonstrated By	Scoring Methodology
				<p>conditions and requirements, but fails to fully address all key issues and/or demonstrated an incomplete understanding and /or is missing information. Information is generally consistent with that provided in other areas of the response and with that shown in the DAT model.</p> <p>0%-1% Incomplete response or significant areas of information missing. Approach is confused or fails to demonstrate an understanding of the required process and/or process proposed is inappropriate to local conditions and requirements and/ or significant areas of information are missing. Information is inconsistent with that provided in other areas of the response and with that shown in the DAT model.</p>
5.6	Construction Approach and Technical Proposal	5%	Clear construction approach that is consistent with other areas of the submission covering access, phasing, supply chain, quality control, addresses key issues that might be covered in a Construction Environmental Management plan.	<p>4%-5% High level, clear construction approach that covers the main issues related to construction and is consistent with other areas of the submission. All information is consistent with that provided in other areas of the response and with that shown in the DAT model.</p> <p>2%-3% High level, clear construction approach that covers most of the main issues related to construction and is generally consistent with other areas of the submission. Information is generally consistent with that provided in other areas of the response and with that shown in the DAT model.</p> <p>0%-1% Construction approach that covers some of the main issues but significant areas of information are missing. Information is inconsistent with other areas of the</p>

Section	Question	Maximum score available	Demonstrated By	Scoring Methodology
				submission.
5.7	Project Risk Assessment	2.5%	Identification of 5 clear risks. Definition of tangible actions that can be undertaken to mitigate those risks.	<p>2%-2.5% Realistic understanding and identification of clear and specific risks. Demonstration of tangible and practical actions that can be undertaken to mitigate those risks. Answer is consistent with information provided elsewhere in the tender submission and in the DAT model.</p> <p>1% Identification of risks, but lacking clarity and / or identifications of actions that can be undertaken to mitigate those risks, actions are incomplete or likely to be ineffective. May be areas of inconsistency with information provided elsewhere in the tender submission.</p> <p>0% Little or incomplete information provided and / or risks identified are unrealistic or actions identified are unresolved or unclear and / or proposals are inconsistent with those shown elsewhere in the tender submission.</p>
5.8	Project Health and Safety	2.5%	Realistic understanding of likely issues and demonstration of tangible actions that can be undertaken to mitigate those risks.	<p>2%-2.5% Realistic understanding of likely issues and demonstration of tangible actions that can be undertaken to mitigate those risks. Answer is consistent with information provided elsewhere in the tender submission.</p> <p>1% Identification of some issues and demonstration of some actions that can be undertaken to mitigate those risks. May be areas of inconsistency with information provided elsewhere in the tender submission.</p> <p>0% No information provided or incomplete information. Issues identified are unrealistic or actions identified are unresolved or unclear and / or proposals are inconsistent with those shown elsewhere in the tender submission.</p>

Section	Question	Maximum score available	Demonstrated By	Scoring Methodology
6.0	Financial	42.5%	<p>In evaluating all the financial aspects of the case study (6.1 – 6.6 below) the HCA will assess the reasonableness of the information provided and the soundness of the financial assumptions used in order to avoid accepting what are clearly unsustainably high values or unsustainably low costs. Value and costs used must be consistent and realistic and must reflect the local market. Where cost or values stated do not appear to be reasonable, the HCA will initially seek clarification from the bidder. If after clarification has been sought, the HCA still considers values or costs to be unsustainable and unjustified the submission will be removed from the competitive process.</p> <p>Please also see section 5.3 of this document.</p>	
6.1	Sales Values: Market Sale Homes	5%	<p>Gross development value (GDV) for market sale homes resulting from financial appraisal input to the HCA Development Appraisal Tool (DAT).</p>	<p>DAT financial submissions are consolidated for all tenders. Tenders are ranked according to the GDV (NIA as per RICS code of measurement). Marks are allocated according to the percentage of the <u>maximum</u> tender value achieved by the individual tender (see example below).</p> <p>Note: the example DAT model figures below are purely illustrative to demonstrate scoring and are not representative of DAT model outputs.</p> <p>Tender 1 bid the highest GDV for market sale homes and is awarded 100% of the marks available: 5 marks.</p> <p>Tender 4 bid at 88% of Tender 1's max GDV and is awarded 88% of the marks available: 4.4.</p>

Section	Question	Maximum score available	Demonstrated By	Scoring Methodology																														
				<table border="1" data-bbox="1301 296 2018 692"> <thead> <tr> <th></th> <th>Gross development value market £/sq m</th> <th>Max sales value</th> <th>% max sales value</th> <th>Score</th> </tr> </thead> <tbody> <tr> <td>Tender 1</td> <td>£ 2,500</td> <td>£ 2,500</td> <td>100%</td> <td>5.0</td> </tr> <tr> <td>Tender 2</td> <td>£ 2,300</td> <td>£ 2,500</td> <td>92%</td> <td>4.6</td> </tr> <tr> <td>Tender 3</td> <td>£ 2,250</td> <td>£ 2,500</td> <td>90%</td> <td>4.5</td> </tr> <tr> <td>Tender 4</td> <td>£ 2,200</td> <td>£ 2,500</td> <td>88%</td> <td>4.4</td> </tr> <tr> <td>Tender 5</td> <td>£ 2,300</td> <td>£ 2,500</td> <td>92%</td> <td>4.6</td> </tr> </tbody> </table> <p data-bbox="1272 727 2045 794">Sales values will be carried forward into the Framework Agreement as baseline figures for future reference.</p>		Gross development value market £/sq m	Max sales value	% max sales value	Score	Tender 1	£ 2,500	£ 2,500	100%	5.0	Tender 2	£ 2,300	£ 2,500	92%	4.6	Tender 3	£ 2,250	£ 2,500	90%	4.5	Tender 4	£ 2,200	£ 2,500	88%	4.4	Tender 5	£ 2,300	£ 2,500	92%	4.6
	Gross development value market £/sq m	Max sales value	% max sales value	Score																														
Tender 1	£ 2,500	£ 2,500	100%	5.0																														
Tender 2	£ 2,300	£ 2,500	92%	4.6																														
Tender 3	£ 2,250	£ 2,500	90%	4.5																														
Tender 4	£ 2,200	£ 2,500	88%	4.4																														
Tender 5	£ 2,300	£ 2,500	92%	4.6																														
6.2	Sales Values: Affordable Homes	5%	Gross development value (GDV) for affordable homes resulting from financial appraisal input to the HCA Development Appraisal Tool (DAT).	<p data-bbox="1272 799 2045 967">DAT financial submissions are consolidated for all tenders. Tenders are ranked according to the GDV (NIA as per RICS code of measurement). Marks are allocated according to the percentage of the <u>maximum</u> tender value achieved by the individual tender (see example below).</p> <p data-bbox="1272 1002 2045 1066">Tender 1 bid the highest GDV for affordable homes and is awarded 100% of the marks available: 5 marks.</p> <p data-bbox="1272 1101 2045 1165">Tender 4 bid at 89% of Tender 1's max GDV and is awarded 89% of the marks available: 4.4.</p>																														

Section	Question	Maximum score available	Demonstrated By	Scoring Methodology				
					Gross development value affordable £/sq m	Max sales value	% max sales value	Score
				Tender 1	£1,800	£1,800	100%	5.0
				Tender 2	£1,750	£1,800	97%	4.9
				Tender 3	£1,700	£1,800	94%	4.7
				Tender 4	£1,600	£1,800	89%	4.4
				Tender 5	£1,750	£1,800	97%	4.9
				Sales values will be carried forward into the Framework Agreement as baseline figures for future reference.				

Section	Question	Maximum score available	Demonstrated By	Scoring Methodology																														
6.3	Construction Costs: Market Sale Homes	5%	Construction costs for market sale homes resulting from financial appraisal input to the HCA Development Appraisal Tool (DAT).	<p>DAT financial submissions are consolidated for all tenders. Tenders are ranked according to the construction costs (residential development floor area GIA as per RICS code of measurement) for market sale homes, with the lowest tender ranked first. Marks are allocated according to the percentage of the <u>lowest</u> tender value achieved by the individual tender (see example below).</p> <p>Tender 4 bid the lowest cost for market sale homes and is awarded 100% of the marks available: 5 marks.</p> <p>Tender 5 bid at 108% of Tender 4's lowest cost and is awarded 1/108% of the marks available: 4.6.</p> <table border="1"> <thead> <tr> <th></th> <th>Construction cost market £/sq m</th> <th>Min cost value</th> <th>% min cost value</th> <th>Score</th> </tr> </thead> <tbody> <tr> <td>Tender 1</td> <td>£800</td> <td>£760</td> <td>105%</td> <td>4.8</td> </tr> <tr> <td>Tender 2</td> <td>£780</td> <td>£760</td> <td>103%</td> <td>4.9</td> </tr> <tr> <td>Tender 3</td> <td>£770</td> <td>£760</td> <td>101%</td> <td>4.9</td> </tr> <tr> <td>Tender 4</td> <td>£760</td> <td>£760</td> <td>100%</td> <td>5.0</td> </tr> <tr> <td>Tender 5</td> <td>£820</td> <td>£760</td> <td>108%</td> <td>4.6</td> </tr> </tbody> </table> <p>Construction costs will be carried forward into the Framework Agreement as baseline figures for future reference.</p>		Construction cost market £/sq m	Min cost value	% min cost value	Score	Tender 1	£800	£760	105%	4.8	Tender 2	£780	£760	103%	4.9	Tender 3	£770	£760	101%	4.9	Tender 4	£760	£760	100%	5.0	Tender 5	£820	£760	108%	4.6
	Construction cost market £/sq m	Min cost value	% min cost value	Score																														
Tender 1	£800	£760	105%	4.8																														
Tender 2	£780	£760	103%	4.9																														
Tender 3	£770	£760	101%	4.9																														
Tender 4	£760	£760	100%	5.0																														
Tender 5	£820	£760	108%	4.6																														
6.4	Construction Costs: Affordable Homes	5%	Construction costs for affordable homes resulting from financial appraisal input to the HCA Development Appraisal Tool (DAT).	<p>DAT financial submissions are consolidated for all tenders. Tenders are ranked according to the construction costs (residential development floor area GIA as per RICS code of measurement) for affordable homes, with the lowest tender ranked first. Marks are allocated according to the percentage of the <u>lowest</u> tender value achieved by the individual tender (see example below).</p>																														

Section	Question	Maximum score available	Demonstrated By	Scoring Methodology																														
				<p>Tender 4 bid the lowest construction cost for affordable homes and is awarded 100% of the marks available: 5 marks.</p> <p>Tender 5 bid at 108% of Tender 4's lowest cost and is awarded 1/108% of the marks available: 4.6.</p> <table border="1" data-bbox="1312 564 2004 863"> <thead> <tr> <th></th> <th>Construction cost affordable £/sq m</th> <th>Min cost value</th> <th>% min cost value</th> <th>Score</th> </tr> </thead> <tbody> <tr> <td>Tender 1</td> <td>£810</td> <td>£770</td> <td>105%</td> <td>4.8</td> </tr> <tr> <td>Tender 2</td> <td>£790</td> <td>£770</td> <td>103%</td> <td>4.9</td> </tr> <tr> <td>Tender 3</td> <td>£780</td> <td>£770</td> <td>101%</td> <td>4.9</td> </tr> <tr> <td>Tender 4</td> <td>£770</td> <td>£770</td> <td>100%</td> <td>5.0</td> </tr> <tr> <td>Tender 5</td> <td>£830</td> <td>£770</td> <td>108%</td> <td>4.6</td> </tr> </tbody> </table> <p>Construction costs will be carried forward into the Framework Agreement as baseline figures for future reference.</p>		Construction cost affordable £/sq m	Min cost value	% min cost value	Score	Tender 1	£810	£770	105%	4.8	Tender 2	£790	£770	103%	4.9	Tender 3	£780	£770	101%	4.9	Tender 4	£770	£770	100%	5.0	Tender 5	£830	£770	108%	4.6
	Construction cost affordable £/sq m	Min cost value	% min cost value	Score																														
Tender 1	£810	£770	105%	4.8																														
Tender 2	£790	£770	103%	4.9																														
Tender 3	£780	£770	101%	4.9																														
Tender 4	£770	£770	100%	5.0																														
Tender 5	£830	£770	108%	4.6																														
6.5	Land Value	12.5%	Land value net of all costs resulting from financial appraisal input to the HCA Development Appraisal Tool (DAT). This is a cash payment with none deferred.	<p>DAT financial submissions are consolidated for all tenders. Tenders are ranked according to the land value net of costs. Marks are allocated according to the percentage of the <u>maximum</u> tender value achieved by the individual tender (see example below).</p> <p>Tender 1 bid the highest land value and is awarded 100% of the marks available: 12.5 marks.</p> <p>Tender 4 bid at 81% of Tender 1's max land value and is awarded 81% of the marks available: 10.1.</p>																														

Section	Question	Maximum score available	Demonstrated By	Scoring Methodology																														
				<table border="1"> <thead> <tr> <th></th> <th>Land value £</th> <th>Max land value</th> <th>% max land value</th> <th>Score</th> </tr> </thead> <tbody> <tr> <td>Tender 1</td> <td>£650,000</td> <td>£650,000</td> <td>100%</td> <td>12.5</td> </tr> <tr> <td>Tender 2</td> <td>£600,000</td> <td>£650,000</td> <td>92%</td> <td>11.5</td> </tr> <tr> <td>Tender 3</td> <td>£550,000</td> <td>£650,000</td> <td>85%</td> <td>10.6</td> </tr> <tr> <td>Tender 4</td> <td>£525,000</td> <td>£650,000</td> <td>81%</td> <td>10.1</td> </tr> <tr> <td>Tender 5</td> <td>£600,000</td> <td>£650,000</td> <td>92%</td> <td>11.5</td> </tr> </tbody> </table>		Land value £	Max land value	% max land value	Score	Tender 1	£650,000	£650,000	100%	12.5	Tender 2	£600,000	£650,000	92%	11.5	Tender 3	£550,000	£650,000	85%	10.6	Tender 4	£525,000	£650,000	81%	10.1	Tender 5	£600,000	£650,000	92%	11.5
	Land value £	Max land value	% max land value	Score																														
Tender 1	£650,000	£650,000	100%	12.5																														
Tender 2	£600,000	£650,000	92%	11.5																														
Tender 3	£550,000	£650,000	85%	10.6																														
Tender 4	£525,000	£650,000	81%	10.1																														
Tender 5	£600,000	£650,000	92%	11.5																														
6.6	Overheads and Profit	10%	Total operating profit (including overheads) resulting from financial appraisal input to the HCA Development Appraisal Tool (DAT).	<p>DAT financial submissions are consolidated for all tenders. Tenders are ranked according to the operating profit including overheads, with the lowest tender ranked first. Marks are allocated according to the percentage of the <u>minimum</u> tender profit and overheads achieved by the individual tender (see example below).</p> <p>Tender 4 bid the lowest overheads and profit, and is awarded 100% of the marks available: 10 marks. Tender 1 bid at 120% of Tender 4's lowest overheads and profit value, and is awarded 1/120% of the marks available: 8.3.</p>																														

Section	Question	Maximum score available	Demonstrated By	Scoring Methodology																														
				<table border="1"> <thead> <tr> <th></th> <th>Overheads & profit £</th> <th>Min o/h & profit value</th> <th>% min o/h & profit value</th> <th>Score</th> </tr> </thead> <tbody> <tr> <td>Tender 1</td> <td>£36,000</td> <td>£30,000</td> <td>120%</td> <td>8.3</td> </tr> <tr> <td>Tender 2</td> <td>£33,000</td> <td>£30,000</td> <td>110%</td> <td>9.1</td> </tr> <tr> <td>Tender 3</td> <td>£32,000</td> <td>£30,000</td> <td>107%</td> <td>9.4</td> </tr> <tr> <td>Tender 4</td> <td>£30,000</td> <td>£30,000</td> <td>100%</td> <td>10.0</td> </tr> <tr> <td>Tender 5</td> <td>£33,000</td> <td>£30,000</td> <td>110%</td> <td>9.1</td> </tr> </tbody> </table> <p>Overheads and profit will be carried forward (converted into a percentage of gross development value) into the Framework Agreement as baseline figures for future reference.</p>		Overheads & profit £	Min o/h & profit value	% min o/h & profit value	Score	Tender 1	£36,000	£30,000	120%	8.3	Tender 2	£33,000	£30,000	110%	9.1	Tender 3	£32,000	£30,000	107%	9.4	Tender 4	£30,000	£30,000	100%	10.0	Tender 5	£33,000	£30,000	110%	9.1
	Overheads & profit £	Min o/h & profit value	% min o/h & profit value	Score																														
Tender 1	£36,000	£30,000	120%	8.3																														
Tender 2	£33,000	£30,000	110%	9.1																														
Tender 3	£32,000	£30,000	107%	9.4																														
Tender 4	£30,000	£30,000	100%	10.0																														
Tender 5	£33,000	£30,000	110%	9.1																														
7.0	Your Role as a Panel Member 15 % Lead and Deputy Contacts	Pass/fail	All requested information is provided.																															
	Role as an Active Panel Member	5%	Clear process for management and the gathering of lessons learned in use of the panel, acting on these where appropriate and feeding information back to the HCA where necessary.	4%-5% Proposals for gathering lessons learned, promotion of the panel and knowledge sharing within their organisation are practical, resolved and draw on current experience and working practices within the organisation. Adequate resources are demonstrated to manage the Panel Membership adequately. Staff proposed have																														

Section	Question	Maximum score available	Demonstrated By	Scoring Methodology
			<p>Information on promotion of use of the panel to other Public Sector Bodies as part of your corporate marketing</p> <p>Information on how they will share knowledge on use of the panel within your organisation to ensure that all regions and divisions have an appropriate level of understanding and usage of the panel is compliant and consistent.</p>	<p>knowledge of housing development and have a place of influence within their organisation and time to devote to the promotion of the panel.</p> <p>2%-3% Proposals for gathering lessons learned, promotion of the panel and knowledge sharing within their organisation are described, but may not be fully resolved or draw on current experience and working practices within the organisation. Resources are demonstrated to manage the Panel Membership. Staff proposed have knowledge of housing development and have a place of influence within their organisation and time to devote to the promotion of the panel.</p> <p>0%-1% Information on panel management within the organisation is missing, inconsistent, impractical or shows lack of understanding, knowledge or experience. Staff proposed are not suitably qualified or experienced, do not hold a position of influence within their organisation, or do not have time to devote to the management of the panel.</p>
8.0	Collection of KPIs	5%	<p>Clear Explanation of how data on use of Small and Medium Enterprises (SMEs) will be collected on projects procured through DPP2 referencing to previous experience of collecting this data on previous projects or frameworks where possible.</p> <p>Answer should be sufficiently detailed, practical and realistic and should identify the resources, processes and means to collect</p>	<p>4%-5% - Clear sound and practical explanation of how KPIs will be gathered on DPP2. Explanation backed up by and draws on current knowledge and experience.</p> <p>2%-3% - An explanation of how KPIs will be gathered on DPP2 is provided, but it lacks in clarity or practicality or does not draw on experience.</p> <p>0%-1% - Information missing or explanation is unresolved or impractical and does not demonstrate previous knowledge or experience of gathering this information.</p>

Section	Question	Maximum score available	Demonstrated By	Scoring Methodology
			this data as a development project progresses. Gathering of other KPIs?	
9.0	Improving Housing Delivery	5%	Presentation of clear, practical and tangible actions with explanation of how you would go about implementing these either alone, with the HCA or with other Panel Members. Drawing on experience of similar initiatives or proposals you have implemented in conjunction with other Public Sector Bodies or other developers or housing industry organisations. Clear identification of resources necessary to undertake actions, timescale and any management of communications required.	<p>4%-5% - Clear sound and practical explanation of your ideas and proposals. Explanation backed up by and draws on current knowledge and experience.</p> <p>2%-3% - Some ideas proposed but full explanation lacking in clarity or practicality or does not draw on broad experience of the housing development industry.</p> <p>0%-1% - Information missing or explanation is unresolved or impractical and does not demonstrate sound knowledge or experience.</p>
10.0	Financial Information	Pass / Fail	<p>Initial financial checks have been carried out on those shortlisted to tender. Updated information provided will be used to assess whether a company has sufficient financial standing, capacity and suitability.</p> <p>The financial information presented will be assessed by the HCA's in-house, professionally qualified financial due diligence team. Consideration of any additional financial information provided will include (but not be limited to) the following:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • age and completeness of financial information provided • trading performance Bidder / group, i.e. levels of turnover, profitability, interest cover • the strength of the balance sheet of the Bidder / group i.e. net asset position, liquidity, fixed assets etc. • level of debt of the Bidder / group 	

Section	Question	Maximum score available	Demonstrated By	Scoring Methodology
			<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • availability of funding the Bidder / group • opinion of the auditors within the financial statements • credit checks as necessary (including but not limited to outstanding CCJs) 	<p>Where necessary the financial standing of any parent company may also be assessed and a positive financial vet may only be given in the event that the parent company guarantee is provided.</p> <p>In the case of consortium bids where it is proposed to set up a joint venture (JV) the financial standing of all JV partners will be assessed and taken into account and parent company guarantees may be sought from the individual members of any JV or their parent companies. A positive financial vet may again be dependent on provision of those parent company guarantees.</p> <p>The opinion is likely to fall within two broad categories, Pass or Fail</p>

