

Tender Name: \_\_\_\_\_  
 Evaluator Name: \_\_\_\_\_

Section	Criteria in Response Required	Score (/10)	Minimum Acceptable Score	Weighting	Weighted Score	Pass / Fail	Comments and Notes
1 & 2	Basic Details & Financial Information						
3	Business Activities		6	50%	0		
4	Quality Assurance		5	10%	0		
5	Equalities		3	10%	0		
6	Experience & References		6	30%	0		
7	Professional & Business Standing						
<b>Total Weighted Score</b>					<b>0</b>		
<b>Out of a Maximum Weighted Score</b>					<b>100%</b>		

**Note:** Any fails, either on a Pass/Fail type question, or as a result of a failure to meet a minimum acceptable score, will result in the Potential Provider being disqualified from the tendering process, regardless of scores against other criteria. Additionally, we will contact the referees of those Potential Providers who are shortlisted to be invited to tender (ITT), in order to verify the accuracy of the assertions made in section 8. Where there is substantial evidence that the bidder has misrepresented the facts, the Cabinet Office reserves the right to disqualify the bidder from the tendering process, and the next best scoring bidder will instead be placed on the ITT shortlist.

Question	Score	Description and Guidance
<b>1 &amp; 2 Basic Details &amp; Financial Information</b>		
1.1, 1.11 & 2.1		The company name and registration number will be used to obtain a financial risk assessment report for each Potential Provider. This report will be analysed by financial experts resulting in a pass or fail outcome. If a Potential Provider prefers to have this assessment carried out in respect of a guarantor, such as its ultimate parent body, then they may elect for this option on the understanding that they must submit a Deed of Guarantee executed by that guarantor and the Potential Provider as part of any subsequent tender. If we are unable to obtain a suitable financial risk assessment report for a particular Potential Provider, or their nominated guarantor, the organisation may be required to provide additional financial information as identified in section 2 of the Pre- Qualification Questionnaire, to enable an assessment to be carried out.
	Pass	Satisfactory level of risk, and estimated contract value does not represent an inappropriately high proportion of overall turnover.
	Fail	Unsatisfactory level of risk and/or estimated contract value represents an inappropriately high proportion of overall turnover
<b>3 Business Activities</b>		
3.1, 3.2 & 3.3		The organisation should clearly demonstrate their range of methodological expertise, outlining the specific skills/experience that key members of staff have demonstrated in previous projects, in addition to their experience of conducting evaluations of this nature, and capacity to deliver projects of this scale. Where organisations are working in partnership. or in a consortium, the response should reflect the experience of all partners.
	0 - 2	Lack of evidence provided
	3 - 5	Limited evidence provided
	6 - 8	Good level of evidence provided
	9 - 10	Extensive level of experience provided
<b>4 Quality Assurance</b>		
4.1 - 4.3		Evidence of a Quality Management System (QMS) provides some assurance as to the ability of a Potential Provider to provide services of a consistent quality. Care should be taken to ensure that the QMS offered is relevant to the service in question
	0	Unanswered or no QMS present and <i>satisfactory</i> explanation for lack of QMS is also absent
	5	No QMS present, but <i>satisfactory</i> explanation for absence is offered.
	7	Has a relevant unaccredited QMS; or can demonstrate that system is equivalent to relevant formally accredited system. Burden of proof is on the supplier.
	10	Has an accredited and relevant quality management system e.g. ISO9001 or equivalent
<b>5 Equalities</b>		
		The Cabinet Office expects Potential Providers to be committed to equality.
5.1 - 5.4	0	Shows no commitment to equality and diversity, or has previous infractions with no or unsatisfactory evidence of steps taken to rectify situation
	3 - 7	Currently adheres to statutory obligations with regard to equality, but has previous infractions with <i>some</i> evidence of steps taken to rectify situation
	8 - 10	Currently adheres to statutory obligations with regard to equality; may have previous infractions with <i>satisfactory</i> evidence of steps taken to rectify situation
<b>6 Experience &amp; References</b>		
		This section aims to assess the Potential Provider's capability and capacity through its previous performance on relevant contracts. Evidence of capability to access the relevant markets or market segments is important, as is evidence of capacity to handle the estimated size and/or value of the contract. It is possible and acceptable to meet the criteria through a single reference, only where the Potential Provider has offered satisfactory explanation for being unable to provide further references.
6.1 - 6.7		No response or totally inadequate response to the requirement;
	0 - 2	Unable to demonstrate many of the required services
	3 - 5	Limited response, providing little in the way of useful detail.
	6 - 8	Good, relevant response, covering the vast majority of services and markets required, and providing clear detail; Evidence of <i>adequate</i> capacity to handle estimated scope of contract, although some growth or expansion may be needed; At least two relevant references, unless satisfactory explanation is given for only being able to provide one.
	9 - 10	Excellent, relevant response covering ALL services required; Evidence of existing <i>ample</i> capacity to handle estimated scope of contract; At least two relevant references, unless satisfactory explanation is given for only being able to provide one.
<b>7 Professional &amp; Business Standing</b>		
		This section is seeking to reassure the Authority that there are no concerns regarding the conduct of the Potential Provider or its directors, partners, proprietors or other key decision makers. In the interests of transparency, the Authority will assess this section broadly in line with Regulation 23 of the Public Contracts Regulations (2006). Where there is evidence of a "major" conviction (see Regulation 23(1)) it is likely that the Potential Provider will be excluded from the tendering exercise. However, where there is evidence of a less serious conviction (see Regulation 23(4)) the Authority reserves the right to review the evidence and improvement steps taken, and accordingly decide whether or not to exclude a Potential Provider from the tendering exercise. With regard to the Authority's discretion in this matter, the Authority's decision will be final and conclusive.
	Pass	No evidence of any convictions, or evidence of less serious convictions as per Regulation 23(4) with, in the Authority's opinion, adequate steps taken to address the issues.

	Fail	Evidence of "major" convictions as per Regulation 23(1), or evidence of les serious convictions as per Regulation 23(4) with, in the Authority's opinion, insufficient steps taken to address the issues.
[Hatched area]		