



Comhairle Contae Mhaigh Eo
Mayo County Council

Tourism, Recreation and Amenity



Upgrade of Clew Bay Cycle Track

Ballytoohy North, Clare Island, County Mayo

Volume D – Works Proposals Tenderer's Quality Submission

June 2026

GUIDANCE FOR QUALITY ASSESSMENT OF CONTRACTOR'S WORKS PROPOSALS

1. This document should be read in conjunction with all other parts of the Tender Documents for this project.
2. The submission made by the Contractor shall represent the entire Contractor's Team for this project. The Contractor's combined response must include all information on behalf of the Contractor (including consortium where applicable) and all Sub-contractors.
3. Failure by a Contractor to complete all questions fully and in accordance with all requirements therein will result in the Contractor's submission being rejected.
4. Each question should be answered separately without cross reference to any other question.
5. The Employer reserves the right to require evidence or additional evidence in relation to any answers given to questions in this submission.
6. The Contractor must, without undue delay, inform the Employer of any changes to the information provided in response to any questions in this questionnaire that may arise at any time during the Contractors participation in this tender process.
7. All responses should be in English and have a font size no smaller than equivalent to 10pt Arial.
8. No general marketing or promotional material from the Contractor or any Sub-contractor either in answer to any of the questions or for any other reason, may be included.
9. Contractors must ensure that their response to each question is relevant and focused on addressing the question asked. Each question will be evaluated only on the information provided for that particular question and any specifically requested and referenced appendices. No marks will be awarded for a particular question for information given elsewhere in the submission.
10. The responses submitted by the Contractor shall, if it is successful in being awarded a Contract, carry forward into the operation of the Contract and will form part of the Contract. Contractors must therefore ensure that the Tender Price submitted reflects the commitments given in the Works Proposals.
11. The assessment of Contractor's Works Proposals will equate to a maximum 30% of the overall score in the assessment of the Most Economically Advantageous Tender (MEAT).

The total of the marks for the responses to each question will be added together to achieve a total mark, with a maximum possible mark of 20 or 10 per question as outlined below. Each question will be given a total mark on the basis that:

Assessment	20 Mark Question
Very good	17-20
Good	13-16
Satisfactory	9-12
Poor / Fail	0-8

A minimum score of "Satisfactory" (9+ marks) will be required for each question in order for the tender submission to proceed to the next stage of the assessment.

If a tenderer is awarded a score of 8 or less marks in response to any of the questions they will be eliminated from the Tender process.

The marks awarded for each question will then be weighted in accordance with the table below:

Question	Criteria	Max. Marks Available Per Question	Weighting Factor	Maximum Quality Score
1	Risk Management	20	0.5	10
2	Programme & Methodologies	20	0.5	10
3	Project Team, Equipment & Sub-Contractors	20	0.25	5
4	Green Credentials	20	0.25	5

The compliant tenderer with the highest total marks will be awarded a score of 30. Each of the other tenderers will be awarded reduced scores based on the following formula:

Tenderer's Adjusted Quality Score:	$\frac{\text{Tenderer's Quality Score}}{\text{Highest Quality Score}} \times 30$
------------------------------------	--

Note: All calculations for tender assessment purposes shall be carried out to two decimal places.

12. Only Tenders that pass the quality assessment will be considered for the assessment of price.
13. The assessment of a Tenderers Price Score will equate to a maximum 70% of the overall score in the assessment of the Most Economically Advantageous Tender (MEAT).

The compliant Tenderer with the Lowest Comparative Cost of Tender total will be awarded a score of 70. Each of the other compliant tenderers will be awarded reduced scores based on the following formula:

Tenderer's Price Score:	$\frac{\text{Lowest Comparative Cost of Tender}}{\text{Tenderer's Comparative Cost of Tender}} \times 70$
-------------------------	---

Note:

- (i) All calculations for tender assessment purposes shall be carried out to two decimal places.

- (ii) Refer to Section 9.5 and Appendix 5, *Instructions to Tenderers Open Procedure for Work Contractors, ITT-W2* for calculation overview of Comparative Cost of Tender.

14. Marking guidance for each question is given on the following pages.

Question 1: Risk Management (Maximum Mark Available: 20)
33.33% of Quality Score

Describe the key challenges, risks and constraints that you see for this project and describe how you will manage and mitigate these risks in order to ensure a successful outcome to the project.

Your response as a minimum shall address:

	Marks Available
Management and mitigation of Health & Safety challenges and risks, to include: ➤ Site specific risks and constraints (e.g. remote location, restricted works area, working at height, excavation, vehicle and pedestrian movements etc). ➤ Work activities required to complete the works in accordance with the Contract.	10
Management and mitigation measures in relation to Environmental Protection for the proposed site, to include: ➤ Working to ensure minimal disruption to existing habitats, flora and fauna. ➤ Liaison/co-ordination of works with Statutory Bodies and/or Utility Providers.	10

Response to be maximum 5 nr sides of A4 paper (font size 10 pt Arial)

If more than 5 nr sides of A4 paper are submitted, only the first 5 nr sides will be assessed

Question 1 Marking Guidance

Assessment	Marks	Interpretation
Very Good	17-20	Very good details and description of challenges, risks, and constraints for the project with a very good management approach and mitigation proposals fully addressing the listed items.
Good	13-16	Good details and description of challenges, risks and constraints for the project with a good management approach and mitigation proposals adequately addressing the listed items.
Satisfactory	9-12	Reasonable details and description of challenges, risks and constraints for the project with a reasonable management approach and mitigation proposals partially addressing the listed items.
Poor / Fail	0-8	Limited details and description of challenges, risks and constraints for the project with a limited management approach and mitigation proposals poorly addressing the listed items.

Question 2: Programme & Methodology (Maximum Mark Available: 20)
33.33% of Quality Score

Provide methodologies and an outline Programme of Works demonstrating how you intend to complete the works, given the site location and site-specific constraints, and within the required timeframe (i.e.) **4 weeks from contract award.**

Your response as a minimum shall address:

	Marks Available
Proposed Programme of Works (Gantt chart or similar on 1 No. A4/A3 size paper)	5
Methodology for liaison with the design team, Employer's Representative, Employer, stakeholders, local businesses, site users and the general public	5
Methodology to ensure quality of works	5
Methodology for constructing all elements of the proposed works, including: - treatment of excavated material, i.e. rock, excavated material. - deliveries / removal of materials/plant to the sites.	5

Response to be maximum 5 nr sides of A4 size paper (excl. programme) (font size 10 pt Arial) If more than 5 nr sides of A4 paper are submitted only the first 5 nr sides will be assessed.

Question 2 Marking Guidance

Assessment	Marks	Interpretation
Very Good	17-20	Very good submission comprehensively addressing the listed items. Very good outline programme information provided along with logical and detailed methodologies for each item.
Good	13-16	Good methodology fully addressing the listed items. Good Outline programme information provided with logical sequence of operations, timescales and key milestones.
Satisfactory	9-12	Reasonable addressing of the listed items. Satisfactory Outline programme information provided with logical sequence of operations, timescales and key milestones.
Poor / Fail	0-8	Limited or no outline programme information provided. Limited or no methodologies addressing the listed items.

Question 3: Project Team, Plant & Equipment, & Sub-Contractors (Maximum Mark Available: 20)
16.67% of Quality Score

Identify the key personnel that will be involved in this project, the equipment and any specialists required to deliver the project. Your response as a minimum shall include:

	Marks Available
Provide details of the Project Team & Project Team Structure for the project	3
Roles, experience and projected inputs of key personnel, including as a minimum: Project Manager & Site Supervisor / Site Foreman	5
Proposed plant & equipment to be used to complete the project taking into consideration the restricted nature of the site, limited site access points and likely ground conditions	6
Provide details for any specialist sub-contractors (e.g. public lighting, walls, etc) or details of own experience to complete any specialist elements of the project	6

Response to be maximum 5 nr sides of A4 paper (font size 10 pt Arial)

If more than 5 nr sides of A4 paper are submitted only the first 5 nr sides will be assessed.

Question 3 Marking Guidance

Assessment	Marks	Interpretation
Very Good	17-20	Very good submission, demonstrated that the key members of the team have very good previous experience of projects of this scale and nature, has a very good knowledge of the equipment required to complete the project; has a very good understanding of (or access to) the various specialist elements required to complete the works
Good	13-16	Good submission, demonstrated that the key members of the team have good previous experience of projects of this scale and nature, has a good knowledge of the equipment required to complete the project; has a good understanding of (or access to) the various specialist elements required to complete the works
Satisfactory	9-12	Reasonable submission, has not fully demonstrated that some/all key members of the team have previous experience of projects of this scale and nature, provided limited information on the equipment required to complete the project; appear to have a limited understanding/access to the various specialist elements required to complete the works
Poor / Fail	0-8	Limited or no information provided in response to the information requested

Question 4: Green Credentials (Maximum Mark Available: 20)
16.67% of Quality Score

Your response as a minimum shall include:

	Marks Available
Provide evidence of two recent and comparable contracts that were delivered with supporting environmental measures (e.g., staff sustainability and awareness training, environmental management system implementation)	10
The practical steps that the tenderer will take to deliver the contract in an environmentally sustainable manner, including sustainability awareness training for personnel involved in contract fulfilment	10

Response to be maximum 5 nr sides of A4 paper (font size 10 pt Arial)

If more than 5 nr sides of A4 paper are submitted only the first 5 nr sides will be assessed.

Question 4 Marking Guidance

Assessment	Marks	Interpretation
Very Good	17-20	Very good submission, demonstrated that the key members of the team have very good previous experience of projects of this scale and nature, has a very good knowledge of the equipment required to complete the project; has a very good understanding of (or access to) the various specialist elements required to complete the works
Good	13-16	Good submission, demonstrated that the key members of the team have good previous experience of projects of this scale and nature, has a good knowledge of the equipment required to complete the project; has a good understanding of (or access to) the various specialist elements required to complete the works
Satisfactory	9-12	Reasonable submission, has not fully demonstrated that some/all key members of the team have previous experience of projects of this scale and nature, provided limited information on the equipment required to complete the project; appear to have a limited understanding/access to the various specialist elements required to complete the works
Poor / Fail	0-8	Limited or no information provided in response to the information requested