

Introduction

Keshcarrigan Development Association intends to award the project to the Tenderer who submits the Most Economically Advantageous Tender (MEAT), based on the following contract award criteria.

A total of **10,000 marks** will be divided relative to the following percentage weighting:

Qualitative (40%): This will be based on the Tenderers approach to delivering and managing the service to be provided

Cost (60%): This will be based on the rates submitted in the Pricing Schedule

Assessment of Tenderers Qualitative Criteria

Marking Scheme for the Assessment of the Qualitative Criteria

Candidates were asked to prepare and submit a response for each of the published Qualitative Criteria. Tenderers will be evaluated against the qualitative criteria set out below:

Criteria/Requirement		Weighting	Qualifying Mark
1.	<i>Experience, Expertise & Accessibility: -</i> Tenderer should demonstrate track record of work done on projects of a similar nature for similar bodies. Qualifications & Experience of Key Personnel should be outlined. Relevant experience, including relevant conservation experience, quality of Programme of Works, Method Statement, capacity to deliver. Letters of recommendation and references should be included.	2,500	1,250
2.	<i>Quality of Previous Work:-</i> Tenderer should provide examples of completed projects of similar nature that may be subject to visual inspection. Technical Quality of relevant previous projects, including conservation projects. Letters of recommendation and references should be included.	1,200	600
3.	<i>Environmental Considerations:-</i> A Statement outlining compliance with current Environmental Best Practice Guidelines, also details of any innovative green technologies to be employed in this project.	300	150

Submissions for the Award Criteria - Qualitative will be evaluated and awarded marks in accordance with the following table:

% Marks Meaning
100% - Excellent response with very few or no weaknesses that fully meets or exceeds requirements, and provides comprehensive, detailed, and convincing assurance that the Tenderer will deliver to an excellent standard.
80% - A very good response that demonstrates real understanding of the requirements and assurance that the Tenderer will deliver to a good or high standard.
60% - A satisfactory response which demonstrates a reasonable understanding of requirements and gives reasonable assurance of delivery to an adequate standard but does not provide sufficiently convincing assurance to award a higher mark.
40% - A response where reservations exist and which have not been addressed by clarification. Lacks full credibility/convincing detail, and there is a significant risk that the response will not be successful.
20% - A response where serious reservations exist. This may be because, for example, insufficient detail is provided (even post clarification), and the response has fundamental flaws, or is seriously inadequate or seriously lacks credibility with a high risk of non-delivery.
0 - Response completely fails to address the criterion under consideration

The formula for calculating the marks for the Award Criteria – Cost is:

$$\text{Price Score} = \text{Maximum Mark Available (6,000)} \times \text{Lowest Valid Tender Total Price} / \text{Tender Total Price of Tender Being Assessed}$$

ie. the tender with the lowest valid tender total price will be awarded the maximum marks available **(6,000)** the remainder of the tenderers will be awarded using the formula "*lowest valid tender total price divided by the net tender total price of the tender been assessed multiplied by the maximum number of marks available*".