Ag Rialáil Gairmithe Sláinte agus Cúraim Shóisialaigh
Regulating Health + Social Care Professionals

Request for Tenders
for the
provision of a
Registrant Management System

Tender Response Document – Qualitative Proposals (TRD-QP)

Procedure	Open Procedure
eTenders Reference	CORU/RMS/2026/01
OJEU Reference	To be Confirmed
Tranche 1 Clarifications Deadline	Friday 13 November 2026 at 12 noon (Dublin Time)
Tranche 2 Clarifications Deadline	Tuesday 17 November 2026 at 12 noon (Dublin Time)
Tender Closing Date and Time	Monday 7 December 2026 at 12 noon (Dublin Time)
Queries to be submitted via	www.etenders.gov.ie **only**
Tenderer Name	Tenderer to insert

Instructions for completion of the TRD-QP

Tenderers must ensure they complete this document in full.

This document is to be used to respond to the Qualitative Award Criteria Q1, Q3, Q4, and Q5 only.

Award Criterion Q2 (Solution Fit and Functional Capability) is assessed by reference to the Tender Response Document – Requirements Compliance Matrix. It is not assessed in this TRD-QP.

This document should be read and completed in conjunction with the RFT.

Each response must be self-contained. Each question shall be evaluated on the basis of the response to that question alone. Material relevant to more than one question must if necessary, be repeated, within any applicable word limit, in each response to which it relates. No cross-referencing between responses is permitted.

Tenderers must complete the response boxes provided below. Each response box should commence on a new A4 page. Do not expand the margins of any response box. A response submitted in any other format, or a response that cross-refers to a document not listed as a permitted attachment, will not be evaluated.

Tenderers are asked to note that the Contracting Authority will stop reading once the page limits specified have been reached and any pages (or parts of pages) submitted in excess of this limit **will not be evaluated**.

Tenderers should note that any information provided outside of the response boxes (or any appended documents) **will not be considered as part of the evaluation** unless specifically indicated. Any marketing material, brochures or other general information or documents will not be considered.

Only the attachments listed against a question are permitted. Attachments must not be used to extend a narrative response.

Hyperlinks to attachments, web pages and embedded files included in the Tender Response Document will NOT be accessed or considered as part of the evaluation process.

Tenderers must not include any response related to the selection criteria in this TRD. The selection criteria responses should only be submitted in the **TRD-SC.**

Tenderers must not include any price, rate, charge or discount in this TRD. Pricing is submitted only in the **TRD-PS**.

Arial font size 10 single space 6pt must be used by Tenderers.

Capitalised terms used in this document have the meaning assigned to them in the RFT and the Agreement (unless stated otherwise herein).

Tenderers Statement

Tenderers shall complete and return the Tenderer's Statement below. A duly authorised officer of the Tenderer organisation must sign and date the statement.

Tenderers who fail to provide the statement below will be eliminated from the competition.

TO: The Health and Social Care Professionals Council (CORU) (the "Contracting Authority")

RE: Request for Tenders for the provision of a Registrant Management System, RFT REF: CORU/RMS/2026/01

Having examined the RFT Documents, we hereby declare the following:

1. We understand the nature and extent of the Services and Solution required to be provided as described in the Specification within the Agreement made available as part of the RFT Documents.
2. We accept all of the terms and conditions of the RFT and the Agreement and agree that if we are awarded the Agreement and requested by the Contracting Authority, we will execute the Agreement made available as part of the RFT Documents.
3. We accept all the Selection and Award Criteria as set out in Section 7 of the RFT.
4. If we are successful with our Tender and conclude an Agreement with the Contracting Authority, we agree to provide the Contracting Authority with the Services in accordance with the RFT and our Tender.
5. If we are successful with our Tender and conclude an Agreement with the Contracting Authority, we agree that, in the performance of the Agreement, we shall comply with all applicable obligations in the field of environmental, social and labour law.
6. We confirm that we have complied with all requirements as set out at Section 4 of the RFT.
7. We confirm that all prices quoted in our Tender will remain valid for the Tender Validity Period.
8. We shall, if we conclude an Agreement with the Contracting Authority, have in place on the Commencement Date all insurances as required by the Agreement made available as part of the RFT Documents.
9. We confirm that all Data Subjects whose Personal Data is provided in our Tender have consented to the processing of such Personal Data by us, the Contracting Authority, the Evaluation Team and the supplier of the etenders.gov.ie website, for the purposes of our participation in this Competition, or that we otherwise have a legal basis for providing such Personal Data to the Contracting Authority for the purposes of our participation in this Competition, and that we will provide evidence of such consent and / or legal basis to the Contracting Authority upon request.
10. We confirm that all Contracting Authority data processed under the Agreement, including all backups, replicas and disaster recovery copies, will be stored and processed within the European Economic Area, and we have identified in our Tender every sub-processor proposed to be engaged and the location in which each will process data.
11. We confirm that the preparation of our Tender was carried out independently and that we have disclosed any actual or potential conflict of interest and any Registrable Interest in accordance with Appendix 1 (Important Notice) paragraphs 2 and 4 in the RFT.
12. We do not come within the category of prohibited economic operators identified in Regulation (EU) No 833/2014 of 31 July 2014 (as amended by EU Regulation 2022/576 or any subsequent amendments to same).
13. The origin of goods connected to our Tender, if any, are not subject to the prohibitions set out in Regulation (EU) No 833/2014 (as amended by EU Regulation 2022/576 or any subsequent amendments to same).
14. Any subcontractor, supplier or other entity on whose capacity we rely as part of our Tender does not come within the category of prohibited economic operators identified in Regulation (EU) No 833/2014 of 31 July 2014 (as amended by EU Regulation 2022/576 or any subsequent amendments to same).

Signed: .....

(Authorised Signatory)

Print Name .....

Company .....

Address .....

.....

Date .....

Qualitative Award Criterion Q1: Quality of Approach to Implementation and Mobilisation
The maximum marks available for Q.1 is 150 marks.

Response Requirement: Set out how you will mobilise, implement the Solution and migrate CORU Data, from the Commencement Date, and how you will manage the risks in doing so

Your response should include (but may not be limited to) the following:

- **Mobilisation –** what you will do during the first thirty (30) days: which team members will be involved, , the governance and reporting arrangements to be established (bearing in mind that the first project board meeting should occur within this 30-day period).
- **Implementation methodology and phasing**; provide a plan for managing the critical path and the period from the Commencement Date to Go-Live of each Implementation Phase.
- **An Initial Implementation Plan aligned to the Payment Milestones M1 to M10 in Schedule Four of the Agreement**, stating the deliverables that evidence completion of each (where applicable).
- **Final Implementation Plan**: explain how the Solution will be delivered in accordance with the Final Implementation Plan developed in accordance with the terms of clause 4 of the Agreement.
- **Data migration**: explain how you will profile, cleanse, map data; explain the number of trial migrations, reconciliation to agreed control totals and the treatment of records that cannot be migrated.
- **Cutover**: explain your approach to final migration, any outage required, and the fallback position if cutover has to be abandoned.
- **Testing**: explain your own system testing and the support you will provide for CORU's user acceptance testing (as outlined in clause 6 of the Agreement), with entry and exit criteria for each and the defect severity model applied.
- **Training and knowledge transfer:** explain how you will ensure training and knowledge transfer for end users, super users and administrators, including the materials and environment provided.
- Explain the **CORU effort required**, by role and by phase, expressed in days.
- Provide an analysis of **risks, dependencies** on the Contracting Authority with the mitigation proposed for each risk and the route by which risks will be escalated.
- **Hypercare**; explain the criteria for exiting hypercare and transitioning into business as usual.

Please refer to scoring matrix below for further information on what the Contracting Authority is seeking.

Page Limits

Tenderers are limited to 12 x A4 pages

Permitted attachments

- An implementation plan in Gantt form (not counted towards the page limit).
- A risk, issue and dependency register in tabular form (not counted towards the page limit).
- Hyperlinks are not permitted and will not be accessed or considered as part of the evaluation process.

What will not attract marks

Generic methodology descriptions not applied to CORU's circumstances and plans that do not identify what CORU itself must do.

Scoring Matrix for Q1

Rating	Meaning
Excellent + 100%	The Tenderer's approach is specific to CORU, with a credible critical path and an Initial Implementation Plan that reconciles to Schedule Four of the Agreement. Migration is evidenced end to end - profiling, mapping, trial runs, reconciliation to control totals and exception handling. Testing is defined with entry and exit criteria, cutover has a stated fallback, the CORU effort required is quantified by role and phase, and risks are identified honestly and mitigated. Nothing material is left unevidenced and the Evaluation Team has no reservation about the response or confidence in delivery.
Excellent 90%	The Tenderer's approach is specific to CORU, with a credible critical path and an Initial Implementation Plan that reconciles to Schedule Four of the Agreement. Migration is evidenced end to end - profiling, mapping, trial runs, reconciliation to control totals and exception handling-. Testing is defined with entry and exit criteria, cutover has a stated fallback, the CORU effort required is quantified by role and phase and risks are identified honestly and mitigated. One aspect is less fully developed than the remainder, but this reservation is minor and does not affect confidence in delivery.
Very Good + 80%	The Tenderer's implementation and migration approach is clear, sequenced and supported, with an Initial Implementation Plan that reconciles to Schedule Four of the Agreement. Testing, training and hypercare are addressed and the CORU effort is quantified, though some dependencies are left implicit and the risk analysis, while sound, is not fully developed. No more than one or two aspects are less fully evidenced than the rest, and neither gives rise to concern or lack of confidence in delivery.
Very Good 70%	The Tenderer's implementation and migration approach is clear, sequenced and supported, with an Initial Implementation Plan that reconciles to Schedule Four of the Agreement. Testing, training and hypercare are addressed and the CORU effort is quantified, though some dependencies are left implicit and the risk analysis, while sound, is not fully developed. Several aspects are less fully evidenced than the rest, though none of them, individually or together, gives rise to material concern or lack of confidence in delivery.
Good + 60%	A recognisable approach is set out by the Tenderer and the principal stages are identified, but it is described at a level that could apply to any customer, or the reconciliation approach, the fallback position or the CORU effort required is given only in outline. Risks are listed rather than analysed. Parts of the response go beyond the acceptable standard, but the response as a whole is not strong.
Good 50%	A recognisable approach is set out by the Tenderer and the principal stages are identified, but it is described at a level that could apply to any customer, or the reconciliation approach, the fallback position or the CORU effort required is given only in outline. Risks are listed rather than analysed. This is the minimum acceptable standard for this criterion.
A mark below 50% results in a Fail and elimination from the Competition	
Fair + 40%	The Tenderer's Initial Implementation Plan is insufficiently developed to give confidence that milestones can be met. Migration is addressed in outline only, reconciliation or exception handling is unexplained, or the effort required from CORU is not stated so CORU cannot assess what it must provide. Dependencies material to delivery are unidentified. Parts of the response are adequate, but the response as a whole falls short of the acceptable standard.
Fair 30%	The Tenderer's Initial Implementation Plan is insufficiently developed to give confidence that milestones can be met. Migration is addressed in outline only, reconciliation or exception handling is unexplained, or the effort required from CORU is not stated so CORU cannot assess what it must provide. Dependencies material to delivery are unidentified. The shortcomings affect most aspects of the response.
Poor + 20%	The Tenderer's response does not set out how the Solution would be implemented or how data would be migrated in any way CORU could rely upon. The Initial Implementation Plan is unsupported or inconsistent with the rest of the response or the approach would place the burden of migration on CORU without saying so. A limited part of the response has some value; the remainder does not.
Poor 10%	The response does not set out how the Solution would be implemented or how data would be migrated in any way CORU could rely upon. The Initial Implementation Plan is unsupported or inconsistent with the rest of the response or the approach would place the burden of migration on CORU without saying so. Little or nothing in the response can be relied upon.
Not Acceptable 0%	No response, or a response of no value: it does not address the question, it is irrelevant to it, or what is proposed is unacceptable to CORU.

[Insert response to Award Criterion Q1 here]

Qualitative Award Criterion Q3: Quality of Experience of Proposed Service Delivery Team
The maximum marks available for Q.3 is 150 marks.

<u>Response Requirement:</u> Identify the Key Contractor Personnel (i.e. those persons who will perform the roles below) and describe the wider team you propose for the Agreement and demonstrate that their experience is relevant to the delivery and operation of a multi-register regulatory system.

Your response should include (but may not be limited to):

- An organisation chart for the proposed Key Contractor Personnel and wider team, showing reporting lines and the interface with CORU, for both the Implementation Period and the service period.
- The named Key Contractor Personnel, with the time commitment of each, expressed as a percentage or in days, by phase.
- For each named individual, provide a curriculum vitae to include their relevant experience of contracts they have worked on, the individual's own role on those contracts, and the relevance of those contracts to CORU's requirements under the Agreement. Any experience of regulatory, licensing or professional registration bodies operating more than one register should be identified expressly.
- Where the same individual is proposed for more than one role or is committed to other contracts during the implementation period, please confirm this and explain how the commitment to CORU will be met.
- The location of the Key Contractor Personnel and wider team, the hours they will work relative to Irish business hours and the extent of any on-site presence offered.
- Continuity: how the named individuals below will be retained, the notice CORU will receive of a proposed change to the identity of any key person, and the process for approving a replacement of at least equivalent experience.
- The role of any subcontractor or third party, what each will do, and how the Contractor will manage and remain accountable for them.

Please refer to scoring matrix below for further information on what the Contracting Authority is seeking.

Key Contractor Personnel Roles & Minimum Requirements

Key Person Role	Minimum requirement
Project Manager / Engagement Lead	Not less than five (5) years' experience managing the implementation of comparable enterprise solutions; holder of a recognised project management qualification (for example PRINCE2 Practitioner, PMP, or equivalent)
Solution Architect	Not less than five (5) years' experience designing and delivering cloud-hosted solutions of comparable scale and complexity on the platform proposed
Data Migration Lead	Not less than three (3) years' experience leading data migration from legacy systems, including data cleansing, mapping, reconciliation and validation
Test Lead	Not less than three (3) years' experience leading functional, integration, performance, accessibility and user acceptance testing
Information Security / Data Protection Lead (may be one or two named individuals)	Demonstrable experience of delivering solutions processing special category personal data in compliance with the General Data Protection Regulation
Service Delivery / Support Manager	Not less than three (3) years' experience managing support and maintenance services delivered under a service level agreement

Note: Where an individual proposed for a Key Contractor Personnel role does not meet the minimum requirement for that role, this will be taken into account in the mark awarded under Q3 and may result in a mark below the minimum acceptable standard for this criterion.

Page Limits

Tenderers are limited to 10 x A4 pages.

Permitted attachments

- A curriculum vitae for each named individual, of no more than two (2) pages each (not counted towards the page limit).
- Hyperlinks are not permitted and will not be accessed or considered as part of the evaluation process.

What will not attract marks

Curricula vitae of individuals who will not work on the Agreement.

Corporate experience presented in place of individual experience.

Curricula vitae of individuals other than the 6 persons those who will fulfil the roles specified above.

Scoring Matrix for Q3

Rating	Meaning
Excellent + 100%	Every key role is filled by a named individual whose curriculum vitae evidence relevant experience on contracts comparable to the Agreement including for regulatory or licensing bodies operating more than one register. Time commitments are stated by phase and are realistic against the implementation plan. Continuity is addressed with a credible retention and replacement process, and the role of any subcontractor is clear and properly managed. Nothing material is left unevidenced and the Evaluation Team has no reservation about the response or confidence in delivery.
Excellent 90%	Every key role is filled by a named individual whose curriculum vitae evidence relevant experience on contracts comparable to CORU's, including regulatory or licensing bodies operating more than one register. Time commitments are stated by phase and are realistic against the implementation plan. Continuity is addressed with a credible retention and replacement process, and the role of any subcontractor is clear and properly managed. One aspect is less fully developed than the remainder, but the reservation is minor and does not affect confidence in delivery.
Very Good + 80%	All roles are filled by named individuals with relevant experience evidenced, and time commitments are stated and consistent with the plan. Comparable multi-register experience is present but thinner in one or two roles or the continuity arrangements are less fully developed. No more than one or two aspects are less fully evidenced than the rest, and neither gives rise to concern.
Very Good 70%	All roles are filled by named individuals with relevant experience evidenced, and time commitments are stated and consistent with the plan. Comparable multi-register experience is present but thinner in one or two roles, or the continuity arrangements are less fully developed. Several aspects are less fully evidenced than the rest, though none of them, individually or together, gives rise to material concern.
Good + 60%	All roles are filled by named individuals, but the experience relied upon is described in general terms, is not clearly related to the individual's own role on the contracts cited or is of limited relevance or comparability to CORU. Time commitments are given in outline and continuity is addressed briefly. Parts of the response go beyond the acceptable standard, but the response as a whole is not strong.
Good 50%	All roles are filled by named individuals, but the experience relied upon is described in general terms, is not clearly related to the individual's own role on the contracts cited or is of limited relevance or comparability to CORU. Time commitments are given in outline and continuity is addressed briefly. This is the minimum acceptable standard for this criterion.
A mark below 50% results in a Fail and elimination from the Competition	
Fair + 40%	One or more roles is unfilled or is filled by an individual already committed elsewhere without explanation. Curricula vitae are generic, describe corporate rather than individual experience or relate to individuals who may not work on the Agreement. Parts of the response are adequate, but the response as a whole falls short of the acceptable standard.
Fair 30%	One or more roles is unfilled or is filled by an individual already committed elsewhere without explanation. Curricula vitae are generic, describe corporate rather than individual experience or relate to individuals who may not work on the Agreement. The shortcomings affect most aspects of the response.
Poor + 20%	The team proposed cannot be assessed or plainly lacks the experience required. Named individuals are not given, commitments are unstated or implausible, or delivery depends on subcontractors whose role and management are unexplained. A limited part of the response has some value; the remainder does not.
Poor 10%	The team proposed cannot be assessed or plainly lacks the experience required. Named individuals are not given, commitments are unstated or implausible, or delivery depends on subcontractors whose role and management are unexplained. Little or nothing in the response can be relied upon.
Not Acceptable 0%	No response, or a response of no value: it does not address the question, it is irrelevant to it, or what is proposed is unacceptable to CORU.

[Insert response to Award Criterion Q3 here]

Qualitative Award Criterion Q4: Quality of Approach and Methodology to Service Delivery
The maximum marks available for Q.4 is 150 marks.

Response Requirement: Describe how the service will be operated from Go-Live of a particular Implementation Phase onwards and how CORU will know that it is performing as promised.

Your response should include (but may not be limited to):

- **The Support Services model**: an explanation of hours of cover, channels, the service desk, triage and how CORU will raise and track an incident.
- **Incident, problem and change management:** an explanation of how this will be managed, including the severity model applied, root cause analysis, and how recurring faults will be eliminated rather than repeatedly fixed.
- **Availability and maintenance**: an explanation of how the availability target set out in Schedule Three of the Agreement will be achieved, how planned maintenance will be scheduled and notified and how CORU's critical business periods will be protected.
- **Release and upgrade management**: an explanation of the release cadence, how upgrades will be tested and deployed, how regression will be managed and how CORU's Configuration will be preserved through an upgrade.
- **Security operations**: an explanation of your patching and vulnerability management, penetration testing and remediation, monitoring, and the security incident process including the timescales within which CORU will be notified.
- **Backup, resilience and recovery**: an explanation of your backup arrangements, the recovery point and recovery time objectives offered, how recovery will be tested and how often.
- **Service reporting**: an explanation of how performance against each of the key performance indicators will be measured and evidenced, what the monthly service report will contain and how CORU will be able to verify the figures reported.
- **Service Levels and Service Credits:** how you will measure, evidence and report performance against each Service Level in Schedule Three of the Agreement, and how Service Credits will be calculated and applied without CORU having to claim them.
- **Capacity and scalability**: how the service will absorb the growth in registrants and transactions projected over the Term.
- **Continuous improvement**: how improvements will be identified, proposed and delivered.

Please refer to scoring matrix below for further information on what the Contracting Authority is seeking.

Page Limits

Tenderers are limited to 10 x A4 pages

Permitted attachments

- A draft monthly service report, populated with illustrative data, of no more than four (4) pages (not counted towards the page limit).
- Hyperlinks are not permitted and will not be accessed or considered as part of the evaluation process.

What will not attract marks

Restatement of the Service Levels set out in the RFT, and descriptions of corporate processes not applied to the Agreement.

Scoring Matrix for Q4

Rating	Meaning
Excellent + 100%	The Tenderer's service model is designed for the Agreement rather than lifted from a corporate process. Measurement of each service level is explained, including how CORU can verify the figures and the draft service report demonstrates it. Release, upgrade and security operations are specific and evidenced, recovery objectives are stated and tested, and Service Credits are shown operating without CORU having to claim them. Nothing material is left unevidenced and the Evaluation Team has no reservation about the response or confidence in delivery.
Excellent 90%	The Tenderer's service model is designed for the Agreement rather than lifted from a corporate process. Measurement of each service level is explained, including how CORU can verify the figures, and the draft service report demonstrates it. Release, upgrade and security operations are specific and evidenced, recovery objectives are stated and tested, and Service Credits are shown operating without CORU having to claim them. One aspect is less fully developed than the remainder, but the reservation is minor and does not affect confidence in delivery.
Very Good + 80%	The Tenderer's support, incident management, reporting, release management and security operations are set out clearly and are workable, with a service report covering the service levels. Verification, recovery testing or capacity planning is addressed in less depth, without giving rise to concern. No more than one or two aspects are less fully evidenced than the rest, and neither gives rise to concern.
Very Good 70%	The Tenderer's support, incident management, reporting, release management and security operations are set out clearly and are workable, with a service report covering the service levels. Verification, recovery testing or capacity planning is addressed in less depth, without giving rise to concern. Several aspects are less fully evidenced than the rest, though none of them, individually or together, gives rise to material concern.
Good + 60%	The Tenderer's service model is described which would function, but it is generic in places, restates the service levels rather than explaining how performance is measured and evidenced, or treats upgrade management, recovery testing or capacity at a general level. Parts of the response go beyond the acceptable standard, but the response as a whole is not strong.
Good 50%	The Tenderer's service model is described which would function, but it is generic in places, restates the service levels rather than explaining how performance is measured and evidenced or treats upgrade management, recovery testing or capacity at a general level. This is the minimum acceptable standard for this criterion.
A mark below 50% results in a Fail and elimination from the Competition	
Fair + 40%	The model proposed by the Tenderer is insufficiently developed to give confidence that the service could be managed. Measurement or verification of the key performance indicators is unexplained, the severity model or escalation route is unclear, or the response describes corporate processes not applied to this Agreement. Parts of the response are adequate, but the response as a whole falls short of the acceptable standard.
Fair 30%	The model proposed by the Tenderer is insufficiently developed to give confidence that the service could be managed. Measurement or verification of the key performance indicators is unexplained, the severity model or escalation route is unclear, or the response describes corporate processes not applied to this Agreement. The shortcomings affect most aspects of the response.
Poor + 20%	No workable service model is proposed by the Tenderer. Support arrangements, reporting, security operations or recovery are absent or inconsistent, or the response indicates that CORU would have to identify and claim service failures itself. A limited part of the response has some value; the remainder does not.
Poor 10%	No workable service model is proposed by the Tenderer. Support arrangements, reporting, security operations or recovery are absent or inconsistent, or the response indicates that CORU would have to identify and claim service failures itself. Little or nothing in the response can be relied upon.
Not Acceptable 0%	No response, or a response of no value: it does not address the question, it is irrelevant to it, or what is proposed is unacceptable to CORU.

[Insert response to Award Criterion Q4 here]

Qualitative Award Criterion Q5: Quality of Approach to Contract Management
The maximum marks available for Q.5 is 100 marks.

Response Requirement: Set out how the Agreement itself will be governed and administered by the Tenderer over the Term, as distinct from how the service is operated day to day.

Your response should include (but may not be limited to):

- **Governance**: the boards and meetings proposed, their membership, frequency and purpose, how they will align with CORU's own governance (reporting to Council every six weeks and to the Digital Technology Governance Committee), the escalation route, and how decisions are recorded.
- **Account and relationship management**: name the Contractor Representative and explain the escalation contacts above that individual, and the review cycle.
- **Performance management**: explain how performance against the Agreement will be reviewed, how disputes about performance will be resolved, and what will happen where performance falls short over successive periods.
- **Change control**: explain how change will be requested, estimated, approved and delivered; how the boundary between chargeable change and defect correction is drawn.
- Explain **risk, issue and dependency management** after Go-Live and how these are reported to CORU.
- **Commercial administration**: explain how invoicing against purchase orders will work, the supporting evidence that will be provided and how Service Credits will appear on an invoice.
- Explain **business continuity of the Contractor's own operations** and how the service will be maintained despite disruption to the Contractor.
- **Exit management**: provide the Exit Management Plan and explain how it will be maintained during the Term and the assistance that the Contractor will provide on expiry or termination.

Please refer to scoring matrix below for further information on what the Contracting Authority is seeking.

Page Limits

Tenderers are limited to 10 x A4 pages

Permitted attachments

- A governance schedule in tabular form, showing each forum, its membership, frequency and purpose (not counted towards the page limit).
- Hyperlinks are not permitted and will not be accessed or considered as part of the evaluation process.

What will not attract marks

Marks are awarded here for the governance and administration of the Agreement, not for the operation of the service.

Scoring Matrix for Q5

Rating	Meaning
Excellent + 100%	The governance proposed by the Tenderer is designed around CORU's governance arrangements and committee cycle and would function from day one: forums, membership, frequency, escalation and decision recording are all specific. The distinction between chargeable change and defect correction is drawn clearly and tested against examples, commercial administration is precise, and exit management is treated as a live obligation throughout the Term rather than an end-of-contract event. Nothing material is left unevidenced and the Evaluation Team has no reservation about the response or confidence in delivery.
Excellent 90%	The governance proposed by the Tenderer is designed around CORU's governance arrangements and committee cycle and would function from day one: forums, membership, frequency, escalation and decision recording are all specific. The distinction between chargeable change and defect correction is drawn clearly and tested against examples, commercial administration is precise, and exit management is treated as a live obligation throughout the Term rather than an end-of-contract event. One aspect is less fully developed than the remainder, but the reservation is minor and does not affect confidence in delivery.
Very Good + 80%	Governance, change control and commercial administration are set out clearly by the Tenderer and are workable. The distinction between chargeable change and defect correction is addressed, and exit management is covered, though one of these is less fully developed than the remainder. No more than one or two aspects are less fully evidenced than the rest, and neither gives rise to concern.
Very Good 70%	Governance, change control and commercial administration are set out clearly by the Tenderer and are workable. The distinction between chargeable change and defect correction is addressed, and exit management is covered, though one of these is less fully developed than the remainder. Several aspects are less fully evidenced than the rest, though none of them, individually or together, gives rise to material concern.
Good + 60%	A governance arrangement is proposed which would function, but it is generic in places, the distinction between chargeable change and defect correction is left imprecise, or exit management is addressed only briefly. Parts of the response go beyond the acceptable standard, but the response as a whole is not strong.
Good 50%	A governance arrangement is proposed which would function, but it is generic in places, the distinction between chargeable change and defect correction is left imprecise, or exit management is addressed only briefly. This is the minimum acceptable standard for this criterion.
A mark below 50% results in a Fail and elimination from the Competition	
Fair + 40%	The arrangement is insufficiently developed. Escalation is unclear or exit management is not meaningfully addressed. The response describes the operation of the service rather than the management of the Agreement. Parts of the response are adequate, but the response as a whole falls short of the acceptable standard.
Fair 30%	The arrangement is insufficiently developed. Escalation is unclear or exit management is not meaningfully addressed. The response describes the operation of the service rather than the management of the Agreement. The shortcomings affect most aspects of the response.
Poor + 20%	No workable contract management arrangement is proposed. Governance, change control and exit are absent, inconsistent, or expressed in terms that would leave CORU without effective recourse. A limited part of the response has some value; the remainder does not.
Poor 10%	No workable contract management arrangement is proposed. Governance, change control and exit are absent, inconsistent, or expressed in terms that would leave CORU without effective recourse. Little or nothing in the response can be relied upon.
Not Acceptable 0%	No response, or a response of no value: it does not address the question, it is irrelevant to it, or what is proposed is unacceptable to CORU.

[Insert response to Award Criterion Q5 here]