

APPENDIX C

Tender Award Criteria and Evaluation Criteria

Any Contract(s) awarded as a result of this procurement will be awarded on the basis of the offer that is the most economically advantageous to the Council. The Award Criteria (**Award Criteria**) are:-

- 100% technical or quality.
- 0% cost

Scores are arrived at following the application of the Evaluation Criteria (**Evaluation Criteria**) set out below to the Tenderer's Tender.

The Tender Evaluation Model showing the Evaluation Criteria and the maximum scores attributable to them is set out below.

Where specified, a minimum pass mark (**Threshold**) applies to the Evaluation Criteria. The Council shall reject any Tender which does not meet the relevant Threshold in respect of one or more criteria.

Evaluation Criteria: Technical	Threshold	Criteria Weighting	Overall Technical Weighted Percentage 100%	Means of evaluation	Means of moderation
Q1: Please demonstrate an understanding of the Care Together Programme aims and how this will be linked to the evaluation approach	N/A	25%	25%	written submission	presentation
Q2. Please state your approach to the evaluation of the Tameside and Glossop transformation funded schemes	N/A	30%	30%	written submission	presentation
Q3 Please describe how you would engage with members of the public and staff involved in health and social settings	N/A	20%	20%	written submission	presentation
Q4. Please describe plans for	N/A	10%	10%	written submission	presentation

handover of evaluation approach and how continuation of evaluation skill set can be ensured post contract						
Q5. Please describe your approach to evaluating social value (including what you define as social value)	N/A	10%	10%	written submission		
Rebate offered under the Platinum Payment Programme	N/A	5%	5%	Submission of the Form of Tender Part B(2)	Not applicable	
			100%			

Technical or quality evaluation

The technical evaluation will be scored in accordance with the following.

Scoring matrix for the technical and quality criteria

Assessment of Submission	Score
Excellent response - The submission provides comprehensive details of a particularly effective and robust approach which addresses the issue(s) raised in the question/criteria in all material respects and exceeds some or all of the major requirements. A high level of relevant information is provided backed up with a clear rationale, examples and evidence of past performance which may include supplementary evidence.	5
Good submission - The submission provides sufficient detail of a good approach which addresses the issue(s) raised in the question/criteria in all material respects and is backed up with a clear rationale and evidence of past performance which may include supplementary evidence	4
Average submission - The submission provides sufficient detail of an adequate approach which addresses the issue(s) raised in the question/criteria in all material respects in most material respects, but is lacking or inconsistent in others	3
Below average submission – The submission details an approach however this is limited and does not provide sufficient detail or evidence and falls short of addressing the issue(s) raised in the question/criteria in all material respects in a number of identifiable respects.	2
Unsatisfactory –Submission significantly fails to address the issue(s) raised in the question/criteria in all material respects and / or contains significant shortcomings or the submission is not relevant or is extremely limited.	1

Not answered - No response

0

Platinum Payment Programme

Rebates are based on underlying payment terms of 30 days and a target acceleration of 20 days (payment issued 10 days after receipt of invoice).

Rebate Offered	Points Scored	Weighted Score or total 5%
0%*	0*	0%
0.50%	1	.5%
1.00%	2	1%
1.25%	5	2.5%
1.50%	8	4%
2.00%	10	5%

*Excludes participation in the Platinum Payment Programme