

### What went out in the Invitation to Tender – Award Criteria and Scoring Rationale

The panel must mark against the tender evaluation criteria and the scoring rationale that was released to the suppliers. Panel members must review and remind themselves of this first. It will look similar to the tables set out below.

It is vital that panel members mark in accordance with the criteria and rationale published; if they do not the suppliers will ask why and this could result in the entire process being abandoned. This will mean the whole process may have to be put back out to market again wasting everyone's time.

#### Award Criteria

Award Criteria Section	Information Required	Weighting
<b>A</b>	<b>Technical</b>	<b>%</b>
<b>A1</b>	Compliance with Specification	PASS/FAIL
<b>A2</b>	Contract Management	15%
<b>A3</b>	Communication and Engagement	10%
<b>A4</b>	Technology and Systems	10%
<b>A5</b>	Traveller Safety and Support	8%
<b>A6</b>	Commercial Approach	25%
<b>A7</b>	Team Resourcing and Key Personnel Skills	10%
<b>A8</b>	Contract Implementation Plan	5%
<b>A9</b>	Environmental/Sustainability/Social	2%
<b>B</b>	<b>Price</b>	
<b>B1</b>	Tender price as specified in Appendix 1 - Tender Response (Price)	15%

### Scoring Rationale

Mark	Term	Indicators
0	<b>Inadequate</b>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- Nil response</li> <li>- Fails to address the requirement</li> <li>- Fails to demonstrate an understanding of the requirement</li> <li>- Fails to demonstrate ability to fulfil the requirement</li> </ul>
1	<b>Poor or Incomplete</b>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- Only partially addresses the requirement</li> <li>- Demonstrates a limited understanding of the requirement</li> <li>- Contains significant shortcomings</li> <li>- Lacks sufficient detail/evidence of addressing the requirement in most areas</li> <li>- Limited detail of the methodology to be applied</li> <li>- High risk that the proposed approach would be unsuccessful</li> <li>- Weaknesses outweigh the strengths</li> </ul>
2	<b>Acceptable</b>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- Addresses the requirement in some respects</li> <li>- Demonstrates a general understanding of the requirement</li> <li>- Contains limited shortcomings</li> <li>- Lacks sufficient detail/evidence of addressing the requirement in some areas</li> <li>- Methodology to be applied requires further detail</li> <li>- Limited risk that the proposed approach would be unsuccessful</li> <li>- Strengths outweigh the weaknesses</li> </ul>
3	<b>Good</b>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- Addresses the requirement in most respects</li> <li>- Demonstrates a good understanding of the requirement</li> <li>- Contains few shortcomings, minor in nature</li> <li>- Lacks some detail/evidence of addressing the requirement in minor areas</li> <li>- Methodology to be applied is clearly explained, but missing some minor details</li> <li>- Negligible risk that the proposed approach would be unsuccessful</li> <li>- Strengths greatly outweigh the weaknesses and the weaknesses are generally not significant</li> </ul>
4	<b>Excellent</b>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- Fully addresses the requirement in all respects</li> <li>- Demonstrates a comprehensive understanding of the requirement</li> <li>- Contains no shortcomings</li> <li>- All detail/evidence of addressing the requirement is provided</li> <li>- Methodology to be applied is comprehensively explained</li> <li>- No risk that the proposed approach would be unsuccessful</li> <li>- No weaknesses identified</li> </ul>