Evaluation

Once all of the bids received have been checked and logged for audit purposes, they can be evaluated.

The evaluation of all bids will be done using the same selection and award criteria that have already been published by the buyer: these criteria cannot be altered.

An example of a scoring methodology that may be used for the selection stage is as follows:

Score	***Description***
0 - Unacceptable	Nil or inadequate response. Fails to demonstrate previous experience/capacity/capability relevant to this criterion.
1 - Poor	Response is partially relevant but generally poor. The response shows some elements of relevance to the criterion but contains insufficient/limited detail or explanation to demonstrate previous relevant experience/ capacity/capability.
2 - Acceptable	Response is relevant and acceptable. The response demonstrates broad previous experience, knowledge and skills/capacity/capability but may lack in some aspects of similarity e.g. previous experience, knowledge or skills may not be of a similar nature.
3 - Good	Response is relevant and good. The response is sufficiently detailed to demonstrate a good amount of experience, knowledge or skills/capacity/capability relevant to providing similar services to similar clients.
4 - Excellent	Response is completely relevant and excellent overall. The response is comprehensive, unambiguous and demonstrates thorough experience, knowledge or skills/capacity/capability relevant to providing similar services to similar clients.

and an example of scoring for the award stage (when using PCS-Tender):

0	**Unacceptable**	Nil or inadequate response. Fails to demonstrate an ability to meet the requirement.
25	**Poor**	Response is partially relevant and poor. The response addresses some elements of the requirement but contains insufficient/limited detail or explanation to demonstrate how the requirement will be fulfilled.
50	**Acceptable**	Response is relevant and acceptable. The response addresses a broad understanding of the requirement but may lack details on how the requirement will be fulfilled in certain areas.
75	**Good**	Response is relevant and good. The response is sufficiently detailed to demonstrate a good understanding and provides details on how the requirements will be fulfilled.
100	**Excellent**	Response is completely relevant and excellent overall. The response is comprehensive, unambiguous and demonstrates a thorough understanding of the requirement and provides details of how the requirement will be met in full.

Evaluation of all bids must be undertaken in an open and transparent way, so that no advantage is given to any bidder (or bidders).

The time taken to evaluate bids will differ for each procurement exercise – this will be dependent on the complexity of the requirement, however the buyer should endeavour to provide approximate evaluation timescales in the procurement documents previously provided, and keep all bidders up to date with developments if these timescales look likely to change.

Quotation Evaluation

Quotation evaluations must be undertaken in line with the buyer's governance procedures.

The buyer will collate all scores. All activities will be transparent and fully documented.

Tender Evaluation

For **tender** evaluations, an evaluation panel of at least two individuals will have been set up to review and evaluate the technical areas of the bids received.

These evaluators will read and score the bids received independently of each other and will submit their scores and comments independently to the buyer. The buyer should score the pricing submissions independently of the technical evaluations.

The buyer will collate all scoring and comments and then chair a moderation meeting. At this meeting all evaluators and the Buyer come together to review and agree on the final scores. The meeting will be fully transparent and documented.