

Enter Part C - Section 10 Price Schedule		Weighting	Supplier A		Supplier B		Weighted Score	Supplier C		Weighted Score	Supplier D		Weighted Score	
P1	Unit Price for Single Sided Document Two Sided Document Each additional side/sheet	40.00%		0.36p (single sided doc) 0.39p (two sided doc) 0.05 (each additional doc)	29.50%		0.29 (single sided doc) 0.29p (two sided doc) 0.02 (each additional doc)	40.00%		0.37p (single sided doc) 0.38p (two sided doc) 0.015 (each additional doc)	32.08%		0.29p (single sided doc) 0.32p (two sided doc) 0.03 (each additional doc)	37.81%
Award Criteria Part C - Section 8 Method Statements Scored (see matrix below) including MANDATORY JUSTIFICATION text for publication to tenderers for compliance with The Public Contracts Regulations 2015														
Method Statement 1	Quality	5%	4	scored against: accreditation, system controls, process to match documents, quality control at print/packing, management reporting, Pl's & staff training	4%	2	No evidence of accreditation. System controls in place, but no details given on process for matching docs, MI reports, staff training. Quality control at print & packing lacked information	2%	2	No details of accreditation, management reporting, staff training, performance measures	2	2	Detailed information on accreditation and system control. No information given on their processes to match documents or how they measure their own performance and no info on staff training.	2
Method Statement 3	Experience	10%	19	scored against: familiar with both Northgate & Civica systems, named at least 3 councils to show experience and a mix of councils, ie: Boroughs, Districts etc. Evidence of annual and daily billing experience with explanations, Financial/efficiency savings proven. Referred to testing and timeline to phasing in	6%	13	scored against: familiar with both Northgate & Civica systems, named at least 3 councils to show experience and a mix of councils, ie: Boroughs, Districts etc. No detailed evidence of annual and daily billing experience with explanations, Financial/efficiency savings proven.	4%	11	No mention to Civica open Revenues. Insufficient information of other LA's and no details of experience with daily and annual billing. No information given on how they would manage the matching of different documents	4	14	Familiar with both Northgate and Civica systems, but no experience given on daily and/or annual billing or examples given	5
Method Statement 4	Site and Account Management	5%	10	Dedicated account manager with proven experience of Revs & Bens. Regular review process with evidence of what support, complaint process, change control process explained showing authorisation, approval and sign off. If additional costs referred to explanation given of when charge would be implemented	3%	8	Dedicated account manager with proven experience of Revs & Bens. Regular review process with evidence of what support, complaint process, change control process explained but failed to show authorisation, approval and sign off. If additional costs referred to explanation given of when charge would be implemented	3%	7	They give details of dedicated account manager but no information as to any experience of Revs & Bens. Only basic information given on how they would manage the approval and implementation of new docs. Explanation given was not relevant to revs & bens. A process for change control was explained although not	2	11	Dedicated account manager but no details of whether they have revs & bens experience	4
Method Statement 5	Software and Systems	5%	11	No subcontracting out of processes. Systems can deal with annual and adhoc. Any requirement for specific formatting detailed	4%	8	Did not give sufficient details on specific formatting requirements to transfer data. No references made to process for producing documents within the style and format for daily and ad-hoc. Insufficient information in respect of being able to add additional text. Does not subcontract	3%	7	Some aspects of service is subcontracted	2	11	No subcontracting out of processes. Unclear if systems can deal with annual and adhoc. Unclear on specific formatting requirements mainly around adding additional text	4
Method Statement 6	Hybrid Mail/Ad Hoc mailings	10%	13	No evidence of same day delivery up to a certain cut off time. No minimum quantity restrictions for ad-hoc mailing. Service available for homeworkers. No user restrictions. Lack of information given on MI available through hybrid systems	4%	20	Same day dispatch. Printer driver installed locally. No minimum quantity for ad-hoc. Service available for homeworkers. Online access to MI reports with a variety of information available	7%	10	No mention of whether they are able to do same day delivery/despatch. Although service is available for homeworkers information was lacking. No information given on what MI information is available to detail ad-hoc mailing created	3	20	Insufficient information on what MI is available to detail ad-hoc mailing created	7
Method Statement 7	Capabilities	10%	31	No limit to number of pages accepted for one document. Stock control process identified. All of production carried out on one site. Lack of information on how they guarantee 100% fulfillment of mailing. Lack of information on what happens to damaged items	6%	33	No limit to number of pages accepted for one document. Stock control process identified. All of production carried out on one site. Information given on how they guarantee 100% fulfillment of mailing. Process supplied on what happens to damaged items	7%	22	Elements of the production is carried out off site. No limit to number of pages accepted for one document	4	21	Insufficient information on how they control stock. Appears that the customer controls stock. No guarantees given on how they ensure 100% mailing fulfilled. No details of whether they are able to add additional text in the form of messages to documents/envelopes	4
Method Statement 8	Service Delivery Requirements	5%	10	Facility to obtain various reports for specific periods of time. Invoicing unclear if separate for printing and posting. Additional chargeable work agreed beforehand with a clear transparent method	3%	11	Facility to obtain various reports for specific periods of time. Invoicing information concise. Additional chargeable work agreed beforehand with a clear transparent method	4%	2	Did not answer questions in respect of invoicing or details of what their method is for charging	1	9	No details of when payment due from invoices. Charging in clear for hybrid mailing only	3
Method Statement 9	Annual Billing	10%	17	Experience demonstrated with at least 3 sites referred to and a variety (ie: districts, Boroughs). Dedicated account manager throughout process, business continuity/disaster recovery plan detailed. Evidence given to show they can detail with a turnaround of high volumes of bulk mailing. Details given of how they manage proof reading: Process, sign off and ability to sign	7%	9	Experience demonstrated with at least 3 sites referred to but not a variety (ie: districts, Boroughs). No reference to a dedicated account manager throughout process, business continuity/disaster recovery plan partially detailed. Evidence given to show they can detail with a turnaround of high volumes of bulk mailing. Insufficient details given of	5%	13	Insufficient experience demonstrated with no recognition of our tight timescale requirements. No information on their disaster recovery process	5	13	insufficient information on their business continuity/disaster recovery processes. Although they have demonstrated their experience of annual billing and referred to at least 3 sites, the sites were not varied (ie. Districts, boroughs etc)	5
Award Criteria - Quality Weighted Score = Total Method Statement Score					37.00%			35.00%			23.00%		34.00	
Commercial / Price Weighted Score = PT					29.95%			40.00%			32.08%		37.81%	
<b>TOTAL BIDDER SCORE:</b>					<b>66.95</b>			<b>75.00</b>			<b>55.08</b>		<b>71.81</b>	
Financial Check? (usually preferred bidder only) procurement@gosharedservices.org.uk			Y/N			Y/N			Y/N			Y/N		

Award Criteria - Qualitative Scoring Matrix

5	<b>Exceeds expectations</b>	Gives high confidence that all key aspects of the requirements will be achieved and may be relied upon without reservation. Offers added value and innovation relevant to the statement of requirement / specification
4	<b>Meets expectations</b>	Gives confidence that all key aspects of the requirements will be achieved
3	<b>Satisfactory</b>	Generally meets requirements, gives minor reservations about meeting some of the requirements
2	<b>Unsatisfactory</b>	Below expectations and does not fully address the requirements and gives rise to concerns about potential reliability
1	<b>Poor</b>	Well below expectations, response is limited or inadequate or substantially irrelevant to the requirements
0	<b>Unacceptable</b>	Nil response, or is incomplete or irrelevant to the requirements that it is not possible to form a judgement