

## Document 2 - Tender Evaluation Criteria

This Tender Response will be evaluated by an approach that takes into account both the price and quality in order to determine the Most Economically Advantageous Tender. The weighting split used to evaluate Tender Responses will be:

Price	50%
Quality	45%
Local Economic Factors	5%

In order to ensure that your Tender Response has the best chance of success, please answer all of the questions set out in the Quality aspect of this ITT.

### PRICING

1. Complete Document 1 Form of Tender.
2. Enclose your priced Activity Schedule.

The Activity Schedule must comply with the requirements of the NEC4 Professional Service Contract and must correlate with the activities/services required in the project stages of the brief provided within the Scope and reflect the completion of key services/duties within these stages. The Activity Schedule must be clearly relatable to the programme to be submitted within Quality section 2 below.

<i>Document</i>	<i>Enclosed (tick)</i>
Priced Activity Schedule	

### Pricing Evaluation Methodology

Within the overall tender evaluation scoring matrix where Price, Quality and Local Economic Factors are assessed, the percentages awarded for Price shall be calculated as follows:

Lowest value submission is awarded PS%, remaining submissions are expressed as a % of the lowest bid. i.e.  $((LC/TC)*PS\%)$

Where:

PS% = The maximum percentage of points available for 'Price' (as given above)

TC = Tenderer's tendered total of the Prices

LC = Lowest tendered total of the Prices

## QUALITY

In support of the quality element of your submission, Tenderers must provide a full written response to each of the questions outlined in Section 1 below, provide the supporting documentation requested in Section 2, and complete the Standard Pre-Qualification Questionnaire on the Procurement Portal in order to provide a response to Section 3.

There is no set word count unless specifically stated in the question and Tenderers are asked to respond to each requirement in a clear, detailed and descriptive manner to also ensure that there is no likelihood for misinterpretation. Text boxes will expand as they are completed.

Where responses are supported by separate documentation, clear references to the additional documents must be provided, which must also be cross-referenced back to the relevant question.

Failure to clearly cross-reference answers could result in Tender Responses receiving lower scores.

### Quality Evaluation Methodology

Evaluation of Quality (and separate Local Economic Factors) is calculated as follows:

Highest quality score is awarded QS%, remaining scores are expressed as a % of the highest score i.e.  $((SQ/HQ)*QS\%)$ :

Where:

QS% = The maximum percentage of points available for 'Quality' (as given above)

SQ = Tenderer's total quality score

HQ = Highest quality score

### Scoring

In order to ensure the evaluation of quality is applied consistently, requirements are marked using a scoring system of zero (0) to five (5).

Score	Criteria for awarding Score
0	Completely fails to meet required standard or does not provide a proposal.
1	Proposal significantly fails to meet the standards required, contains significant shortcomings and/or is inconsistent with other proposals.
2	Proposal falls short of achieving expected standard in a number of identifiable respects.
3	Proposal meets the required standard in most material respects, but is lacking or inconsistent in others.
4	Proposal meets the required standard in all material respects.
5	Proposal meets the required standard in all material respects and exceeds some or all of the major requirements.

### Minimum Score Criteria

A number of requirements have been identified that are fundamental to the delivery of the Services, these requirements are annotated "Minimum score applies". Only Tender Responses that score a minimum of three (3) will be considered for contract award.

### Criteria Weighting

A weighting (or multiplier) is allocated to each of the evaluation criteria below, relative to their importance to the Services being tendered for. The score awarded to the Tenderer's response (as set-out in the table above) is multiplied by the weighting (as indicated against each criterion below) in order to obtain the 'weighted score'.

## Quality Assessment Criteria

### Section 1 – Quality questions

Req. No.	Minimum Score Criteria	Quality questions
	Criteria Weighting	
<b>SD1</b>	Minimum score applies	<p><b>Company and <i>Project Manager</i></b></p> <p>Provide evidence of the experience that your company has in leading a multi-disciplinary Design Team working in the museums and heritage sector, including conservation professionals and museum designers.</p> <p>Provide details of your proposed <i>Project Manager</i> who will manage the project and lead the Design Team.</p> <p>Provide specific detailed examples of previous projects undertaken by the company and the <i>Project Manager</i>.</p> <p>Provide details of any professional qualifications or memberships of relevant professional bodies.</p>
	Criteria weighting: 25	
<b>SD2</b>	Minimum score applies	<p><b>Client and stakeholder liaison</b></p> <p>Describe how you will work with the <i>Client</i> and other stakeholders to ensure that their objectives are fully understood and realised to the best possible standards.</p> <p>Describe how you will promote and maintain efficient communication between the Design Team, <i>Client</i> Project Team, other stakeholders and the construction team to deliver a creative and innovative product to time, quality and budget.</p>
	Criteria weighting: 20	

<b>SD3</b>	Minimum score applies	<p><b>Design Team</b></p> <p>List the resources, other than the <i>Project Manager</i>, that will make up your Design Team (to include architect; exhibition designer, M&amp;E consultant; structural engineer; and planning supervisor).</p> <p>For <b>each individual professional discipline</b> provide:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Subcontractor company name or state if provided in-house by your company</li> <li>• Evidence of the company's track record working similar projects over the last 5 years including specific details of three similar projects which have been successfully undertaken (include project name, client, dates and approximate value)</li> <li>• Details of the key people and evidence of their experience, professional competency, qualifications and memberships of relevant professional bodies. Clearly identify key individuals involved in delivery and the specific skills that they bring to the project.</li> <li>• Evidence of the company's capacity to deliver the project in the required timeframe, including details of any other projects which will be undertaken simultaneously.</li> </ul> <p>Where the members of the Design Team have experience of working together on the same projects clearly identify this in your response.</p>
	Criteria weighting: 25	
<b>SD4</b>	No minimum score	<p><b>Exhibition Design Process</b></p> <p>Describe the process that you will use to carry out the exhibition design, including how you will deliver a creative and innovative project that meets the requirements of the brief.</p> <p>What guarantees/after-sales service will be offered in relation to the exhibition design?</p>
	Criteria weighting: 20	
<b>SD5</b>	Minimum score applies	<p><b>Initial Visual Creative Response</b></p> <p>Provide an initial visual creative response to the exhibition design brief that demonstrates your understanding of the scope and ambition of the brief, the interdependencies of the various components of the site, its collections (including the Peggy) and the social/cultural history together with the objectives for the new gallery.</p>
	Criteria weighting: 30	
<b>SD6</b>	Minimum score applies	<p><b>Environment and Sustainability</b></p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Provide a copy of any environmental and sustainability policies that your company has.</li> <li>Provide an environmental design statement outlining how sustainable design and construction will be applied to this project.</li> </ol>

	Criteria weighting: 15	
--	---------------------------	--

<b>SD7</b>	Minimum score applies	<b>Quality</b>  a) Provide a copy of any quality policies that your company has. b) Provide a quality plan or statement outlining how you will manage quality on this project.
	Criteria weighting: 15	

<b>SD8</b>	Minimum score applies	<b>Resource Plan</b>  a) Provide a proposed programme and resource plan identifying key individuals for each stage of the project. b) As part of the plan include a resource schedule that correlates key individuals with the Programme and Activity Schedule.
	Criteria weighting: 20	

## Section 2 – Quality supporting documentation

Provide the following documents:

Req. no.	Document	Enclosed (tick)	Minimum Score or Pass/Fail	Criteria Weighting
<b>Doc1</b>	Completed Contract Data Part 2		No minimum score	N/A – not to be scored
<b>Doc2</b>	Programme, clearly identifying compliance with <i>starting date</i> , <i>key dates</i> , and <i>completion date</i> .		Minimum score applies	20
<b>Doc3</b>	Evidence of insurance cover to the levels required under the Agreement, or a commitment to obtain the necessary insurance prior to commencement, if successful.		Pass/Fail	N/A – not to be scored

**Section 3. Standard Pre-Qualification Questionnaire (SPQQ)**

The Standard Pre-Qualification Questionnaire must be completed on the Portal.

If the Tenderer has submitted a completed SPQQ for the Isle of Man Government within the past twelve months, the name of the project which it was submitted for may be referred to on the Portal form instead of re-completing the SPQQ. Where one has been previously completed, a Construction Standard Pre-Qualification Questionnaire (CSPQQ), may be referenced in lieu of the SPQQ.

The responses to the SPQQ/CSPQQ are grouped by following headings in the table below and will be evaluated in line with the evaluation criteria above.

<b>Criteria</b>	<b>Weighting</b>	<b>Minimum Score Criteria or Pass/Fail</b>
How satisfactory is the information on financial standing?	1	Minimum score applies
How satisfactory is the information on business activities and standing?	1	Minimum score applies
Is the insurance cover satisfactory?	1	Minimum score applies
How satisfactory is the information on Quality Assurance?	1	No minimum score
Does the bidder have a written H&S policy or system?	1	No minimum score
Does the bidder have an EO policy?	0.5	No minimum score
Does the bidder hold Investors in People status?	0.5	No minimum score
Does your organisation have an environmental management system?	1	Minimum score applies

#### Section 4 – Interview/Presentation (Additional Evaluation Criteria)

It is anticipated that following the initial Tender Evaluation in line with the criteria laid out above, the highest scoring Tenderer(s) will be invited to an interview/presentation. Lower scoring Tenderers will not be invited to an interview/presentation. The number of Tenderers to be invited to interview/presentation will be decided following the initial Tender Evaluation based on the overall tender scores and will be at the discretion of the Department.

Where more than one Tenderer is invited to an interview/presentation, Tender Responses for those Tenderers will be re-scored via the inclusion of further evaluation criteria for the interview/presentation which is anticipated to include:

a) Clarification on any elements of the Tender Response as required (scores awarded in the initial Tender Evaluation may be amended based on the clarification).

b) Additional Evaluation Criteria:

- How the Initial Visual Creative Response (provided in response to question SD5 above) above captures and expresses understanding of the context, ambition and objectives of the Brief.
- The Tenderer's proposals with regard to interactive and engaging design.
- The Tenderer's proposals with regard to adaptation and development of a registered building within a historic setting.
- Approach to sustainable design.
- Full awareness of accessibility issues and compliance with equality legislation.
- How the design will serve the whole range of diverse audiences expected to engage with this Isle of Man story.
- An ability to promote and maintain close working relationships between the design team and the *Client* in understanding the *Client's* needs and realising high quality responses.
- Knowledge of environmental conditions required by museum collections (lighting, temperature and RH).
- Experience and understanding of designing for marine environments (ie. tides, exposure etc).
- Recognition of the need for flexibility to allow for elements of the display to change.
- Approach to creative public engagement through the design process.

Additional Evaluation Criteria will each have a criteria weighting of 5 and no Minimum Score Criteria will apply.

Should there be any change to the above criteria, this will be notified to the Tenderer upon invitation to attend the interview/presentation.

Tenderer attendees for the interview/presentation will be expected to include the *Project Manager*, architect and the exhibition designer as a minimum.

## LOCAL ECONOMIC FACTORS

Local economic factors will be assessed in the same methodology and scoring system as used for Quality as outlined on page 2 above.

### Local Economic Factors Assessment Criteria

Req. No.	Minimum Score Criteria	Question
	Criteria Weighting	
<b>LE1</b>	no minimum score	Please estimate what percentage of your tender price will be delivered by Isle of Man based resources.
	Criteria weighting: 1	
<b>LE2</b>	no minimum score	Please confirm approximately how many of the personnel engaged to complete this project / service will be paying local income tax and national insurance in Isle of Man.
	Criteria weighting: 1	
<b>LE3</b>	no minimum score	Where applicable, please indicate the number of on/off island travel movements you anticipate to fulfil this contract, and indicate whether by sea or air.
	Criteria weighting: 2	
<b>LE4</b>	no minimum score	Where applicable, please indicate the number of bed nights you anticipate bringing to the Island to complete this project / service.
	Criteria weighting: 3	
<b>LE5</b>	no minimum score	In no more than 400 words, please identify what benefits your company would bring to the Isle of Man economy as a direct result of undertaking this contract.
	Criteria weighting: 3	



<b>LE6</b>	No minimum score	How will you seek to maximise potential for procurement of materials and skills from the Isle of Man?
	Criteria weighting: 3	