

## Appendix 5

### Scoring Methodology – quality (60%)

For each written response (save for the written response to Cost of Service Financial Evaluation Criterion number 16), the evaluation team will use the following scoring methodology/approach. Each score will then be multiplied by the relevant weighting.

Outline Solution	How well does the Potential Provider's response to Final Tender questions demonstrate an ability to meet the relevant Councils' requirements as set out in the ISFT documents	Mark
An unacceptable response	The Potential Provider does not understand or fails to address the Councils' requirements or the solution is incapable of meeting the Councils' requirements	0
An unsatisfactory response	The Potential Provider understands the Council's requirements but there are some major risks or omissions in the response or the proposed solution to deliver the services and the Councils would not be confident of the Councils' requirements being met	1
A satisfactory response	The Potential Provider understands the Councils' requirements and the solution could meet them but there are some areas in the response or the proposed solution to deliver the services which require refinement to ensure that the solution meets the Councils' needs	2
A good response	The solution shows that the Potential Provider understands the Councils' requirements, offers attractive risk and commercial positions, has a robust methodology, service delivery plan or other processes and resources to deliver the service and the solution is capable of meeting the Councils' needs	3
A very good response	The solution shows that the Potential Provider understands the Councils' requirements, offers very attractive risk and commercial positions, has a robust methodology, service delivery plan or other processes and resources to deliver the service and the solution has additional benefits and opportunities to add value or otherwise enhance the delivery of the required outputs.	4
An excellent response	The solution shows that the Potential Provider understands the Councils' requirements, offers excellent and highly attractive risk and commercial positions, has a robust methodology, service delivery plan or other processes and resources to deliver the service and the solution has significant ability to add value or otherwise enhance the delivery of the outputs.	5

## Scoring Methodology – financial (40%)

For the response to Cost of Service Financial Evaluation Criterion number 16, the evaluation team will use the following scoring methodology/approach. The score will then be multiplied by the relevant weighting.

Outline Solution	A Initial Core Services Price Reduction	B Core Services Financial Benefit	C Operational Cost Reduction	Mark
An excellent response	10% or above	25% or above	35% or above	5
A very good response	10% or above	20% or above	30% or above	4
A good response	10% or above	15% or above	25% or above	3
A satisfactory response	5% or above	15% or above	25% or above	2
A unsatisfactory response	5% or above	exceeds minimum savings target (10% for each council)	20% or above	1
A unacceptable response	Below 5%	Does not achieve minimum savings target for each council	Below 20%	0

For the purposes of this Final Tender evaluation the following shall apply:

- In order to score a particular mark the Potential Provider’s response to the Cost of Service Financial Evaluation Criterion must satisfy each of the requirements in columns A, B and C attributable to that mark. For example, to achieve a ‘good response’ mark of 3, the response must deliver 10% or more as the Initial Core Services Price Reduction for the first 12 months of the Initial Term under column A, 15% or more as the Core Services Financial Benefit over the Initial Term under column B and 25% or more as the Operational Cost Reduction by the end of the Initial Term under column C.
- **Column A (Initial Core Services Price Reduction):** The Initial Core Service Price Reduction percentage is the difference between (1) the Council Cost Baseline (Transferring Budgets) for the first 12 months following the anticipated operational service commencement date for each Council (these being: 01/08/16 for South Oxon and Vale of White Horse, 01/07/17 for Mendip and 01/10/17 for Hart and Havant) and (2) the Total Core Services Price from Bidder for the same period, as a percentage of the

Council Cost Baseline (Transferring Budgets). This figure is reported in cell L79 of the 'Summary' tab of the Financial Pro-forma spreadsheet.

- **Column B (Core Services Financial Benefit):** The Core Services Financial Benefit percentage is the cash total for the Initial Term of the Total Core Services Financial Benefit as a percentage of the cash total for the Initial Term of the Council Cost Baseline (Transferring Budgets). This figure is reported in cell Q60 of the 'Summary' tab of the Financial Pro-forma spreadsheet.
- **Column C (Operational Cost Reduction):** The Operational Cost Reduction percentage is the difference between (1) the Current Operational Expenditure and (2) the Total Final 12 Months Operational Expenditure, as a percentage of the Current Operational Expenditure. This figure is reported in cell Q72 of the 'Summary' tab of the Financial Pro-forma spreadsheet.
- The Council Cost Baseline (Transferring Budgets) and Current Operational Expenditure figures are set out in the summary sheet of the Financial Pro-Forma.
- For the purposes of the Total Core Services Price, Core Services means the services in scope of this procurement and for which a cost baseline has been calculated as set out in line 22 of the 'Summary' tab of the Financial Pro-forma spreadsheet.