****

**LGRP Framework
Further Competition Template**

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
| Further competition title | Insert details |
| Contract period | Insert details |
| Organisation name | Insert details |
| Organisation contact  | Insert details |
| Email address | Insert details |
| Phone number | Insert details |
| LGRP lot required | Insert details |
| Further competition deadline | Insert details |

1. **Introduction**

The LGRP framework went live on 10th November 2021.

This further competition has been sent to all providers on the suitable lot; it is the decision of the provider if they wish to respond.

1. **Organisations requirement/specification**

Please insert specification

1. **Further competition deadline**

All submissions must be uploaded to [Insert details of portal or email address].

Submissions must be returned no later than [Insert time]on [Insert date]. Please ensure sufficient time to submit your tender, late submissions will not be accepted.

Clarifications in relation to this further competition should be sent through to [Insert details].

Clarifications in relation to the further competition must be raised within the timescales provided.

1. **Further competition timetable**

The timetable for the delivery of the procurement process can be found in the table below.

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
| **Activity** | **Date** |
| Issue of the further competition | Insert date |
| Clarification deadline | Insert date |
| Submission deadline  | Insert date |
| Evaluation period | Insert date |
| Decision letters published | Insert date |
| Contract award | Insert date |

Organisations can include a voluntary standstill period of 10 days if they wish.

Potential providers are advised that the above timetable is indicative only and may be subject to change without prior notice.

The organisation reserves the right to decline to make an award for its service requirements, or to abandon or cancel the further competition process. YPO/London Borough of Waltham Forest or the organisation will not be responsible for any costs or expenses incurred as a result of following this course of action.

1. **Evaluation criteria**

The further competition will be evaluated against the below criteria:

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
| **Criteria** | **Percentage weightings** |
| Price  | Insert percentage  |
| Quality | Insert percentage |

1. **Scoring methodology**
	1. **Price criteria**

Insert details of how you will evaluate the pricing of the further competition, provide exact details of how the scores will be allocated against each pricing bid.

Ensure to always request a full cost breakdown.

Example:

The provider with the lowest cost will be allocated the highest marks available and other providers marks will be calculated using the % price different. The % price difference model allocates the lowest price submission the highest score and the highest price the lowest score. The price % difference is scored on the % difference between the lowest price and the price submitted.

In the event that any bid price is considered *abnormally low*, the provisions of Clause 69 (1) to (7) of the Public Contracts Regulations 2015 will apply. In summary these require the participating organisations to invite the tenderer concerned to account for their tendered price, and having considered the explanation, to advise the tenderer whether or not their bid will remain in consideration. Any bid verified as *abnormally low* will be excluded before the above points calculations are carried out.

* 1. **Quality criteria**

Insert details of how you will evaluate the quality of the further competition, include exact details of how the score will be allocated against each bid.

Example:

The quality section of the tender will be scored on the response to the details you provide within the method statements within section 6.2.

The methodology given in the table below will be used for the evaluation unless otherwise stated within the Response requirement. Scoring for questions will be out of 5 as detailed on the next page.

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
| **Question responses** | **Marks**  |
| **Score** | **Explanation** |
| 5 | Excellent response with requirements being met and exceeded in some areas. Showing a comprehensive understanding and the ability to deliver to a high standard. Evidence relating to the proposed requirements shows high quality.  |
| 4 | Good response with requirements being met understanding all requirements and the ability to deliver to a high standard. Evidence in relation to the proposed requirements shows good quality. |
| 3 | Acceptable answer with requirements being met in part but not fully. A reasonable understanding to have the ability to deliver the requirements. Evidence to show that the requirements are suitable for the purpose but have not met the standard expected. |
| 2 | Poor response where some requirements are being met but there are some large exceptions. Concerns that the requirements proposed would not be suitable for use.  |
| 1 | Target requirements only met on a few occasions. Low standard response. Major concerns that the requirements proposed would be suitable for use.  |
| 0 | Answer not met the requirements at all. No evidence that the requirements would be suitable.  |

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
| **Weighting** | **Weighting definition** |
| 5 | High importance to the contract |
| 4 | Medium - high importance to the contract |
| 3 | Medium importance to the contract |
| 2 | Low - medium importance to the contract |
| 1 | Low importance to the contract |

The weighting applied to each individual question relates to the importance of the question in relation to the contract as detailed further in the table below:

1. **The further competition**

This section of the further competition is in relation to how your organisation will provide the service described in the specification.

Please provide responses clearly and concisely in the format below, any organisation that does not complete the answer within the document may be removed from the process.

* 1. **Method statement/quality**

These questions are collectively refered to as the method statement, providers are required to submit a response to each method statement question below describing how they intend to deliver the required services.

For each method statement question relating to this lot there is a maximum word limit of approximately 1000 words. The response boxes will expand to accommodate your response.

All questions must be responded to.

|  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- |
| **Question 1** |  | **Weighting** Insert weighting |
| Insert question |
| Response: |

|  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- |
| **Question 2** |  | **Weighting** Insert weighting |
| Insert question |
| Response: |

|  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- |
| **Question 3** |  | **Weighting** Insert weighting |
| Insert question |
| Response: |

If you need to add more questions, please copy the above boxes.

* 1. **Pricing schedule**

The pricing schedule must be completed, a response that does not include this pricing schedule may not be evaluated.

The pricing schedule should include a full breakdown of all costs to ensure that each customer and line manager understands how the final rate charged is calculated.

Insert pricing schedule

1. **Key performance indicators**

Please see below the suggested KPI’s (customers can delete this section if not required).

|  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- |
| **KPI title** | **KPI description** | **KPI monitoring**  |
|  Insert KPI’s |   |   |
|   |   |   |
|   |   |   |
|   |   |   |
|   |   |   |

1. **Framework terms and conditions**

Please confirm that you agree to the framework terms and conditions: Yes/No

Please confirm that you agree to the call off terms and conditions: Yes/No

Acknowledgement of this will create the order form between the customer and the provider.