**Appendix 2**

**Scoring criteria and weightings**

# Compliance criteria

|  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- |
| Compliance Checking | | |
| 1.1 | Tender received on time? | Yes / No |
| 1.2 | Tender complete and in the requested format? | Yes / No |
| 1.3 | HDR UK Standard Terms shared and understood to be basis of any contract without caveat? | Yes / No |
| 1.4 | Financial strength assessed and risk acceptable? | Yes / No |
| 1.5 | Compliance with HDR UK Ethics Policy | Yes / No |
| Scoring Criteria:  PASS – Tender is compliant, or Tenderer has corrected any obvious error in their Tender after clarification.  REJECTED – Tender is not compliant, including any clarification measures.  If the Tender is compliant, it can be scored in no 2 below. | | |

# Scoring criteria

|  |
| --- |
| 2.1 The applicant’s experience of each of the requirements set out in the invitation to tender |
| **Scoring Criteria:**  0 – Response incomplete or does not substantively address the requirement  3 – Response poor and, whilst addresses the requirement, causes major concern about the expertise and relevance of the track record against the requirements.  7 – Response is good, addressing the requirement and causing only minor concerns about the expertise and relevance of the track record against the requirements.  10 – Excellent response proving the expertise and track record of the Tenderer in successfully delivering against the requirements. |

|  |
| --- |
| 2.2 The applicant’s approach to meeting the requirements set out in this document (project plan) |
| **Scoring Criteria:**  0 – Response incomplete or does not substantively address the requirement  3 – Response poor and whilst addresses the requirement, causes major concern about the proposed project plan or ability to meet timelines.  7 – Response is good, addressing the requirement and causing only minor concerns about the proposed project plan or ability to meet timelines.  10 – Excellent response where proposed project plan fully meets requirements. |

|  |
| --- |
| 2.3 Key risks and how these will be mitigated |
| **Scoring Criteria:**  0 – Response incomplete or does not substantively address the requirement  3 – Response poor and whilst addresses the requirement, causes major concern about mitigation of any key risks identified.  7 – Response is good, addressing the requirement and causing only minor concerns about the mitigation of any key risks identified.  10 – Excellent response, clearly highlighting any key risks with realistic mitigation plans for these. |

|  |
| --- |
| 2.4 The proposed individual or team who will deliver the work |
| **Scoring Criteria:**  0 – Response incomplete or does not substantively address the requirement  3 – Response poor and whilst addresses the requirement, causes major concern about the individual or team who will deliver the work  7 – Response is good, addressing the requirement and causing only minor concerns about the individual or team who will deliver the work  10 – Excellent response detailing a credible, proactive, named individual or team who will deliver the work |

|  |
| --- |
| 2.5 Total cost and value for money (VFM) |
| **Scoring Criteria:**  0 – Response incomplete or does not substantively address the requirement  3 – Response poor and whilst addresses the requirement the commercial offer is vague or lacking detail and requires significant clarification.  7 – Response is good and the commercial offer is reasonably detailed and transparent, or requiring little clarification, but lacks clear VFM assurance.  10 – Excellent response which provides detailed, line-item pricing, fully transparent assumptions, clearly exclusive of VAT, and describing any charitable or public sector discounts applied or alternative VFM aspects of the commercial offer. |

|  |
| --- |
| 3.1 The Tenderers previous experience and knowledge of data-driven research |
| **Scoring Criteria:**  0 – Response incomplete or does not substantively address the requirement  3 – Response poor and whilst addresses the requirement, causes major concern about the experience and knowledge of cross-domain data research and infrastructure  7 – Response is good, addressing the requirement and causing only minor concerns about the experience and knowledge of data research infrastructure.  10 – Excellent response proving the experience and knowledge of data research infrastructure. |

|  |
| --- |
| 4.1 Price |
| **Scoring Criteria:**  Price will be comparatively assessed against all compliant Tenders received. |

# Weightings

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
| **DARE ITT Selection Criteria Weightings** | |
| **Requirement** | **Weighting** |
| 1.0 Compliance Checking | PASS/REJECTED |
| 2.1 The applicant’s experience of each of the requirements set out in the invitation to tender | 20% |
| 2.2 The applicant’s approach to meeting the requirements set out in this document within the required timelines (project plan) | 15% |
| 2.3 Identification of key risks and how these will be mitigated | 10% |
| 2.4 The proposed individual or team who will deliver the work | 5% |
| 2.5 Total cost and value for money (VFM) | 15% |
| 3.1 The Tenderers previous experience and knowledge of data-driven research | 15% |
| 4.1 Price | 20% |
| Total | **100%** |