**Quality Criteria Assessment Methodology**

The Response section of the Request for Quotation Form outlines what is required of participants when returning the quotation.

The Specification section requires a “Yes” or “No” response from participants and will be assessed on a Pass/Fail Criteria (please refer to the specification for more information).

This document relates to how the Quality Award Criteria (QC) (Item 3 in the Response Section) will be assessed and is guide for quoting parties to ensure that they understand the Council’s reasoning on this procurement. This methodology will be applied to each submission received and the assessment will only take into consideration the information provided by the participant. To ensure that your submission scores as highly as possible, the Council recommends that participants provide a full response to each criteria bearing in mind this assessment methodology.

**Quality Criteria 1** – This criteria has been designed to ensure that the vehicle that the Council selects as the preferred vehicle has sound body work and a good chassis. With this in mind it is important that the Council is aware of any rust spots, deterioration of the paint work, body work and/or chassis, dents, damage or visible signs of wear and tear. The assessment criteria is split into two elements which will make up the overall **35% score attributed to this section**. These elements and their assessment methodologies are as follows

Element 1 - Descriptive detail (1 A4 side max) & photographic evidence (no restriction) – the descriptive element should be used by participants to detail the condition of the vehicles bodywork and chassis. Participants should note that a pre-contract inspection will be undertaken, so details provided must be accurate. Submissions will score higher where they provide greater levels of detail on the condition of the vehicle. Participants should refer to Element 2 descriptions to get an understanding of the specific details the Council is seeking clarity on.

Where participants feel that their response would be limited as the vehicle is in good condition and there is “nothing to report” it is recommended that participants describe each of the areas examined e.g. near side cab panel, followed by an appropriate statement e.g. “no rust, dents, scratches…” etc. This approach will show that a careful consideration of the vehicle has been made and whilst there may be “noting to report” in terms of damage etc. the Council will know that the participant has fully reviewed the vehicle and provided the most comprehensive response achievable.

The photographic evidence will support the descriptive detail and will ideally be cross referenced to the description so that a clear understanding of the condition of the vehicle is gained by the evaluators. Generic photographs at a distance e.g. profile shots, will be of limited use in this regard and should be supplemented with more specific shots, for example, those that take in a panel or a particular detail e.g. dent.

This section will form **15% of the overall** **35% for QC** **1** - **Please note that this section has a minimum score requirement of 6%.** This section will be scored as follows:

|  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- |
| Assessment Area | Response Level | Scoring Mechanism |
| **Bodywork** | No detail provided | 0% |
|  | Minor information relating to bodywork e.g. descriptions relate to an entire side of the vehicle | 1% |
|  | Good levels of detail relating to the bodywork e.g. descriptions relate to individual panels or elements of the vehicle | 4% |
| **Chassis** | No detail provided | 0% |
|  | Minor information relating to chassis e.g. descriptions relate to broad area of the chassis | 1% |
|  | Good levels of detail relating to the bodywork e.g. descriptions relate to individual elements/areas of the chassis | 4% |
| **Photographic Evidence** | No photo’s provided | 0% |
|  | Generic photographs or photos do not show detail | 1% |
|  | Detailed photographic evidence that clearly shows individual panels or items e.g. dents or scratches | 4% |
| **Cross-Referencing** | Photographic evidence is as “detailed” above and is cross-referenced to the text in the descriptions for chassis **and** bodywork | 3% |

Worked Example – Participant 1 provides a limited description of the bodywork, provides a good description of the chassis, provides a detailed photographic evidence and cross references this but only for the **bodywork**. Participant 1 therefore scores as follows:

Bodywork detail – 1%

Chassis detail – 4%

Photographic evidence – 4%

Cross-referencing - 0%

**TOTAL – 9%**

Had Participant 1 cross-referenced the photos to the chassis as well as the bodywork this score would the total score would have been 12%. Coupled with a better bodywork description this would have resulted in a total of 15%.

**Element 2** – This element is a straight assessment of the quality of the bodywork and the chassis based on the information provided by the participant (descriptions and photographic evidence from element 1). It **forms the remaining 20% of the assessment methodology** **for QC 1** and scores will be awarded as follows:

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
| **Chassis Description** | **Score** |
| Significant Damage to Chassis | Fail - this vehicle will not be considered further |
| Minor Damage to Chassis | 2% |
| No Damage | 5% |

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
| **Dents or Gouges Description** | **Score** |
| Numerous dents above 4cm, 1 dent 10cm or above or 1 Gouge in excess of 4cm | 0% |
| Numerous dents below 4cm or 1 dent 4cm -9cm | 1% |
| 1 dent below 4cm | 2% |
| No dents | 5% |

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
| **Scratch Description** | **Score** |
| Numerous Scratches above 4cm through base coat | 0% |
| Numerous Scratches above 4cm top coat only | 1% |
| Superficial or no scratches | 4% |

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
| **Rust Description** | **Score** |
| 1 or more rust patches exceeding 2cm and which may require repair within 1 year | 0% |
| 1 or more rust patches exceeding 2cm and which may require repair within 2 years | 1 |
| Superficial rust patches | 2% |
| No rust | 4% |

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
| **Other** | **Score** |
| Other sign of vehicle deterioration, visible wear and tear or work required that would lead to expenditure over £1500 within 1 year | 0% |
| Other sign of vehicle deterioration, visible wear and tear or work required that would lead to expenditure up to £1500 within 1 year | 1% |
| No other sign of vehicle deterioration | 2% |

Worked Example – A vehicle with no chassis damage, 1 dent below 4cm, numerous scratches above 4cm but only top coat, with no rust and no other signs of vehicle deterioration would score:

Chasis – 5%

Dents – 2%

Scratches – 1%

Rust – 4%

Other – 2%

**TOTAL - 14%**

**Quality Criteria 2** – This quality criteria relates to the level of service history held by the participant. The Council is looking for a vehicle which has been well maintained and has been serviced at regular intervals. Scores will be awarded as follows:

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
| Level of Service History Held | Score |
| None | 0% |
| Partial | 5% |
| Full | 10% |

Participants should note that the service history will be expected to be reviewed by the Council or its agent following the evaluation stage if the participant is selected as the preferred bidder. Where the participant misrepresents the amount of service history held for the vehicle the participant may be excluded from the quotation process.

**Quality Criteria 3** – The Council wishes to make sure that the vehicle it purchases is capable of being repaired in the short to medium term and therefore it is important that a spare parts market exists for the vehicle being put forward by the participant. The Council has requested a commentary from the participant that aids the Council in determining the type of spares market that exists for the vehicle. **The overall quality criteria is worth 15% of the available marks.** This quality criteria is separated in to three distinct elements these are:

Element 1 - Are parts being manufactured or have they been discontinued (**up to 5% of the available 15%)**?

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
| Spares Manufacturing Status | Score |
| Discontinued | 0% |
| Still being manufactured | 5% |

Evidence to support a response to this element of the quality criteria should not be based on an assurance from the participant and could include a statement from the manufacturer of the vehicle or parts.

Element 2 - Are the spares generally available (**up to 5% of the available 15%)**?

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
| Spares Availability Status | Score |
| No evidence of availability provided | 0% |
| Some evidence of availability provided | 2% |
| Significant evidence of availability provided | 5% |

Evidence to support this element of the quality criteria could include references to parts suppliers including appropriate websites or contact numbers that the Council can check/contact. A greater score will be provided to those participants identifying multiple avenues for purchasing spare parts.

Element 3 - Are spare parts only available as proprietary products i.e. manufacturer only, or is the spares market such that an equivalent or approved spare is available (**5% of the available 15%)**?

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
| Spares Type Status | Score |
| Manufacturer/Proprietary Only | 0% |
| Evidence of equal or approved spares market | 5% |

Evidence to support this quality criteria response could be identification of a spare that is not produced by the manufacturer. This could be a print from a website or other form of evidence. A written statement by the participant is not considered proof that equal or approved items exist.

**Worked Example –** Participant 1 identifies that spares are still being manufactured for the vehicle, provides one example where spares can be obtained from and provides an example of a non-proprietary product. Participant 1 therefore scores

Manufacturing Status – 5%

Availability Status – 2%

Type Status – 5%

**TOTAL – 12%**