


SCP152		INVITATION TO TENDER (ITT) SCORING MATRIX																																										
Civils and Tunnelling Works Framework Agreement																																												
		Criterion question				Question Weighting	Criticality of Criterion											HOCHTIEF UK			J MURPHY			JOSEPH GALLAGHER		MORGAN SINDALL BeMo JV					TAYLOR WOODROW BAM NUTTALL JV													
								Lot 1 Civils		Lot 2 Tunnelling		Lot 3 Civils & Tunnelling		Lot 1 Civils		Lot 2 Tunnelling		Lot 3 Civils & Tunnelling		Lot 3 Civils & Tunnelling		Lot 1 Civils		Lot 2 Tunnelling		Lot 3 Civils & Tunnelling		Lot 1 Civils		Lot 2 Tunnelling		Lot 3 Civils & Tunnelling												
		FAIL SCORES				TOTAL WEIGHTED SCORES										Fail		Fail						83.22%		85.40%		83.60%		80.06%		79.14%		79.55%										
1	INSURANCES [Discretionary Pass/Fail]					SCORE RATIONALE																																						
		Please provide confirmation that the following insurances are in place and/or can be procured in respect of the Bidder prior to the establishment of the framework agreement, (including (without limitation) copies of insurance certificates and other supporting information such as letters of confirmation from relevant insurers)																																										
1.1		Employer's Liability - minimum requirement £10M per occurrence				N/A	Discretionary Pass/Fail	Discretionary Pass evidence judged to mitigate concerns Discretionary Fail evidence lacking or judged not to mitigate concerns Note default position: Fail		Pass		Pass		Pass		Pass		Pass		Pass		Pass		Pass		Pass		Pass		Pass		Pass												
1.2		Public Liability - minimum requirement £25M per occurrence				N/A	Discretionary Pass/Fail	Discretionary Pass evidence judged to mitigate concerns Discretionary Fail evidence lacking or judged not to mitigate concerns Note default position: Fail		Pass		Pass		Pass		Pass		Pass		Pass		Pass		Pass		Pass		Pass		Pass		Pass												
1.3		Product Liability - minimum requirement £25M per occurrence				N/A	Discretionary Pass/Fail	Discretionary Pass evidence judged to mitigate concerns Discretionary Fail evidence lacking or judged not to mitigate concerns Note default position: Fail		Pass		Pass		Pass		Pass		Pass		Pass		Pass		Pass		Pass		Pass		Pass		Pass												
1.4		Professional Indemnity - minimum requirement £25M for each and every claim for the duration of the Contract and for 12 years after the expiry or termination of the Contract				N/A	Discretionary Pass/Fail	Discretionary Pass evidence judged to mitigate concerns Discretionary Fail evidence lacking or judged not to mitigate concerns Note default position: Fail		Pass		Pass		Pass		Pass		Pass		Pass		Pass		Pass		Pass		Pass		Pass		Pass												
1.5		Contractor's plant and equipment insurance - minimum requirement – an amount sufficient to cover the reinstatement cost of any damage to or loss of the Contractor's tools, plant, equipment				N/A	Discretionary Pass/Fail	Discretionary Pass evidence judged to mitigate concerns Discretionary Fail evidence lacking or judged not to mitigate concerns Note default position: Fail		Pass		Pass		Pass		Pass		Pass		Pass		Pass		Pass		Pass		Pass		Pass		Pass												
1.6		Provide details of any aggregate limits and/or automatic reinstatements applying to any of the policies stated in questions Q1.1 to Q1.5 inclusive.				N/A	Discretionary Pass/Fail	Discretionary Pass evidence judged to mitigate concerns Discretionary Fail evidence lacking or judged not to mitigate concerns Note default position: Fail		Pass		Pass		Pass		Pass		Pass		Pass		Pass		Pass		Pass		Pass		Pass		Pass												
1.7		If any of the insurances stated in questions Q1.1 to Q1.5 are not maintained explain how you would finance losses that would have been recoverable under such insurance policies.				N/A	Discretionary Pass/Fail	Discretionary Pass evidence judged to mitigate concerns Discretionary Fail evidence lacking or judged not to mitigate concerns Note default position: Fail		Pass		Pass		Pass		Pass		Pass		Pass		Pass		Pass		Pass		Pass		Pass		Pass												
1.8		If your insurances are part of group policies, (including, without limitation) those maintained by a parent company, please confirm that such insurances cover your activities under this Framework				N/A	Discretionary Pass/Fail	Discretionary Pass evidence judged to mitigate concerns Discretionary Fail evidence lacking or judged not to mitigate concerns Note default position: Fail		Pass		Pass		Pass		Pass		Pass		Pass		Pass		Pass		Pass		Pass		Pass		Pass												
1.9		Please advise whether (i) the insurances in Q1.1 to Q1.5 provide cover on a worldwide basis, or (i) there are territorial limits on these insurance policies.				N/A	Discretionary Pass/Fail	Discretionary Pass evidence judged to mitigate concerns Discretionary Fail evidence lacking or judged not to mitigate concerns Note default position: Fail		Pass		Pass		Pass		Pass		Pass		Pass		Pass		Pass		Pass		Pass		Pass		Pass												
	TERMS AND CONDITIONS [Pass/Fail]																																											
2		LUL expects its Terms and conditions of contract to be unamended and that tenderers will not seek to qualify these. Tenderers will be requested to withdraw any qualifications included within their tender. In the event that a tenderer declines to make such withdrawal of qualifications associated with its tender, the following process will apply. LUL will assess the evidence in support of the amendment and at its discretion either • Fail and reject the tender on the grounds that the amendment or any associated mitigation action is unacceptable; or • Permit the amendment in which case it may add to the tender evaluation criteria, including price, (for the purposes of comparing tenders) scores to cover any mitigating actions it deems appropriate.				N/A	Discretionary Pass/Fail	Discretionary Pass evidence judged to mitigate concerns Discretionary Fail evidence lacking or judged not to mitigate concerns Note default position: Fail		Pass		Pass		Pass		Pass		Pass		Pass		Pass		Pass		Pass		Pass		Pass		Pass												
	HEALTH AND SAFETY [Pass/Fail]																																											
3		Provide a completed QUENSH menu.				N/A	Pass/Fail	FAIL No Quensh menu, incomplete Quensh menu or Quensh menu featuring unacceptable qualifications that are deemed to introduce risk of adverse impact to people, environment or property. PASS Completed Quensh menu with no qualifications or acceptable qualifications that are deemed not to introduce risk of adverse impact to people, environment or property.		Pass		Pass		Pass		Pass		Pass		Pass		Pass		Pass		Pass		Pass		Pass		Pass												
4		Provide CVs of staff proposing to work on the Example Work Package with specific Health, Safety and Environmental responsibilities (including the project manager). Complete and self score the HSE Competencies Matrix (Guidance and Matrix are on additional worksheets) of staff proposing to work on the Example Work Package with specific Health, Safety and Environmental responsibilities (including the project manager).				N/A	Pass/Fail	FAIL CV's or HSE Competency Matrix do not provide sufficient confidence that the HSE requirements of the Example Work Package will be sufficiently well managed. HSE Competency Matrix client score is 'C'. PASS CV's and Competency Matrix provide sufficient confidence that the HSE requirements of the Example Work Package will be sufficiently well managed and that the Principal Contractor responsibility may be competently discharged by the bidder if requested to do so. HSE Competency Matrix client score is 'A' or 'B'.		Pass		Pass		Pass		Pass		Pass		Pass		Pass		Pass		Pass		Pass		Pass		Pass												
	TECHNICAL CAPABILITY [Pass/Fail and Scored 43%]																																											
5		With regards to interfaces how will you successfully identify and manage all technical interfaces within the civils scope elements of the Example Work Package? Provide a tender stage interface plan and risk plan. Provide a single response relevant to Civils only (Lots 1 and 3 only) .				8%	Score with minimum 5 to Pass	(0) No evidence provided Poor (1 2) Basic very high level response given across only some of the criteria. Unsatisfactory (3 4) Tender stage interface plan provided, lacking detail across some criteria. Methodology only at concept level. High level risks considered, lack of mitigation detail. Adequate (5) Tender-ready plan provided, signed, containing basic detail against all criteria. Methodology explained in basic detail. Risk plan provided with assumptions included. Very Good (6 8) Tender stage interface plan provided, signed, containing basic detail against all criteria. Methodology explained and specific to the project. Risk plan detailed with individual mitigations for each risk. Assumptions included. Excellent (9 10) Tender stage interface plan provided, signed, containing thorough detail against all criteria. Methodology thoroughly explained and specific to the project. Risk plan thoroughly detailed with individual mitigations for each risk. Detailed assumptions included.		7		5.60%		7		5.60%		4		3.20%		4		3.20%		5		4.00%		6		4.80%		9		7.20%		9		7.20%				
6		With regards to interfaces how will you successfully identify and manage all technical interfaces within the tunnelling scope elements of the Example Work Package? Provide a tender stage interface plan and risk plan. Provide a single response relevant to Tunnelling only (Lots 2 and 3 only) .				8%	Score with minimum 5 to Pass	(0) No evidence provided Poor (1 2) Basic very high level response given across only some of the criteria. Unsatisfactory (3 4) Tender-ready plan provided, lacking detail across some criteria. Methodology only at concept level. High level risks considered, lack of mitigation detail. Adequate (5) Tender-ready plan provided, containing basic detail against all criteria. Methodology explained in basic detail. Risk plan provided with assumptions included. Very Good (6 8) Tender-ready plan provided, containing basic detail against all criteria. Methodology explained and specific to the project. Risk plan detailed with individual mitigations for each risk. Assumptions included. Excellent (9 10) Tender-ready plan provided, signed, containing thorough detail against all criteria. Methodology thoroughly explained and specific to the project. Risk plan thoroughly detailed with individual mitigations for each risk. Detailed assumptions included.						7		5.60%		7		5.60%		5		4.00%		5		4.00%		9		7.20%		9		7.20%		8		6.40%		8		6.40%
7		Demonstrate how you would minimise the impact on the site neighbours during the establishment of the station box and what precautions would you apply in ensuring minimal disruption as part of the Example Work Package? This should include a high level appraisal of the construction methodology and considered proposals which weigh-up the benefits of alternative proposals versus the negative effects of such alternative proposals. Lots 1 and 3 only.				5%	Score with minimum 5 to Pass	(0) No response provided Poor (1 2) Deemed unworkable and not achieving requirements to minimise disruption. Unsatisfactory (3 4) Not optimised, key activities not complete, high risk of disruption minimisation not being achieved. Adequate (5) Workable with key actions considered and explained. Very Good (6 8) Very good with clear and achievable methodology for reducing disruption. Excellent (9 10) Excellent with clear and achievable methodology for minimising disruption.		6		3.00%		6		3.00%		5		2.50%		5		2.50%		6		3.00%		9		4.50%		7		3.50%		7		3.50%				

Criterion question			Question Weighting	Criticality of Criterion	HOCHTIEF UK						J MURPHY				JOSEPH GALLAGHER		MORGAN SINDALL BeMo JV						TAYLOR WOODROW BAM NUTTALL JV								
8		How would you deal with the underbridge which cuts into the northbound platform invert that features within the Example Work Package? Highlight the main risks and mitigations. In setting out how to construct this consider the methodology required to ensure that optimal headroom within the under-passage can be achieved with minimal disruption to the operational railway. Lots 2 and 3 only.	5%	Score with minimum 5 to Pass	(0) No response provided Poor (1 2) Risks and mitigations deemed unworkable and not achieving requirements. Unsatisfactory (3 4) Not optimised, key risks and mitigations not considered, high risk of requirements not being achieved. Adequate (5) Workable with key risks and mitigations considered and explained. Very Good (6 8) Very good with clearly identified risks mitigated and logical methodology for meeting requirements. Excellent (9 10) Excellent with clearly identified risks mitigated and robust methodology for meeting requirements.			6	3.00%	6	3.00%			6	3.00%	8	4.00%			8	4.00%	8	4.00%			7	3.50%	7	3.50%		
9		Proposal Provide details of your proposed methodology and potential improvement initiatives to enhance delivery of the specified Example Work Package scope including where appropriate the following • Construction / Phasing of the Works • Value adding initiatives (refer to the Value Model and consider and propose opportunities that will add value to the Example Work Package outcome) • Explain how you propose to ensure that the works and all contract deliverables required for Completion will be delivered to LUL to achieve acceptance by the Completion Date. Provide a single response relevant to Lot 3. You may refer to documents provided to support your response to the above question(s) relating to management of technical interfaces as well as to the risk register.	12%	Score with minimum 5 to Pass	(0) No evidence provided Poor (1 2) Based on evidence provided judged incapable of delivering the requirement and obligations. Unsatisfactory (3 4) Based on evidence provided, judged at significant risk of not delivering requirements and obligations. Adequate (5) Based on evidence provided, judged good enough to deliver the requirement and meet its obligations, with some value adding initiatives, and other benefits. Very Good (6 8) Based on evidence provided, judged very capable of delivering the requirement and meet its obligations, with very good value adding initiatives, and other benefits. Excellent (9 10) Based on evidence provided, judged to have excellent capability to deliver the requirement and obligations; substantial value adding initiatives; and objective business improvement benefits.	7	8.40%	7	8.40%	7	8.40%	6	7.20%	6	7.20%	6	7.20%	5	6.00%	9	10.80%	9	10.80%	9	10.80%	8	9.60%	8	9.60%	8	9.60%
10.0		Provide details of how you would implement working within a structured assurance regime including your approach to compliance on this Example Work Package.	5%	Score with minimum 5 to Pass	(0) Provided no details of how the bidder will implement working within a structured assurance regime, or their approach to compliance on this Example Work Package. Poor (1 2) Provided insufficient details of how the bidder will implement working within a structured assurance regime, or their approach to compliance on this Example Work Package. Unsatisfactory (3 4) Provided unsatisfactory level of detail of how the bidder will implement working within a structured assurance regime, or their approach to compliance on this Example Work Package. Adequate (5) Provided acceptable details of how the bidder will implement working within a structured assurance regime and their approach to compliance on this Example Work Package. Very good (6 8) Provided very good level of detail of how the bidder will implement working within a structured assurance regime and their approach to compliance on this Example Work Package. Excellent (9 10) Provided excellent level of detail of how the bidder will implement working within a structured assurance regime and their approach to compliance on this Example Work Package.	6	3.00%	6	3.00%	6	3.00%	6	3.00%	6	3.00%	5	2.50%	6	3.00%	6	3.00%	6	3.00%	6	3.00%	8	4.00%	8	4.00%	8	4.00%
			43%		SECTION SCORING		20.00%		20.00%		28.60%		15.90%		17.20%		22.90%		23.50%		23.10%		25.00%		34.30%		24.30%		23.50%		34.20%
MANAGEMENT OF THE WORKS (Scored 5%)																															
11		Provide CVs of staff proposing to work on this Example Work Package with specific responsibilities for the Example Work Package and assuming a contract award date of December 2016. CV's should include experience of similar works. Provide a Competency Matrix of staff proposing to work on this project.	5%	Score with minimum 5 to Pass	(0) No CVs/Competency Matrix provided Poor (1 2) CVs do not demonstrate training or experience required to discharge responsibilities Unsatisfactory (3 4) CVs provided but little previous experience in relevant work insufficient number of CV's provided. Competency Matrix not documented. Good enough (5) CV's requested provided and demonstrate sufficient experience in similar work. Competency Matrix provided. Very good (6 8) CV's requested provided. Most staff have experience on projects similar in scale and nature. Competency Matrix provided. Excellent (9 10) Large proportion of staff have suitable qualifications and have previously worked on a number of projects similar in scale and nature. Highly relevant CVs and Competency Matrix provided.	6	3.00%	6	3.00%	6	3.00%	5	2.50%	5	2.50%	5	2.50%	7	3.50%	8	4.00%	8	4.00%	8	4.00%	9	4.50%	9	4.50%	9	4.50%
					SECTION SCORING		3.00%		3.00%		3.00%		2.50%		2.50%		2.50%		3.50%		4.00%		4.00%		4.00%		4.50%		4.50%		4.50%
QUALITY (Scored 5%)																															
12		Provide; A tender stage Quality Plan for the Example Work Package. Describe how you develop the plan against customer expectations / your internal process and set down in BS ISO 10005 - Guidelines for a Quality Plan [in particular Section 4 to 6.4].	5%	Score with minimum 5 to Pass	(0) No Plan provided Poor (1 2) - Very little detail provided within the Plan. Unsatisfactory (3 4) - Basic but limited/partial response provided within the Plan. Adequate (5) - A good enough response through provision of an acceptable Plan. Very Good (6 8) - A very good tender Quality Plan featuring appropriate and acceptable level of detail. Document signed. Excellent (9 10) - An excellent response with a thorough and detailed Quality Plan. Document signed.	10	5.00%	10	5.00%	10	5.00%	5	2.50%	5	2.50%	5	2.50%	5	2.50%	10	5.00%	10	5.00%	10	5.00%	7	3.50%	7	3.50%	7	3.50%
					SECTION SCORING		5.00%		5.00%		5.00%		2.50%		2.50%		2.50%		2.50%		5.00%		5.00%		5.00%		3.50%		3.50%		3.50%
PROGRAMME (Scored 12%)																															
13		Schedule Integrity Provide a programme for the works which complies with all requirements of the Contract and includes resource and cost loading for the Example Work Package Lot 3 only.	12%	Score with minimum 5 to Pass	(0) No programme provided Poor (1 2) provided a poorly developed programme for the works, incorporating limited activities and resource loading. Unsatisfactory (3 4) programme provided incorporates many of the activity requirements. Highly significant flaws in terms of logic or activity durations. Very limited cost or resource loading. Adequate (5) programme from contract award to completion date. Incorporates most of the works activity requirements and only limited flaws in logic. Limited cost or resource loading. Very good (6 8) very good programme from award to completion date, incorporates most of the works activity requirements and only limited flaws in logic. Good cost and resource loading. Excellent (9 10) excellent programme from award to completion date, incorporates all or almost all of the works activity requirements and very limited flaws in logic. Excellent cost and resource loading that reflects the pricing proposal. Delivers optimal works duration, alignment with construction methodology and appropriate float allowances.	9	10.80%	9	10.80%	9	10.80%	7	8.40%	7	8.40%	7	8.40%	5	6.00%	8	9.60%	8	9.60%	8	9.60%	9	10.80%	9	10.80%	9	10.80%
					SECTION SCORING		10.80%		10.80%		10.80%		8.40%		8.40%		8.40%		6.00%		9.60%		9.60%		9.60%		10.80%		10.80%		10.80%
COMMERCIAL AND PRICING (Scored 30%)																															
14		Complete the Example Work Package For Lot 3 Only - As defined in Section 1.3 of Volume 3 - Instructions to Bidders The tender must include the following tender price support information as a minimum Completed activity schedule linked to the programme and Cost Feedback Structure (CFS) in accordance with the guidance notes in Appendix 1 to the Framework Agreement, including Rates, rates breakdown (in to people, equipment and plant & materials), schedule of estimating assumptions upon which your price is based. Fee details: Maximum Framework Fee Calculator (MFFC) completed so as to show evidence of subcontracted fee and direct fee percentages applied to a notional quantity of work included in the Example Work Package Full price breakdown of all items shown in the CFS and Activity Schedule and which form part of the tender price. The Example Work Package is to be priced on an NEC Option E cost reimbursable basis The template can be found in Volume 3, Section 3 of the Framework ITT (Cost Feedback Structure)	15%	Score	(0) No evidence provided Poor (1 2) Very little and insufficient supporting tender price information provided Unsatisfactory (3 4) Incomplete or illogical tender price supporting information provided Adequate (5) Completed activity schedule provided in CFS structure, with full list of estimating assumptions. Very Good (6 8) In addition to the minimum information requirements, detailed supporting information/price breakdowns supplied, with supporting evidence and details of applicable subcontractor/supplier costs. Excellent (9 10) Price submission exceeds minimum information requirements, full supporting documentation provided with complete rationale for prices, breakdown of costs, list of assumptions linked to cost loaded programme and construction methodology. Copies of relevant cost justification supplied. Note that the above evaluation aims to consider the quality of the estimate rather than the resultant price.	8.9	13.35%	8.9	13.35%	8.9	13.35%	7.8	11.70%	7.8	11.70%	7.8	11.70%	8.5	12.75%	9.7	14.55%	9.7	14.55%	9.7	14.55%	7.2	10.80%	7.2	10.80%	7.2	10.80%
15 A		Complete the Maximum Framework Rates Calculator (NEC Options A, C and E) as defined in Section 4 of Volume 3 - Instructions to Bidders	5%	Score	The framework rates will be assessed against discipline / trade and shift period. The evaluation of maximum framework rates is broken in to two evaluations which will be combined and each evaluated out of 5 marks such that the total is scored out of 10. Discipline / Trade Evaluation For each discipline / trade, an overall cost (excluding fee) will be derived using the Maximum Framework Rates Calculator (MFRCL). Each overall cost will be given a percentage weighting, calculated as a percentage out of 100 of the Grand Total Cost. For each discipline / trade, the Contractor will be ranked 5 (most competitive price) to 1 (least competitive price). A discipline / trade price amounting to more than 20% higher than the lowest price will be awarded zero. Each discipline / trade ranking (of 1 - 5) will be multiplied by the percentage weighting to give a weighted score. The sum total of weighted scores for all discipline / trades provide a score out of 5. Shift Period Evaluation For each shift period, an overall cost (excluding fee) will be derived using the Maximum Framework Rates Calculator (MFRCL). Each overall cost will be given a percentage weighting, calculated as a percentage out of 100 of the Grand Total Cost. For each shift period, the Contractor will be ranked 5 (most competitive price) to 1 (least competitive price). A discipline / trade price amounting to more than 20% higher than the lowest price will be awarded zero. Each shift period ranking (of 1 - 5) will be multiplied by the percentage weighting to give a weighted score. The sum total of weighted scores for all shift periods provide a score out of 5. The Discipline / Trade Evaluation and Shift Period Evaluation will be combined to generate a score out of 10.	4.5	2.25%	4.5	2.25%	4.5	2.25%	8.3	4.15%	8.3	4.15%	8.3	4.15%	3.6	1.80%	6.9	3.45%	6.9	3.45%	6.9	3.45%	5.9	2.95%	5.9	2.95%	5.9	2.95%

			Criterion question	Question Weighting	Criticality of Criterion	HOCHTIEF UK						J MURPHY						JOSEPH GALLAGHER		MORGAN SINDALL BeMo JV						TAYLOR WOODROW BAM NUTTALL JV											
15 B			Complete the Maximum Framework Fee Calculator (MFFC) Maximum Framework Fees (NEC Options A, C and E) Evaluation of Maximum Framework Fees using the Maximum Framework Fee Calculator (MFFC) for NEC Options A, C and E included in Section 4 of Volume 3 - Instructions to Bidders. The MFFC includes Maximum Framework Fees taken from Contract Data Part 2 of the Framework and Subcontract works and Direct works percentage proportions taken from the Example Work Package.	10%	Score	The MFFC will produce a total notional price for a defined value of works for NEC Options A, C and E Any price that's 15% or more higher than the lowest Notional Total Price (NTP) scores 0. The lowest compliant total evaluated price submitted will be used as a benchmark and awarded 5 points. All other tender submissions will have 0.33 deducted for each percentage point by which the evaluated tender price exceeds that of the lowest tendered submission. The weighting will be applied to the score to determine the weighted score. IL: lowest evaluated compliant NTP price IX: this tender NTP price (a compliant tender is one that is not rejected in line with stated evaluation criteria) $((X-IL)/IL \times 100 = \% \text{ difference}$ $5 - (\% \text{ difference} \times 0.33 = \text{evaluation score (if negative score }= 0))$ The score for each of the 3 NEC Options will be combined to give a total mark out of 15 which will be aggregated down to a score out of 10 ie. NEC Option A + NEC Option C + NEC Option E Overall score out of 15. Overall score out of 15 x 0.66 Score out of 10	9.1	9.10%	9.1	9.10%	9.1	9.10%	8.4	8.40%	8.4	8.40%	8.4	8.40%	9.9	9.90%	8.7	8.70%	8.7	8.70%	8.7	8.70%	8.7	8.70%	8.8	8.80%	8.8	8.80%	8.8	8.80%			
				30%		SECTION SCORING							24.70%		24.70%		24.70%		24.25%		24.25%		24.25%		24.45%		26.70%		26.70%		26.70%		22.55%		22.55%		22.55%
		RISK (Scored 5%)																																			
16			Review the attached risk register, for the Example Work Package, and suggest amendments and additions that demonstrate your understanding of the risks and propose how you would provide solutions to mitigate those risks.	5%	Score with minimum 5 to Pass	(0) No evidence provided Poor (1-2) Lack of clarity of identification key risks. Some confusion as to risk description, cause and effect, risk register provided is qualitative only, a number of risks do not have mitigations identified. Unsatisfactory (3-4) Lack of clarity of identification of key risks. Some confusion as to risk description, cause and effect, the risks do not accurately reflect the key cost, schedule, design, construction and quality. Mitigations identified fall mainly into the category of not being proactive risk management or do not address the cause or the impact of the risk. Adequate (5) Contractor identified risks, which may include other categories as deemed appropriate, are described using the standard format of risk cause, description and impact. Mitigations identified fall mainly into the category of not being proactive risk management or do not address the cause or the impact of the risk. Very Good (6-8) Risks reasonably reflect the key cost, schedule, design, construction and quality risks for the proposed scheme. Mitigations identified are proactive and addresses the cause or the impact of the risk. Excellent (9-10) Risks accurately reflect the key cost, schedule, design, construction and quality risks for the proposed scheme. Mitigations identified are proactive and addresses the cause or the impact of the risk.	9	4.50%	9	4.50%	9	4.50%	6	3.00%	6	3.00%	6	3.00%	7	3.50%	8	4.00%	8	4.00%	8	4.00%	8	4.00%	8	4.00%	8	4.00%	8	4.00%			
						SECTION SCORING							4.50%		4.50%		4.50%		3.00%		3.00%		3.00%		3.50%		4.00%		4.00%		4.00%		4.00%		4.00%		
		Sub contracting (Pass/Fail)																																			
17			Identify the aspects / work packages of the Example Work Package the bidder would require or intend to Sub-Contract to third parties and those that will be delivered by its own permanent or directly engaged staff or plant and equipment resources, including the approximate % subcontracted as a proportion of the total Works.	N/A	Pass/Fail	FAIL: Limited level of detail or the response does not clearly identify the distinction between elements of the Works to be delivered by permanent 'in-house' or directly engaged resource, and those which are to be Sub-Contracted. PASS: The response clearly identifies those elements which are to be Sub-Contracted against those to be delivered internally or through direct engagement and at a sufficient level of detail to enable both relative proportion of Works provision and description of Works to be provided.	Pass		Pass		Pass		Pass		Pass		Pass		Pass		Pass		Pass		Pass		Pass		Pass		Pass		Pass				
		IM&M (Pass/Fail)																																			
18			Based on industry best practice demonstrate your understanding of the Employer Information Requirements (EIR) and how you will develop a BIM Execution Plan (BEP) to provide digital assurance around the delivery of graphical data, non-graphical data and documentation as specified in the EIR.	N/A	Pass/Fail	FAIL: Limited level of detail or the response does not clearly demonstrate understanding of the EIR or how the BEP will be developed in order to provide a sufficient level of assurance. PASS: Good level of detail and the response clearly demonstrates understanding of the EIR, how the BEP will be developed in order to provide a sufficient level of assurance and includes details of working to industry best practice, BS1192:2007 and the associated PAS suite of documents.	Pass		Pass		Pass		Pass		Pass		Pass		Pass		Pass		Pass		Pass		Pass		Pass		Pass		Pass				
		ENVIRONMENTAL (Pass/Fail)																																			
19			Explain how your company will ensure compliance with Best Practicable Means (BPM), as defined under Section 72 of the Control of Pollution Act (CoPA) 1974, to all activities? In order to support this explanation, include CVs of employees with specific noise and vibration experience and/or qualifications that will work on this project.	N/A	Pass/Fail	FAIL: Poor – No information provided. FAIL: Unsatisfactory – Generic statement that tenderer complies with legislation and BPM PASS: Good enough – General noise control procedure provided. Some experience applying for S61s PASS: Very good – Some members of staff have experience managing noise impacts and applying for section 61s on projects. Evidence provided demonstrates good process(es) for managing noise and vibration including such items as assessing programme and method of works, identifying what will be assessed and sensitive receptors and sources of noise, monitoring, controls included in method statements, management plans and toolbox talks and applying for S61 as necessary. PASS: Excellent – Staff have years of experience managing noise impacts and applying for section 61s on projects with significant noise and vibration impacts. Have used full-time staff member with experience of noise monitoring and modeling. Evidence provided demonstrates robust process(es) for managing noise and vibration including such items as assessing programme and method of works, identifying what will be assessed and sensitive receptors and sources of noise, monitoring, controls included in method statements, management plans and toolbox talks and applying for S61 as necessary.	Pass		Pass		Pass		Pass		Pass		Pass		Pass		Pass		Pass		Pass		Pass		Pass		Pass		Pass				
20			Consider the scope of work of the Example Work Package; the bidder is required to demonstrate how it will ensure good practice in environmental sustainability in execution of the works regarding waste minimisation and adherence to the Waste Hierarchy adopting the principles Reduce, Reuse, Recycle and the use of recycled materials.	N/A	Pass/Fail	FAIL: Poor – no information provided FAIL: Unsatisfactory – Generic statement that tenderer will deliver compliant waste management PASS: Good enough – specific proposals for waste reduction / recovery – examples of approach to using less materials, reducing waste, data monitoring and reporting that uses the correct metrics and enables reporting against the project targets. PASS: Very Good – Evidence demonstrates some experience in project similar in scale and nature and includes – specific proposals for waste reduction / recovery; – examples of approach to using less materials and reusing waste, data monitoring reducing major waste arisings (e.g. identifying individual waste streams, waste hierarchy); and plan for waste prevention/reduction; – process for data monitoring and reporting from waste management and trade contractors that use the correct metrics and enable reporting against the project targets; where demolition / excavation will take place, they specify how materials will be re-used on this project PASS: Excellent – Evidence provided demonstrates experience in project similar in scale and nature and includes – specific proposals for waste reduction / recovery; – solutions to project-specific barriers and constraints; – examples of approach to reducing major waste arisings (e.g. identifying individual waste streams, waste hierarchy); – input into the designer's initial Site Waste Management Plan ("SWMP") that further improves the SWMP and plan for waste prevention/reduction; – process for data monitoring and reporting from waste management and trade contractors that use the correct metrics and enable reporting against the project targets. where demolition / excavation will take place, they specify how materials will be re-used on this project	Pass		Pass		Pass		Pass		Pass		Pass		Pass		Pass		Pass		Pass		Pass		Pass		Pass		Pass				
		TUNNEL DESIGN (INFORMATION ONLY)																																			
21			Please review WI300 for the Example Work Package and consider sharing of responsibilities for tunnel lining design. How would you propose that the responsibilities be apportioned between designer and works contractor in order to deliver the optimal safe, cost effective, environmentally and functionally effective outcome? (Lots 2 and 3 only)	N/A	Information only	Information only																															