

TfL Professional Services Framework 2: Engineering Consultancy Services

Standard Selection Questionnaire 2

Incorporating Sections 6 and 7

Weight: 30% (20% for Commercial and 10% for Health, Safety and Environmental (HSE))

Criticality: A minimum score of 9 – meets requirement per question and a pass per question must be achieved in order to pass each section.

Submission Instructions

A single submission of this document must be completed.

No additional information may be provided via separate file attachments – your complete response to this section must be contained within this file. You must adhere to the word/page limits specified within each question

Files must be returned in one of the following formats:

1. WORD (.doc) – please ensure that files are saved in Word 97-2003 Document (.doc) format.
2. ADOBE (.pdf) – this is the preferred format, but must only be provided as searchable, unprotected files created by “File > Save As > .pdf” from recent Microsoft Word applications or from a PDF Writer. It is not permissible to provide scanned pdf images, as these are not searchable and may not be possible to read.

The file size of this document once completed should not exceed five Megabytes (5MB). Larger files may take significant time to open over the internet and cause delays in evaluation.

Provide your response within the spaces provided below. Do not amend this file in any other way.

Section 6	Commercial Capability	Response
	<p>This Section is weighted at 20%.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • 6.1.1 – 5% • 6.1.2 – 5% • 6.1.3 – 5% • 6.1.4 – 5% <p>Tenderers must score a <u>minimum</u> score of 9 – meets requirement per question to Pass.</p>	
6.1.1	<p>Provide details of your project/contract, relationship, and performance management processes and practices</p> <p>Unacceptable (0) = Processes judged to be in part or in whole unacceptable Poor (4) = Processes judged to be in part or in whole unsatisfactory Meets requirement (9) = Processes judged to be meet requirement Good (16) = Processes judged to be good or very good but no less with some benefits to risk mitigation and TfL cost reduction Outstanding (25) = Processes judged to be very good or excellent but no less, with significant risk reduction, TfL cost reduction, and other objective benefits</p>	
6.1.2	<p>Provide details of your approach to risk mitigation</p> <p>Unacceptable (0) = Risk mitigation approach judged to be in part or in whole unacceptable Poor (4) = Risk mitigation approach judged to be in part or in whole poor Meets requirement (9) = Risk mitigation approach judged to be satisfactory or good enough Good (16) = Risk mitigation approach judged to be good or very good but no less, with objective reductions in required risk provision, costs and liabilities Outstanding (25) = Risk mitigation judged to be very good or excellent but no less, with excellent controls, financial benefits, with positive contributions towards business performance</p>	
6.2.3	<p>Provide details of your approach to generation of value improvements for your clients and customers</p> <p>Unacceptable (0) = Uninterested in offering or participating in value improvement Poor (4) = Value improvements but open to</p>	

	<p>participation with us in developing initiatives</p> <p>Meets requirement (9) = Value improvement initiatives minor but achievable</p> <p>Good (16) = Value improvement a key feature of the bid with objective cost reduction, performance enhancement, and business benefits achievable</p> <p>Outstanding (25) = Value improvement a major contribution with significant objective cost reduction, performance enhancement and business benefits guaranteed</p>	
6.2.4	<p>Provide details of your approach to cost and price transparency and your level of sharing with clients and customers</p> <p>Unacceptable (0)= Approach judged to be in part or in whole unacceptable</p> <p>Poor (4) = Approach judged to be in part or in whole poor</p> <p>Meets requirement (9) = Approach judged to be satisfactory or good enough</p> <p>Good (16) = Approach judged to be good or very good but no less, and with cost savings associated with reductions in TfL resource required to verify the costs</p> <p>Outstanding (25) = Approach judged to be class leading with very good or excellent guaranteed reductions in cost to TfL</p>	

Section 7	Health, Safety and Environmental	
	<p>Responses are restricted to 750 words excluding Graphs and images.</p> <p>The following questions are discretionary pass/fail:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • 7.1.1 • 7.1.2 <p>This Section is weighted at 10%.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • 7.1.3 – 5% • 7.1.4 – 5% <p>Tenderers must score a <u>minimum</u> score of 9 – meets requirement per question to Pass.</p>	
7.1.1	<p>Provide your company health & safety policies signed by a senior member of the management team and reviewed within the last 12 months.</p> <p>Discretionary Pass/Fail</p>	
7.1.2	In the last five years has your organisation, parent	

	<p>company or subsidiary company been:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Prosecuted for a breach of Health and Safety or Environmental legislation? • Have any pending prosecutions? • Issued with any improvement or prohibition notices for breaches of health, safety and environmental legislation? <p>If answering yes to any of the above please provide a summary for each occurrence. In addition, provide full details of the most recent occurrence (i.e. investigation report) and the actions taken to prevent reoccurrence.</p> <p>Discretionary Pass/Fail</p>	
7.1.3	<p>Describe your selection process for your suppliers to ensure health & safety competence including;</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Identifying required competence/Capability • Initial Assessment • Approval • Ongoing Competence Monitoring <p>If your organisation does not sub-contract please describe your selection process for your in-house team to ensure health & safety competence to include the above list.</p> <p>Unacceptable (0) - exceeds word count. Does not have a selection system in place. Poor (4) - Has a system in place but requirements not fully identified in response. Meets the requirement (9) - Has a selection system in place which includes an assessment process that identifies competence, capability & a named person responsible for approval. Good (16) - As for "Meets the requirements" above and also includes clear expectations and ongoing competence monitoring. In addition, evidence provided that good lines of communication exist between the organisation and their suppliers or in house team. Outstanding (25) - As for "Good". In addition, the selection process is well incorporated into a Business Management or Assurance System and evidence of lessons learned outcomes introduced.</p>	
7.1.4	<p>Please provide the following: a) explain your company's H & S competence arrangements. Including staff competence requirements for the business, mechanism for recording and managing competence, training for staff/workforce appropriate to the type/s of activity your</p>	

	<p>organisation undertakes b) provide supporting documentation as evidence.</p> <p>(Supporting evidence excluded from word count).</p> <p>Unacceptable (0) - Does not have adequate competence arrangements as described and/or no supporting documentation provided.</p> <p>Poor (4) - The organisation's competence arrangements not fully or adequately explained in a) and b).</p> <p>Meets requirements (9) - Has clear competence requirements for staff. Competence is recorded and managed. Sufficient staff training is provided. Adequate supporting evidence provided.</p> <p>Good (16) - As for " Meets requirements" and has provided good examples/evidence of how the arrangements work, details of staff competence requirements, recording and managing processes and good, relevant staff training provided.</p> <p>Outstanding (25) - As for "Good " above and also indicates how the results are used to drive improvements and ensure staff continuously maintain competence.</p>	
--	---	--