

Platform Screen Doors System	C631
Tender Opening and Evaluation Plan (Deliverable 8)	54.0
The original document and completed Approvals and Authorisation Form are to be retained by the Procurement Manager.	

### Approvals

The following confirmation signatures are required for the Tender Opening and Evaluation Plan before submission for Authorisation.

Role	Name	Signature	Date
Procurement Leader	Clive Thomas	[Redacted]	17/07/14
Evaluation Manager	Paul Darlington	[Redacted]	18/9/14
Project Manager	<del>Gary Milligan</del> Jonathan Osgood	[Redacted]	18/2/14
Accountable Manager	<del>Siv Bhamra</del> Colin Gainsford	[Redacted]	
Procurement Manager	Clive Thomas	[Redacted]	17/07/14

### Procurement Authorisation

Following approvals, the Tender Opening and Evaluation Plan must be authorised by the Head of Procurement before proceeding to the next stage of the procurement process.

Role	Name	Signature	Date
Head of Procurement	Kevin Lloyd Davies		

The PLAN AS DRAFTED AT 14/8/14  
 BEEN EXECUTED. H23  
 ONLY DATES & MANAGER  
 NAMES HAVE CHANGED;  
 AS REVIEWED BY NOT REJECTED  
 [TO BE VIEWED] [Redacted] 14/8/14  
 C.F. GAINSFORD





## Procurement Department

# TENDER OPENING AND EVALUATION PLAN

Contract Notice: 2013/S 041-066187  
Contract C631 - Platform Screen Doors

Document Number: CRL1-XRL-V3-STP-CR001\_Z-50004

### Document History:

Version	Date	Author	Lead Reviewer	Approved by	Reason for Issue:
1.0		Clive Thomas			
2.0	14 March 2014	Clive Thomas			Revised for new return date and change in evaluators.
3.0	3 April 2014	Clive Thomas			Revised evaluator for questions E010 & E011
4.0	30 April 2014	Clive Thomas			Additional and revised evaluators, E003a6, E004, E005h and E008.
5.0	16 July 2014	Clive Thomas			Changed PM & Director and revised dates

This document contains proprietary information. No part of this document may be reproduced without prior written consent from the Chief Executive of Crossrail Ltd.

## Contents

<b>1 Introduction .....</b>	<b>3</b>
1.1 Purpose and application .....	3
1.2 Background.....	3
<b>2 Tender Opening and Evaluation Team .....</b>	<b>4</b>
2.1 Roles and Responsibilities .....	4
2.2 Suitability .....	5
<b>3 Tender Opening.....</b>	<b>6</b>
3.1 Approved Tender Opening and Evaluation Plan .....	6
3.2 Use of Crossrail eSourcing system .....	6
<b>4 Tender evaluation.....</b>	<b>7</b>
4.1 Tender Briefing .....	7
4.2 Use of AWARD .....	7
4.3 Scoring Technical Submissions .....	7
4.4 Scoring Commercial Submissions.....	9
4.5 Letter of Clarification .....	10
<b>5 Approvals and authorisation to Award Contracts .....</b>	<b>11</b>
5.1 Submission to Review Panel (above £10,000,000) .....	11
<b>6 Contract Award .....</b>	<b>12</b>
6.1 Award Decision Notice Letters .....	12
6.2 De-briefing .....	12
<b>Appendix A – Tender Programme .....</b>	<b>13</b>
<b>Appendix B – Tender Opening and Evaluation Stakeholders.....</b>	<b>14</b>
<b>Appendix C – Criteria and Assessor Assignment .....</b>	<b>15</b>

# 1 Introduction

## 1.1 Purpose and application

1.1.1 This document sets out the process of tender opening and evaluation carried out for each Crossrail tender. The purpose of the document is to ensure that the tender opening and evaluation:

- meets Crossrail Limited's (CRL's) and legislative requirements;
- is fully planned and communicated to the relevant stakeholders prior to tender opening;
- is fully transparent;
- treats all Tenderers equally and in a non-discriminatory way.

1.1.2 This document (and relevant sections of the ITT) shall be read and implemented by all assessors and those involved in the evaluation process (shown in Appendix B).

## 1.2 Background

1.2.1 Final tenders will be submitted using the Crossrail eSourcing system. Only those tender responses received via the e-Tendering service will be evaluated. The tenders are to be evaluated using the Most Economically Advantageous Tender (MEAT) process and by using Crossrail's balanced score card evaluation model.



## 2 Tender Opening and Evaluation Team

### 2.1 Roles and Responsibilities

- 2.1.1 The **Procurement Leader** is ultimately responsible for the tender evaluation process. The Procurement Leader will manage and oversee the implementation of this Tender Opening and Evaluation Plan and will be responsible for the management of the technical and commercial evaluation process, monitoring evaluation progress and production of the Contract Award Recommendation Report.
- 2.1.2 The **Procurement Manager** will be accountable for co-ordinating the Authorisation of the Contract Award Recommendation.
- 2.1.3 The **Procurement Production Manager** will be responsible for the ongoing operation of the Crossrail eSourcing system, including establishing appropriate access rights, training and preparing relevant information.
- 2.1.4 The **AWARD Administrator** will be responsible for the set-up and management of the Crossrail e-Evaluation system (AWARD), including training and establishing appropriate access rights. In addition to the responsibilities detailed above, the AWARD Administrator will ensure that the set-up of AWARD and the transfer of data from Crossrail eSourcing system have been undertaken correctly and checked. Confirmation of such checking shall be made in the Contract Award Recommendation Report. AWARD Reports covering progress, consensus meeting and results reports will be produced by the AWARD Administrator.
- 2.1.5 The **Technical Evaluation Panel** and the **Commercial Evaluation Panel** will be responsible for undertaking the evaluation of Tender submissions in accordance with this plan. If due to unforeseen circumstances any Assessors are unable to undertake the evaluation then they will nominate an alternative evaluator with the necessary competence to undertake that assessment. (Each alternative evaluator will be reviewed for their suitability in accordance with 2.2.1 below).
- 2.1.6 The **Consensus Scorer** will ensure that the criteria have been scored on a consistent and fair basis, fully in accordance with the evaluation procedures set out in the Procurement Code. The consensus scorer will be responsible for entering a single 'authority view' score based on the Assessors scores and the tender submissions. This score will be supported by a short summary rationale statement clearly highlighting the strengths and weaknesses of the submission for each criterion. If, after attempting to reach a consensus score, the Consensus Scorer decides that further specialist technical input is required in relation to any specific evaluation criterion, a person with the relevant competence will be nominated by the relevant department to provide such input in order to achieve a consensus score.
- 2.1.7 The **Review Panel** will be responsible for considering and approving the findings of the evaluation prior to the award recommendation being presented for authorisation. The Review Panel is convened by the Procurement Leader who will present the draft Contract Award Recommendation Report for review and comment.
- 2.1.8 Appendix B details the names of all stakeholders and panel members.

## 2.2 Suitability

- 2.2.1 In order to demonstrate that the nominated Assessors have the proficiency required to assess the criteria assigned to them, they will be required to provide details of their relevant experience, knowledge, qualifications, etc, demonstrating their competency to assess the criteria that they have been nominated to review. The Procurement Leader will provide the names of all nominated assessors to the Evaluation Management Team. They will check against currently approved competency statements and if necessary, seek competency statements and approvals. Assessors will not be allowed to undertake an evaluation until they have provided a competency statement and had it approved by someone senior in their line management chain.

All members of the Evaluation Panels, Review Panel and the Consensus Scorer must confirm that they do not have any personal or financial interest in, or previous working relationships with, any of the tendering organisations that presents a material or perceived risk to the objectivity of the process. This is confirmed by a declaration of Conflict Of Interest on the e-Evaluation system when an Assessor logs in for the first time to perform an evaluation. The Procurement Leader will maintain a record of all conflicts of interest should any be identified and refer to them to the Procurement Manager.

### **3 Tender Opening**

#### **3.1 Approved Tender Opening and Evaluation Plan**

3.1.1 Tender opening shall not commence until the Tender Opening and Evaluation Plan has been produced and approved.

#### **3.2 Use of Crossrail eSourcing system**

3.2.1 The tendering process is being conducted electronically using the Crossrail eSourcing system. The system:

- receives tender submissions, records the date and time received, and will not permit submissions after opening;
- records each submission received and retains the original copies of all submissions in a secure storage area that cannot be amended or deleted;
- helps to maintain separation between technical and commercial information; and
- maintains an audit trail of all communications with tenderers.



## **4 Tender evaluation**

### **4.1 Tender Briefing**

- 4.1.1 The Procurement Leader will invite all members of the Evaluation Panels to a Tender Briefing meeting, the purpose of which is to ensure that roles and duties are clearly understood ahead of the evaluation process.
- 4.1.2 Training and guidance will be given, as required, in the use of AWARD for inputting scores and rationale.
- 4.1.3 The Evaluation Panel members will ensure that they understand and make themselves fully conversant with the relevant ITT documents and the requirements of this plan. This is included in the AWARD assessor acknowledgement page which needs to be accepted prior to any evaluation.

### **4.2 Use of AWARD**

- 4.2.1 The tender evaluation scores, rationale and internal clarifications shall be recorded using AWARD. The AWARD system:
  - gives visibility of the Tender submissions to Assessors in a read-only format;
  - tracks evaluation progress;
  - records any clarifications raised by evaluators for the attention of the Procurement Leader;
  - records final evaluation scores and rationale in a secure storage area to provide an audit trail that underpins the contract award decision;
  - produces information to assist with consensus meetings, the production of Review Panel reports and feedback to Tenderers.

### **4.3 Scoring Technical Submissions**

- 4.3.1 The tendering process seeks to determine the most economically advantageous offer from the point of view of CRL (the Contracting Authority). Tenders will be evaluated using the criteria, scoring and weightings set out in the ITT.
- 4.3.2 The following principles should be kept in mind when evaluating the Tenderers' submissions:
  - all Tenderers will be given an equal opportunity to succeed;
  - the award criteria and scoring guidance will be followed and will be applied consistently and objectively without bias throughout the evaluation process;
  - no additional sub-criteria or sub-weightings will be introduced (by the Assessors); and
  - objective reasons for deciding on particular scores highlighting the key positives and negatives will be recorded to support de-briefing which is an integral part of The Utilities Contracts Regulations.

- 4.3.3 Assessors will ensure that the assessment is not undertaken in public areas and that it is not discussed with anyone not formally associated with this plan.
- 4.3.4 Each technical question will be scored on a scale from 'Major Concerns' through to 'Excellent Confidence' as shown in the ITT.
- 4.3.5 In the first instance, Technical Assessors will score the submissions independently and their scores will be supported by suitable rationale statements. These will be deemed to be draft scores.
- 4.3.6 Technical Assessors will record a full and accurate rationale in AWARD, ensuring that it captures the reasons behind the scores awarded for the responses to technical submissions. Comments should be aligned with the specified criteria and not to refer to any other matters not disclosed in the Information For Tenderers (IFT). Rationale statements will fully and clearly support the score awarded and give reasons in terms of submission strengths and any missing information or concerns.
- 4.3.7 Assessors will ensure that scores are based exclusively on what can be read in the written submissions. Any preconceptions that Assessors may have regarding tendering organisations through previous contact will be inadmissible.
- 4.3.8 Scores will be based on a clear and reasonable understanding of the submitted Tenders. Therefore, communication with Tenderers to clarify Tenders may be required during the Tender evaluation process. Assessors will not communicate directly with any Tenderer. Any issues requiring clarification that arise during the tender evaluation shall be discussed with the Procurement Leader. Management of communications with Tenderers is the responsibility of the Procurement Leader who will arrange for the clarification request to be communicated to Tenderers via BRAVO.
- 4.3.9 It is the responsibility of the Tenderers to present their proposals clearly in their tender submissions within the time allowed in the tender period. It is important to ensure that a Tenderer does not obtain an unfair advantage by being given an extra opportunity to submit new information, or to improve their presentation of material through the clarification process. The Regulations require all Tenderers to be treated equally and so if one Tenderer is given an opportunity to score marks by submitting new information as part of the clarification process then all Tenderers would have to be given the same opportunity. It is for this reason that in general extra marks should not be given as a result of clarifications. The approach should be for the Assessors whenever possible to base their initial score on the best interpretation of the tender proposal and if they are unsure on their interpretation then clarification or confirmation should be sought. If it is not possible to award a score then clarification may be obtained first but care should be taken not to award a score on the basis of new information. If confirmation is obtained then the initial score can be retained; if not, then the score may be reduced based on the correct understanding following clarification.
- 4.3.10 The only exceptions to the rule that the score should not be increased are if the clarification process shows that information was overlooked in the original tender which should have been scored or if an evaluator realises that a manifest error was made in the original evaluation and marking.
- 4.3.11 The Procurement Leader will review responses to clarifications to ensure that the response is purely a clarification and does not include additional material. Material that adds new



content to the submission rather than clarifying the submission will not be permitted and will not be evaluated.

- 4.3.12 Following the completion of the technical evaluation, the Consensus Scorer will begin to review the assessment made against each criteria for each tenderer and will enter a single 'authority view' score based on the Assessors scores and the tender submissions. This score will be supported by a short summary rationale statement clearly highlighting the strengths and weaknesses of the submission for each criteria.
- 4.3.13 If the Consensus Scorer is unable to reach a single score for any criteria, either due to the inadequacy of the evaluator scoring rationale or where Assessors do not have the same or a reconcilable score, a consensus meeting will be held with all parties involved in order to reach a consensus score. If considered necessary by the Consensus Scorer, a specialist person with the relevant competence will be nominated by the relevant department to provide advice to the Consensus Scorer in order that a consensus score can be achieved.
- 4.3.14 These meetings will be chaired and facilitated by the Consensus Scorer and attended by the relevant Assessors and other specialists if required. The Procurement Leader will also attend to ensure that the correct process is being observed.
- 4.3.15 The purpose of the consensus meetings will be to agree a single 'authority view' and supporting summary rationale statement.
- 4.3.16 Upon completion of the procedures within this plan the individual scores will be locked in AWARD. The final consensus scores will be used to give the overall weighted technical score for each Tenderer.

#### **4.4 Scoring Commercial Submissions**

- 4.4.1 The Commercial Evaluation Panel shall score the commercial submissions in AWARD. Guidance on the evaluation and scoring of the commercial submission is given the IFT.
- 4.4.2 If an error in the commercial submission of any Tender is identified, the Procurement Leader shall contact the Tenderer concerned to check whether an error has been made and if so, to request a written correction.
- 4.4.3 The Commercial Evaluation Panel will identify any Tenders that might be considered to be abnormally low in price and seek the approval of the Director of Procurement prior to instigating the abnormally low procedures described in the IFT. The abnormally low process can only be applied when the overall Tender is suspiciously low and not just elements of the Tender. Decisions as to whether to increase the notional price of abnormally low Tenders or whether to reject such Tenders will be made by the Procurement Director. Details of any adjustments will be included in the Contract Award Recommendation report.
- 4.4.4 The commercial scoring shall be undertaken independently of the technical scoring. Access to the commercial sections of the Tenders, and any evaluation of these, will not be available to anybody outside the Commercial Evaluation Panel until the Contract Award Recommendation Report is compiled.
- 4.4.5 The Commercial Evaluation Panel will enter the results of the commercial evaluation for each Tenderer into AWARD including any post-tender adjustments. These scores will be

combined with the technical scores to develop the overall score to be included in the Contract Award Recommendation Report and subsequent reported to the Review Panel.

#### **4.5 Letter of Clarification**

- 4.5.1 Following completion of the evaluation, the Procurement Leader shall prepare a draft letter or letters of clarification in accordance with Deliverable 9 in Section 2 of the Procurement Code.



## 5 Approvals and authorisation to Award Contracts

### 5.1 Submission to Review Panel (above £10,000,000)

5.1.1 After the Tender evaluation has been undertaken, the Procurement Leader will prepare a summary report of the tender evaluation activities, findings and score summary tables. The main contents of the Contract Award Recommendation Report to the Review Panel will be:

- Executive Summary
- Background
- Tender Receipt and Opening
- Evaluation Methodology
- Technical Scores
- Commercial Scores
- List Of Appendices
  - Appendix A Tender Opening Form
  - Appendix B Tender Opening and Evaluation Plan
  - Appendix C Low Scores Report

5.1.2 The Review Panel will consider this report and either:

- accept the Evaluation (namely, Technical and Commercial) Panels' findings;
- challenge the basis of scoring, or
- raise any queries in relation to the findings with the appropriate Evaluation Panel for clarification or further consideration.

5.1.3 The Procurement Leader will implement the required actions and amend the report accordingly. The final Contract Award Recommendation Report will be resubmitted to the Review Panel for approval.

5.1.4 After the Review Panel has accepted the Evaluation Panels' findings the Procurement Manager will co-ordinate the procurement authorisation for the recommended contract award.

## **6 Contract Award**

### **6.1 Award Decision Notice Letters**

- 6.1.1 Following the receipt of formal authorisation to notify Tenderers of the intention to award the Contract, the successful Tenderer and all unsuccessful Tenderers will be notified of the intended contract award, at the same time, by letter signed by the Head of Procurement. This communication will be undertaken using the Crossrail eSourcing system. The letters will state that Contract Award will be subject to the required standstill period.

### **6.2 De-briefing**

- 6.2.1 De-briefing is an integral part of the procurement process and CRL are obliged to give details of the reasons for rejection of Tenders and information on the characteristics and relative advantages of the winning bid.
- 
- 6.2.2 The detailed reasons will be compiled from the information entered into AWARD. A failure to enter in AWARD accurate evaluation records that are suitable for supporting the contract award processes introduces significant risks to CRL. Procedural challenges could result in CRL being prevented from awarding contracts, damages being awarded to tenderers and, in limited circumstances, contracts being cancelled because they are declared ineffective.
- 6.2.3 De-briefing to Tenderers will be led by the Procurement Manager and provided by the same team on a consistent basis to all Tenderers. The composition of the de-briefing team will be agreed with the Procurement Director as appropriate.

## Appendix A – Tender Programme

Contract Notice: 2013/S 041-066187

Contract C631 - Platform Screen Doors

The ITT documents were issued to Tenderers on 22 November 2013.

Tenders are due to be returned on 7 April 2014.

The tender evaluation programme will be managed by the Procurement Leader. The key dates in the evaluation programme are as follows:

Planned activity	Date
Assessor briefing	3 March 2014
Tender return date	7 April 2014
Tender opening	7 April 2014
AWARD opened for evaluation	9 April 2014
Finalise technical evaluation	13 May 2014
Complete consensus scoring	29 May 2014
Complete negotiations regarding any qualifications and TPOs	19 June 2014
Complete commercial evaluation	21 May 2014
Submit Report to the Review Panel	26 June 2014
Review Panel meeting	<del>03 July</del> 06 Aug 2014
Submit Contract Award Recommendation Report Paper	<del>08 July</del> 05 Aug 2014
CSC Meeting	<del>16 July</del> 13 Aug 2014
Approval to award contract	<del>16 July</del> 13 Aug 2014
Issue Award Decision Notice letters	<del>18 July</del> 14 Aug 2014
Standstill period ends	<del>30 July</del> 27 Aug 2014
Execute contract	<del>01 Aug</del> 29 Aug 2014
Submit Contract Award Notice to OJEU	<del>15 Aug</del> 12 Sept 2014

## Appendix B – Tender Opening and Evaluation Stakeholders

Evaluation Panel – see Appendix C

Review Panel

Role	Name
Head of Procurement	Kevin Lloyd Davies
Accountable Manager	<del>Siv Bhamra</del> Jonathan Osgood
Relevant Delivery Director	<del>Chris Sexton</del> Colin Gainsford
Head of Contract Administration	David Morrice

Supporting Roles

Role	Name
Procurement Leader	Clive Thomas
Procurement Manager	Clive Thomas
Consensus Scorer	Paul Darlington
Procurement Production Manager	Paul Darlington
AWARD Administrator	Ana Vaccaro
Evaluation Manager	Paul Darlington



## Appendix C – Criteria and Assessor Assignment

Award criteria	Assessor names (Minimum 2 names per question on section E-M unless approved by Procurement Director)
A – Conflicts of Interest	Clive Thomas
B – Contractual Considerations	Clive Thomas
C – Performance Bonds, PCGs & Accounts	Tom Morgan
D - Insurances	Clive Thomas
E - General approach to delivery	
E001 – Leadership	Russell Pilgrim & Stuart Powls
E002a – Organisation Chart	Gary Milligan & Jonathan Osgood
E002b – Key People Resource Profile	Richard Burn & Desmond McCann
E002c – Management Planning	Gary Milligan & Jonathan Osgood
E003a1 – Project Manager	Gary Milligan & Russell Pilgrim
E003a2 - Construction Manager	Gary Milligan & Frederick Russell
E003a3 – Commercial Manager	Michael Oliver & Michael Mullaly
E003a4 – Design Manager	Gary Milligan & Bob Kent
E003a5 – Project Controls Manager	Michael Oliver & Michael Mullaly
E003a6 – Testing & Commissioning Manager	Frederic Sancho & Frank Foley
E003a7 – Integration Manager	George Georgiou & Jim Claxton
E004 – Execution Plan	Frank Foley & Jonathan Osgood
E005a - Elevations & Details	Julian Robinson & Wicek Sosna
E005b – Earthing & Bonding	Gary Milligan & Andy Power
E005c – RAM	Jim Claxton & Jon Jarrett
E005d – Entrapment Detection	Pierre Chartier & Frank Foley
E005e – Advertising Cassette	Julian Robinson & Wicek Sosna
E005f – Engineering Interface	Mark O'Donnell & Frank Foley
E005g – Delivery method statement	Gary Milligan & Frank Foley
E005h – Installation method statement	Frank Foley & Fred Russell
E006 – Supply Chain Strategies	Simon Pain & Gary Wright
E007 – Undertakings & Assurances	Sam Hernandez & Gareth Epps
E008 - Design Management	Mark O'Donnell & Jonathan Osgood & Pierre Chartier
E009 – Design Schedule	Mark O'Donnell & Desmond McCann
E010 – Risk Management Plan	Andy Lees & Michael Oliver
E011 – Risk Log	Andy Lees & Michael Oliver

<b>Award criteria</b>	<b>Assessor names (Minimum 2 names per question on section E-M unless approved by Procurement Director)</b>
<b>F - Delivering a high quality product</b>	
F001a – Self Certification	Steve Smith & Ian Streeter
F001b – Quality Assurance	Steve Smith & Ian Streeter
F001c – Quality Risk Management	Steve Smith & Ian Streeter
F002a – Quality Manager	Steve Smith & Ian Streeter
F003 – Quality Resource	Steve Smith & Ian Streeter
<b>G - Delivering the contract to budget</b>	
G001 - Delivering the contract to budget	Michael Mullaly & Carole Noel
<b>H - Delivering the contract on time</b>	
H001 – Tender Programme	Richard Burn & Desmond McCann
H002 – Approach to Delivering the Programme	Richard Burn & Desmond McCann
<b>J - Health &amp; Safety delivery</b>	
J001a – H&S Risks (working area)	Jon Mildwater & Peter Shanahan
J001b – H&S Risks (Interfaces)	Jon Mildwater & Peter Shanahan
J001c – H&S Risks (Workforce)	Jon Mildwater & Peter Shanahan
J002 – H&S Manager	Jon Mildwater & Peter Shanahan
J003 – H&S Key Inputs & Deliverables from Others	Jon Mildwater & Peter Shanahan
<b>K - Sustainable and Responsible Delivery</b>	
K001 – Environmental Management Plan	Mike de Silva & Daniel Bowden
K002 – Environmental Manager	Mike de Silva & Daniel Bowden
K003 – Responsible Procurement	Anne-Sophie Blin & Farha Musa
<b>L - Managing Interfaces</b>	
L001 – Interface Risks	George Georgiou & Bob Kent
<b>M - Price</b>	Chris Carr & Jean Marie Galle

Note – all assessors must have an approved competency statement before they can begin evaluating. Please check with Evaluation Management Team