



Stage 2 – Award Criteria

Tenders that have met the minimum standards of professional ability will be evaluated using the following criteria and associated weightings.

Criteria	Weight		Your Score	Weighted Score	Comments	
Methodology: Contract Management Arrangements	10%	Scoring System				
			Measure	4	8	
		5	Excellent response that meets the requirements. Indicates an excellent response with detailed supporting evidence and no weaknesses.			<p><i>Regular progress meetings.</i> <i>Recognise contingency through no named personnel.</i> <i>RF by Wilby Postle which is very good</i></p> 
		4	A good response that meets the Client's requirements with good supporting evidence. Demonstrates good understanding.			
		3	Meets Requirements. The response generally meets the Client's requirements, but lacks sufficient detail to warrant a higher mark.			
		2	A response with reservations. Lacks convincing detail of the methodology to be applied.			
		1	An unacceptable response with serious reservations. Limited detail of the methodology to be applied.			
0	Failed to address the questions					

Stage 2 – Award Criteria

Tenders that have met the minimum standards of professional ability will be evaluated using the following criteria and associated weightings.

Criteria	Weight		Your Score	Weighted Score	Comments	
Methodology: Resource Allocation	15%	Scoring System	4	12	<p><i>Appropriate overall number of days</i> <i>Balance between consultant, economist</i> <i>is appropriate</i> <i>33 days at inception (data collection)</i> <i>which could be reduced if data</i> <i>already collected is accounted for.</i></p> 	
		Measure				
		5				Excellent response that meets the requirements. Indicates an excellent response with detailed supporting evidence and no weaknesses.
		4				A good response that meets the Client's requirements with good supporting evidence. Demonstrates good understanding.
		3				Meets Requirements. The response generally meets the Client's requirements, but lacks sufficient detail to warrant a higher mark.
		2				A response with reservations. Lacks convincing detail of the methodology to be applied.
		1				An unacceptable response with serious reservations. Limited detail of the methodology to be applied.
		0				Failed to address the questions

Stage 2 – Award Criteria

Tenders that have met the minimum standards of professional ability will be evaluated using the following criteria and associated weightings.

Criteria	Weight	Scoring System	Measure	Your Score	Weighted Score	Comments
Methodology: Methodology to meet each of the requirements in section 9 of the ToR	40%			4	16	
		5	Excellent response that meets the requirements. Indicates an excellent response with detailed supporting evidence and no weaknesses.			<p><i>Tasks and activities at each of the 10 steps.</i></p> <p><i>Strategic context detailed the background issues</i></p> <p><i>SUMNET targets linked to objectives of NZI</i></p> <p><i>Detailed rules to the policy</i></p> <p><i>NZVI is very good</i></p> <p><i>Understanding of issues regarding land use, building reg etc</i></p> <p><i>Section 4 - identified potential impacts on oil and gas sector.</i></p> <p><i>List of data required/heard some has already been collected.</i></p> <p><i>No reference to additionality or deadweight.</i></p>
		4	A good response that meets the Client's requirements with good supporting evidence. Demonstrates good understanding.			
		3	Meets Requirements. The response generally meets the Client's requirements, but lacks sufficient detail to warrant a higher mark.			
		2	A response with reservations. Lacks convincing detail of the methodology to be applied.			
		1	An unacceptable response with serious reservations. Limited detail of the methodology to be applied.			
		0	Failed to address the questions			

CONTRACT NAME AND REFERENCE: PROJECT 3882 Economic Appraisal of a Northern Ireland Renewable Heat Incentive

NAME OF TENDERER: *CEPA*

DATE OF EVALUATION: 10/12/10

Stage 1. Selection Criteria

Failure to meet the minimum standards of professional ability will result in the remainder of the tender offer not being assessed.

Selection Criteria	Indicator	Comments
1. Professional Ability	Pass/Fail	
Each of the following members of the proposed team – Project Manager, Principal Engineer and Principal Economist must be able to demonstrate by way of 2 case studies within the last three years that they have experience of providing technical, environmental and economic consultancy advice in relation to renewable heat, that they have experience of cost benefit analysis / economic appraisal of major energy infrastructure projects. This must include evidence of the collation and assessment of complex data in relation to renewable heat/ heat markets		

Cost	35%		20.2	
Total Score	100%		72.2	

SIGNED BY EVALUATION TEAM

Signed [Signature] Printed Peter Hutchinson Date 10/12/10
Signed Samuel Connolly Printed SAMUEL CONNOLLY Date 10/12/10
Signed Alison Clydesdale Printed ALISON CLYDESDALE Date 10/12/10
Signed _____ Printed _____ Date _____

SSD REPRESENTATIVE (S) – (Do not score, provide procurement advice)

1. Signed Paul Joyce Printed PAUL JOYCE Date 10/12/10