



Compiler guidance note

Component document: T1.2 - Tender Data

Function and broad outline of contents

States the applicable conditions of tender and associated tender specific data that establishes the rules from the time that tenders are invited to the time that a tender is awarded.

Notes

Sub-clause 4.4.3.1 of the Standard for Uniformity in Construction Procurement requires that the Tender Data reference the Standard Conditions of Tender contained in Annex F.

The Tender Data informs tenderers about the tendering procedures that are to be observed and the documentation that needs to be submitted with tender offers, failing which, tender offers may be rejected or not be evaluated. The Tender Data also establishes the manner in which the employer undertakes to conduct the tender process and to evaluate tender offers. The Tender Data does this by establishing a set of generic rules relating to the process of offer and acceptance and the tender specific variables relating thereto.

The Standard Conditions of Tender anticipate that certain information associated with particular sub-clauses will be found in the Tender Data. **Such sub-clauses may be voided should such information not be provided.**

The clauses and sub-clauses in the Standard Conditions of Tender are prefixed with the letter F.

The Standard furthermore requires that the tender offer validity period not generally not exceed **eight** weeks and in exceptional circumstances, not exceed **12 weeks** (sub-clause 4.4.3.3), and provides standard wording in sub-clause 4.4.3.4 relating to the manner in which the standard tender evaluation methods are referenced in the Tender Data. The Standard in sub-clause 4.3 provides a number of ways in which **quality** may be ensured in the work. The ways in which quality may be addressed through the Tender Data are by:

- a) taking cognizance of whole-life costing in the financial evaluation of tender offers;
- b) introducing quality into the eligibility criteria;
- c) establishing a category of preference for quality in the evaluation of tenders; or
- d) evaluating selected quality (functionality) criteria as an integral part of the tender offer.

Sub-clauses 4.3.2 to 4.3.6 of the Standard address the evaluation of quality in tender submissions. They describe what quality is and what it is not. They also include examples of what constitutes quality and provides guidance on how to evaluate quality criteria.

Sub-clause 4.3.5 requires quality to be evaluated in terms of prompts for judgment by at least three persons who are fully conversant with the technical aspects of the procurement. Sub-clause 4.3.6 requires that the prompts for judgment or qualitative indicators are communicated are communicated to tenderers in procurement documents.

Sub-clause 4.5 of the Standard prescribes standard wording that must be used to apply the register of contractors.

Commentary:

- 1 The tender data establish the rules which:
 - a) bind the employer and tenderer to behave in a particular manner;
 - b) establish what a tenderer must do to submit a compliant tender;

- c) make known to tenderers the criteria by which the tenderer will be evaluated;
- d) establish the manner in which the employer will conduct the process of offer and acceptance; and
- e) provide the necessary feedback to tenderer on the outcomes of the process

The tender data furthermore establish the precise means by which a preferred tenderer will be identified in a competitive selection process and preferred tenders will be identified for each successive round of negotiations in the competitive negotiation procedure. The award criteria, weightings assigned to such criteria, the relevant ratios between and the formula for scoring financial offer, quality and preference, and any threshold scores for quality must be stated in the tender data.

- 2 Tender offers may only be evaluated in accordance with the evaluation criteria stipulated in the procurement documents. It is therefore essential that the manner in which this is to be done is precisely described in the Tender Data. Sub-clause 4.4.3 of the Standard for Uniformity in Construction Procurement requires that specific wording be incorporated in the Tender Data to precisely define how the evaluation is to take place. These requirements are aligned with the requirements of laws governing public sector procurement. The text may be varied to accommodate private sector procurement requirements as such procurement is not constrained by law.
- 3 The involvements of women and black persons in contracts should not be evaluated in the form of quality criteria in public contracts. This must be addressed in the preferencing points. It should be noted in this regard that the courts have already ruled that empowerment is specifically catered for in the preference points system. (See Reported case (2002[3] All SA 336 ((case No 18276/2001 in the High Court of South Africa)). Furthermore, the Supply Chain Management Circular issued by National Treasury on 10/05/2005 states that “ *Preference points for HDI involvement may not be included as part of functionality, but should be provided for separately as part of the 10 or 20 points allocated for specific goals.*” Sub-clause 4.3.4 the Standard for Uniformity in Construction Procurement prohibits the inclusion of social considerations, such as the composition of workforces in terms of race, gender or disability in quality criteria.
- 4 Any eligibility criteria introduced into the Tender Data should generally be based on the demonstration of the following, as necessary:
 - a) professional and technical qualifications;
 - b) professional and technical competence;
 - c) financial resources;
 - d) equipment and other physical facilities;
 - e) managerial capacity, reliability, experience; and
 - f) reputation.

Eligibility criteria framed around race and gender may be regarded as a “*the denial of access to opportunities*”, an action prohibited in terms of sections 7 and 8 of the Promotion of Equality and Prevention of Unfair Discrimination Act of 2000 (Act 4 of 2000). Eligibility criteria must not be used to create captive or restricted markets or to erect unjustifiable barriers to trade.

- 5 Quality should only be introduced into the evaluation of tender submissions where it is required to achieve policy objectives in terms of an organization’s procurement policy or it is justifiable in terms of procurement outcomes. Quality measures must not promote captive markets and should result in quality that is appropriate to comply with user requirements as opposed to the best quality available.
- 6 Quality criteria used in the evaluation of tender offers must form an integral part of the tender offer and hence the outcome of the procurement. Such criteria must:
 - a) relate directly to the supplies, services or engineering and construction works that are being procured and to matters that cannot directly be expressed in monetary terms;
 - b) be justifiable in terms of projected procurement outcomes;
 - c) enable the most economically advantageous offer to be established; and
 - d) to the extent practicable, be objective and quantifiable.

Quality criteria may include criteria such as:

- a) technical merit;
- b) response to (ability to relate to) the proposed scope of work/project design
- c) aesthetic and functional characteristics;
- d) safety and environmental characteristics;
- e) quality control practices and procedures which ensure compliance with stated employer’s requirements;
- f) reliability;

- g) durability;
- h) organization, logistics and support resources relevant to the scope of work;
- i) qualifications and demonstrated experience of the key staff (assigned personnel) in relation to the scope of work;
- i) demonstrated experience of tendering entity with respect to specific aspects of the project / comparable projects;
- j) running costs;
- k) after-sales service and technical assistance;
- l) delivery date; and
- m) delivery period or period of completion

Quality criteria must not include matters relating to the basic capability or capacity of the tendering entity to execute the contract. Quality criteria should wherever appropriate be rated as “poor”, “satisfactory”, “good” or “very good” in terms of qualitative criteria that is communicated to tenderers. Fixed scores should be assigned against each of these ratings.

- 7 The Construction Regulations issued in terms of the Occupational Health and Safety Act of 1993 state the following:

4(4) No client shall appoint a principal contractor to perform construction work, unless the client is reasonably satisfied that the principal contractor that he or she intends to appoint has the necessary competencies and resources to carry out the work safely.

*4.(1) A client shall be responsible for the following in order to ensure compliance with the provisions of the Act —
(g) to ensure that every principal contractor is registered and in good standing with the compensation fund or with a licensed compensation insurer prior to work commencing on site*

This is one of the legal reasons for rejecting a tender offer submitted by a tenderer (see clause 3.13 of the Standard Conditions of Tender).

- 8 Regulation 16A9.2 of the Supply Chain Management Regulations issued in terms of the Public Finance Management Act and Regulations 38(1)(g) of the Supply Chain Management Regulations issued in terms of the Municipal Finance Management Act allow an organ of state to disregard a tender if the tenderer or any of its directors have abused the organ of state’s supply chain management system, committed fraud or any other improper conduct in relation to such system or have failed to perform on any previous contract. This is one of the legal reasons for rejecting a tender offer submitted by a tenderer (see clause 3.13 of the Standard Conditions of Tender).

It should be noted that Regulation 38(1)(g) looks at a period of 5 years over which a contractor has failed to perform.

- 9 Regulation 44 of the Local Government: Municipal Finance Management Act, 2003, Municipal Supply Chain Management Regulations prohibits the award of a contract to a natural person who is in the service of the state or to a juristic person with a director, manager, principal shareholder or stakeholder is a person who is in the employ of the state. Regulation 44 requires that the notes to the annual financial statements of a municipality or municipal entity must disclose any award of a contract of more than R2000 to a person who is a spouse, child or parent of a person in the service of the state in the previous 12 months.

A person in the employ of the state may in terms of section 30 of the Public Service Act, 1994 as amended by Public Service Labour Relations Act, 1994, provide services in terms of a public sector contract to the state provided that his or her conditions of employment make provision to do so or he or she has the President’s, Deputy President’s Minister’s, the Premier’s or the Member of the Executive Council’s, as appropriate, permission to do so.

Chapter 2 of the Public Service Regulations (Code of Conduct) requires a person in the employ of the state to obtain permission to undertake remunerative work outside her or his official duties.

Chapter 3 of the Public Service Regulations (Code of Conduct) requires that members of the Senior Management Service and accounting officers must declare and register their shares and other financial interests in private or public companies and other corporate entities recognised by law; directorships and partnerships; remunerated work outside the public service; and consultancies and retainerships.

The code of conduct Code of conduct (SCM 4 of 2003) and Regulation 16A8.3 of the Supply Chain Management Regulations issued in terms of the Public Finance Management Act requires officials to disclose and avoid conflicts of interest.

Accordingly, a person in the employ of the state may provide services in terms of a public sector contract provided that:

- 1) either his or her conditions of employment make provision to do so or he or she has the President's, Deputy President's Minister's, the Premier's or the Member of the Executive Council's, as appropriate, permission to do so; and
- 2) it does not present any conflicts of interest or compromise the work that he or she does for the state..

This is one of the legal reasons for rejecting a tender offer submitted by a tenderer (see clause 3.13 of the Standard Conditions of Tender). It should be noted that the Compulsory Enterprise Questionnaire facilitates the capturing of the information required to ensure compliance with the abovementioned requirements.

- 10 Tender evaluation criteria need to be disclosed to tenderers in a fair, equitable and transparent procurement system. Accordingly, all criteria and weightings need to be disclosed within the procurement documents, and no additional criteria may be imposed after the tenders close.

It is important that the wording for the evaluation of tender offers contained in the Standard for Uniformity in Construction Procurement be used without amendment in the public sector. The Preferential Procurement Policy Framework Act (Act 5 of 2000) only makes provision for the evaluation of tender offers on the basis of "price" and "preference." As a result, points for quality, financial offer and preference cannot be scored separately and combined arithmetically to arrive at a final score. What can be done is to combine the separate scores for quality and financial offer into a scoring of value for money and to treat this score as the "price", which may then be scored and combined with "preference" in the manner contemplated in the PPPFA.

The Regulations issued in terms of this Act allows the calculation of points for price and functionality (quality) when functionality is regarded as an important evaluation criterion. In this case the tenderer who scored the highest combination of points for price and functionality, must score 80 or 90 points, while other tenderers should score on a pro-rata basis less points out of 80 or 90.

The results of the tender evaluation may be affected by the approach and formula that is adopted as illustrated in the example below. In the interests of transparency, the precise method of evaluating tender submissions must be fully described in the Tender Data.

Note: The Standard for Uniformity in Construction Procurement requires that the following formulae be used with the following methods:

Method	Formula for financial offer	Formula for quality	Formula for combining quality and financial offer
1 Financial offer	-	-	-
2 Financial offer and preferences	<p>Highest price or discount: $W_1 \times A = (1 + \frac{P - P_m}{P_m})$</p> <p>Lowest price or percentage commission/ fee $W_1 \times A = (1 - \frac{P - P_m}{P_m})$</p> <p>Where W_1 is equal to 80 or 90 P_m is the comparative offer of the most favourable tender offer. P is the comparative offer of tender offer under consideration.</p>	-	-
3 Financial offer and quality	<p>Highest price or discount: $W_1 \times A = (1 + \frac{P - P_m}{P_m})$</p> <p>or $W_1 \times A = P / P_m$</p> <p>Lowest price or percentage commission/ fee $W_1 \times A = (1 - \frac{P - P_m}{P_m})$</p> <p>or $W_1 \times A = P_m / P$</p> <p>Where W_1 is the percentage score given to financial offer</p>	$W_Q = W_2 \times S_Q / M_S$	$T_{EV} = N_{FO} + N_P$ where: N_{FO} is the number of tender evaluation points awarded for the financial offer N_P is the number of tender evaluation points awarded for preferences claimed

	Pm is the comparative offer of the most favourable tender offer. P is the comparative offer of tender offer under consideration.		
4 Financial offer, quality and preferences	<p>Highest price or discount: $W_1 \times A = P / P_m$</p> <p>Lowest price or percentage commission/ fee $W_1 \times A = P_m / P$</p> <p>Where W_1 is the percentage score given to financial offer Pm is the comparative offer of the most favourable tender offer. P is the comparative offer of tender offer under consideration.</p>	$W_Q = W_2 \times S_Q / M_S$ where W_2 is the percentage score given to quality and equals ____* S_Q is the score for quality allocated to the submission under consideration M_S is the maximum possible score for quality in respect of a submission	<p>Private sector $T_{EV} = N_{FO} + N_P + N_Q$</p> <p>where: N_{FO} is the number of tender evaluation points awarded for the financial offer; N_P is the number of tender evaluation points awarded for preferences; N_Q is the number of tender evaluation points awarded for quality</p> <p>Public sector * $W_C = W_3 \times \frac{(1+(S-S_m))}{S_m}$</p> <p>Where W_3 is the number of tender evaluation points for quality and financial offer and equals 80 / 90 S is the sum of score for quality and financial offer of the submission under consideration S_m is sum of the score for quality and financial offer of the submission scoring the highest number of points</p>

Note: * The wording to be included in the tender data is prescribed in clause 4.5 of the CIDB Standard for Uniformity in Construction Procurement.

Example 1: Financial offer and preference

Tenderer A tenders an amount of R 1 000 000 to construct houses for the public sector and is the lowest financial offer received. Tenderer B tenders an amount of R 1 050 000, Tenderer C an amount of R 1 100 000, Tenderer D an amount of R 1 070 000 and Tenderer E an amount of R 1 030 000.

What are the tender evaluation points for financial offer that these tenderers receive, if the value for W_1 provided for in the Tender Data is 90 and method 2 (financial offer and preferences) is to be used in the evaluation of tenders.?

Note: Formula 2 is selected because the tenderer with the lowest financial offer is the most favourable offer. Option 1 is selected as the Standard for Uniformity in Construction Procurement requires that this option is to be selected for public sector projects.

- Tenderer A gets 90 points (i.e. the maximum), as this is this most favourable financial offer received.
- Tenderer B obtains $90 \times (1 - \frac{(P - P_m)}{P_m}) = 90 \times (1 - \frac{(1\,050\,000 - 1\,000\,000)}{1\,000\,000}) = 90 \times (1 - 0.05) = 90 \times 0.95 = 85,50$ points
- Tenderer C obtains $90 \times (1 - \frac{(1\,100\,000 - 1\,000\,000)}{1\,000\,000}) = 81,00$ points
- Tenderer D obtains $90 \times (1 - \frac{(1\,070\,000 - 1\,000\,000)}{1\,000\,000}) = 83,70$ points
- Tenderer E obtains $90 \times (1 - \frac{(1\,030\,000 - 1\,000\,000)}{1\,000\,000}) = 87,30$ points

Example 2: Financial offer and preference

Tenderer F tenders a discount of 10% on the tariff of fees for architectural services in terms of a public sector tender. Tenderer G tenders a discount of 11%. What are the tender evaluation points for price that these two tenderers receive, if the value for W_1 provided for in the Tender Data is 80 and method 2 (financial offer and preferences) is to be used in the evaluation of tenders.?

Note: Formula 1 is selected because the tenderer with the highest financial offer is the most favourable offer.

Tender G gets 80 points (i.e. the maximum) as this is the most favourable offer received.

Tenderer F obtains $80 \times (1 + \frac{(10-11)}{11}) = 80 \times 0.9091 = 72,73$ points

Example 3: Financial offer, quality and preference

Tenders are invited. Three tenders are received and are scored by the tender evaluation panel as follows:

Tenderer	Financial offer	Quality score of 100 (max)	Preference granted
A	R1 050 000	55,2	0
B	R 1 550 000	84,53	8
C	R 2 050 000	98	2,5

The weighting between financial offer and quality is 20:80 and preferences count a maximum of 10 points with financial offer and quality 90 points.

1 Scoring using simple formula (private sector approach)

The points for financial offer, quality and preference (private sector) are 72 (80 / 100 x 90), 18 (20 / 100 x 90) and 10

The score for quality is to be calculated using the following formula:

$$W_Q = W_2 \times S_O / M_S$$

where W_2 is the weighting given to quality and equals 72
 S_O is the score for quality allocated to the submission under consideration
 M_S is the maximum possible number of tender evaluation points awarded for the quality as stated in the tender

Score financial offer using the following formula (option 2):

$$(1 - \frac{P - P_m}{P_m}) 18$$

where:
 P_m = the comparative offer of the most favourable tender offer.
 P = the comparative offer of tender offer under consideration.

Tenderer	Score for financial offer	Score for quality	Score for preference	Total	Ranking
A	18	39,74	0	57,74	3
B	9,43	60,86	8	78,29	1
C	0,86	70,56	2,5	73,92	2

Note: If tenderer C tendered an amount above R 2 100 000, the formula would yield a negative number and as a result cannot be scored.

If option 1 (P_m/P) 18 was used to score tenderers, the results would have been as follows:

Tenderer	Score for financial offer	Score for quality	Score for preference	Total	Ranking
A	18	39,74	0	57,74	3
B	12,19	60,86	8	81,05	2
C	9,22	70,56	2,5	82,28	1

The use of the alternative formula changes the competitive position of tenderers. It is for this reason that the precise formula must be stated in the tender data.

2 Use approach contained in the Standard for Uniformity in Construction Procurement and National Treasury SCM Practice Note 3

The percentage weighting is
The score for quality is to be calculated using the following formula:

$$W_Q = W_2 \times S_O / M_S$$

where W_2 is the percentage score given to quality and equals 80
 S_O is the score for quality allocated to the submission under consideration
 M_S is the maximum possible score for quality in respect of a submission

The score for financial offer is calculated using the following formula where W_1 is the percentage score given to financial offer and equals 20:
 $P_m / P \times W_1$

where:
 P_m = the comparative offer of the most favourable tender offer.
 P = the comparative offer of tender offer under consideration.

The score for quality and financial offer is combined, before the addition of the score for preference, as follows:

$$W_C = W_3 \times \frac{(1 + (S - S_m))}{S_m}$$

Where W_3 is the number of tender evaluation points for quality and financial offer and equals 90
 S is the sum of score for quality and financial offer of the submission under consideration
 S_m is sum of the score for quality and financial offer of the submission scoring the highest number of points

Tenderer	Score for financial	Score for quality	Combined	Score for offer	Score for preference	Total	Ranking
----------	---------------------	-------------------	----------	-----------------	----------------------	-------	---------

	offer						
A	20	44,16	64,16	65,14	0	65,14	3
B	13,55	67,62	81,17	82,42	8	90,42	2
C	10,24	78,40	88,64	90	2,5	92,50	1

Had the alternative formula for the calculation of price be used as set out below, the results would have been as follows:

$$(1 - \frac{P - P_m}{P_m}) \times 20$$

Tenderer	Score for financial offer	Score for quality	Combined	Score for offer	Score for preference	Total	Ranking
A	20	44,16	64,16	72,77	0	72,77	3
B	10,48	67,62	78,10	88,58	10	98,58	1
C	0,95	78,40	79,35	90	2,5	92,5	2

Note: It is always preferable to use the formula $P_m / P \times W$, to score the financial offer as it will not yield a negative number. The use of the alternative formula changes the competitive position of tenderers. It is for this reason that the precise formula must be stated in the tender data.

11 Examples of commonly encountered quality criteria, appropriate to the different categories of contract are listed in Table 1. Table 2 provides a range of indicative quality / financial offer ratios which are appropriate to a range of professional services and construction works. It should be noted that in terms of clause 4.3.6 of the Standard for Uniformity in Construction Procurement, the scoring of interviews is not to form a substantive portion of the overall scoring for quality.

The prompts for judgments provided to the tender evaluation panel should be framed around those provided in Tables 3 or 4. The making known of the prompts for judgment to prospective tenderers allows tenderers or respondents to focus their submissions.

The prompts for judgment must in terms of the Standard for Uniformity in Construction Procurement be included in procurement documents.

Table 1: Examples of commonly encountered quality criteria

Category of contract	Description of quality criteria
Construction works	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Quality control / health and safety / environmental practices and procedures which are geared to satisfying stated requirements • Technical approach / methodology / proposed programme to satisfying stated employer's objectives / managing project risks • Demonstrable capability to mobilize own, hired and subcontracted resources in projects of a similar nature • Qualifications / experience of staff allocated to the project / availability of skills to manage and perform the contract (assigned personnel) • Experience (track record) on previous contracts of a similar nature, scope or complexity (over the last five years). <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Availability of equipment and personnel required for the project and contingency plans. • Management structure and resources allocated to the contract • Time to practical completion • Aesthetic (design and construct / develop and construct contracts) • Functional characteristics (design and construct / develop and construct contracts) • Projected life cycle costs of the works (design and construct / develop and construct contracts)

Category of contract	Description of quality criteria
Services (including professional services)	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Response to (ability to relate to) the proposed scope of work/project design (Approach paper) which establishes the manner in which the respondent or tenderer intends to perform the contract and add value in the attainment of the employer's stated objectives • Adequacy of proposed work plan and proposed methodology • Organization, logistics and support resources • Demonstrable managerial ability appropriate to the size and nature of work • Control procedures • Qualifications and competence of the key staff (assigned personnel) in relation to the scope of work • Demonstrated experience (past performance) in comparable projects • Demonstrated experience with respect to specific aspects of the project • Experience (familiarity) in the region or similar regions (local knowledge) • Quality assurance systems which ensure compliance with stated employer's requirements • Sound knowledge of the employer's policies or work procedures (or both) • Arrangements for the transfer of knowledge • Demonstrable capability to mobilize own, hired and subcontracted resources in projects of a similar nature
Supplies	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Attainment of quality standards e.g. quality marks • Quality assurance systems / environmental practices which ensure compliance with stated employer's requirements or objectives • Periods for delivery • Availability of after sales service / technical support / spare parts • Safety and environmental benefits • Product reliability and performance • Life cycle costs

Table 2: Indicative ranges of quality / financial offer ratio for professional services and construction works

Type of project	Indicative ranges of quality / financial offer ratio	
	Professional services	Construction works where contractor is not responsible for the design of the works ^a
Feasibility studies and investigations	80 / 20 to 90 / 10	-
Innovative projects	70 / 30 to 85 / 15	20 / 80 to 40 / 60
Complex projects	60 / 40 to 80 / 20	15 / 85 to 35 / 65
Straightforward projects	30 / 70 to 60 / 40	10 / 90 to 25 / 75
Repeat projects	10 / 90 to 30 / 70	5 / 95 to 10 / 90

^a The indicative ratios for design and construct projects are 85/15 to 60 /40

Table 3: Qualitative indicators or prompts for judgment used in the evaluation of quality (linear scale)

Score	Prompt for judgement
0	Failed to address the question / issue
20	A detrimental response / answer / solution – limited or poor evidence of skill / experience sought or high risk that relevant skills will not be available
40	Less than acceptable – response / answer / solution lacks convincing evidence of skill / experience sought or medium risk that relevant skills will not be available.
60	Acceptable response / answer / solution to the particular aspect of the requirements and evidence given of skill / experience sought
80	Above acceptable – response / answer / solution demonstrating real understanding of requirements and evidence of ability to meet it.
100	Excellent – response / answer / solution gives real confidence that the tenderer will add real value.

*The threshold score, below which tenderers are eliminated from further consideration, should be between 50 and 60%.

Table 4: Qualitative indicators or prompts for judgment used in the evaluation of quality (logarithmic scale)

Score*	Rating	Qualitative indicator or prompt for judgement		
		Example 1 (Proposed Organisation and staffing)	Example 2 (Approach paper)	Example 3 (Knowledge of issues pertinent to the project)
0	No response	Failed to provide information	Failed to provide information	Failed to provide information
40	Poor	The organization chart is sketchy, the staffing plan is weak in important areas. There is no clarity in allocation of tasks and responsibilities.	The technical approach and / or methodology is poor / is unlikely to satisfy project objectives or requirements. The tenderer has misunderstood certain aspects of the scope of work and does not deal with the critical aspects of the project.	Key staff have limited experience of issues pertinent to the project
70	Satisfactory	The organizational chart is complete and detailed, the technical level and composition of the staffing arrangements are adequate.	The approach is generic and not tailored to address the specific project objectives and methodology. The approach does not adequately deal with the critical characteristics of the project. The quality plan, manner in which risk is to be managed etc is too generic.	Key staff have reasonable experience of issues pertinent to the project
90	Good	Besides meeting the "satisfactory" rating, staff are well balanced i.e. they show good co-ordination, complimentary skills, clear and defined duties and responsibilities. Some members of the project team have worked together before on limited occasions.	The approach is specifically tailored to address the specific project objectives and methodology and is sufficiently flexible to accommodate changes that may occur during execution. The quality plan and approach to managing risk etc is specifically tailored to the critical characteristics of the project.	Key staff have extensive experience of issues pertinent to the project
100	Very good	Besides meeting the "good" rating, the proposed team is well integrated and several members have worked together extensively in the past.	Besides meeting the "good" rating, the important issues are approached in an innovative and efficient way, indicating that the tenderer has outstanding knowledge of state-of-the- art approaches. The approach paper details ways to improve the project outcomes and the quality of the outputs	Key staff have outstanding experience of issues pertinent to the project

* The threshold score, below which tenderers are eliminated from further consideration, should be between 50 and 60%.