

Project Title: Unified Housing ICT System
Project Quality Weighting:
Project Price Weighting:

71%
29%

Scoring System	Scoring Context - Written responses 8.1 (c) to (f)	Scoring Context - Demos 8.1 (g) to (h)	Pricing Evaluation
0 = Unacceptable/Failed to address	No response or extremely limited response	No response or extremely limited response	The Supplier with the lowest price will be awarded the highest
2 = Reservations	Response is limited and fails to provide a significant proportion of relevant information, is unworkable and/or inconsistent. Shows limited understanding of, and/or inappropriate approach to the matter in question.	Response is limited and fails to provide a significant proportion of relevant information, is unworkable and/or inconsistent. Shows limited understanding of, and/or inappropriate approach to the matter in question and/or the functionality is not intuitive, it is not very user friendly and it is a complicated process to undertake the task in question	(Lowest Submitted Bid / Suppliers Submitted Bid) x Total Score Available = Total Score 500 / 750 x 30 = 20
5 = Satisfactory	A broad response with an adequate level of information provided that is relevant to the question. Shows reasonable understanding of, and/or acceptable approach to the matters in question.	A broad response with an adequate level of information provided that is relevant to the question. Shows reasonable understanding of, and acceptable approach to the matters in question and displays reasonably intuitive functionality. It is relatively user friendly and it is fairly easy to undertake the task in question.	For example the total weighting for a price evaluation is 70%. The lowest submitted Total Figure is £500 and the Supplier submits a Total Figure of £750. The Supplier will receive a score of 20.
8 = Good	Good level of detailed information provided that is particularly relevant to the question. The response demonstrates a good understanding of and a good approach to the matters in question.	Good level of detailed information provided that is particularly relevant to the question. The response demonstrates a good understanding of and a good approach to the matters in question and displays a good intuitive functionality. It is user friendly	If a supplier submits a price of £1000 they will get a score of 15.
10 = Excellent	Exemplary response. Comprehensive level of information provided that is relevant. The Bidder could not be expected to answer the question more comprehensively or appropriately.	Exemplary response. Comprehensive level of information provided that is relevant. The Bidder could not be expected to answer the question more comprehensively or appropriately. The system displays a highly intuitive functionality and quick process. It is very user friendly	

Scoring Part 1			Tender 1		Tender 2	
Questions (As defined in Standard Selection Questionnaire)	Criteria or Section %	Evaluation Comments	Criteria Met	Notes	Criteria Met	Notes
			Delete as appropriate	Enter Additional Info (if required)	Delete as appropriate	Enter Additional Info (if required)
Section 1 - Organisation Profile Completed?	Yes/No	For information only	Yes		Yes	
Section 2 - Grounds for mandatory exclusion	Pass/Fail	If an organisation cannot confirm any of the statements, the Authority reserves the right to disqualify the organisation from the process at this point in the evaluation.	Pass		Pass	
Section 3 - Grounds for discretionary exclusion	Pass/Fail	If an organisation cannot confirm any of the statements, the Authority reserves the right to disqualify the organisation from the process at this point in the evaluation.	Pass		Pass	
Section 4 - Economic & Financial Standing	Pass/Fail	Bidders undertake a self-assessment using the financial appraisal model provided. The Authority will only validate the information submitted by the successful tenderer(s).	Pass			To verify if preferred
Section 5 - Consortia Financial Information	For information	If relevant Confirmation required that information will be provided if successful		N/A		N/A
Section 7 - Modern Slavery Act 2015	Pass/Fail	Organisations must achieve a Pass for this section to be considered for inclusion.	Pass		Pass	
Scoring Part 1 - Quality						
Section 8 - Additional Questions		The Authority will use the scoring system shown above to evaluate the following project specific questions				
Project specific questions and demonstrations to assess technical and professional ability			Score	Weighted	Score	Weighted
Stage 1 Pass/Fail Pass/Fail Disqualification		Marks Available				
8.1 (a) Business Requirements	Pass/Fail	Pass/Fail	Pass		Pass	
Stage 2 - Pass/Fail Pass/Fail Disqualification			Pass		Pass	
8.1 (b) System Requirements Response Document - 'Must Haves'	Pass/Fail	Pass/Fail				
Stage 3 - Scored						
8.1 (c) System Requirements Response Document - 'Should Haves, Could Haves'	10.00%	10		9.32%		6.73%
Stage 4 - Written responses and demonstrations						
	2.50%		2.00%		0.50%	Addressed most aspects/examples. No Roadmap provided. This is a requirement of this question and is something to contribute to the scoring. If the supplier had provided this it would not have been shared outside of the evaluation panel therefore remained Commercially Sensitive. No reference to which organisations provides quotes. Asset Mgt heavily weighted in comparison with other aspects. Case studies mainly referred to single systems. Unclear of how successful the delivery of a unified system may have been.
8.1 (d) Technical Delivery	10		8		2	
	2.50%		2.00%		0.50%	Go-live/BAU lacked information. Roles & Responsibilities of Project Team not defined. Training & Testing - some concerns around scoping & delivery. Project Plan could have provided more detail e.g. no. of days for each element
8.1 (e) Implementation	10		8		2	
	2.50%		2.50%		0.50%	Core hours of Operation detailed. A number of points to specifically address in response to this question not present. Support didn't come across as being very thorough. Some confusion/Conflict over Security Policies
8.1 (f) Support	10		10		2	
	2.50%		1.25%		0.50%	Addressed 5 Priorities but related these generally to the North East and Newcastle. Lacked commitment to North Tyneside
8.1 (g) Social Value	10		5		2	
System demo Day 1						
	3.00%		2.40%		0.60%	Basics covered but lacked further detail. Some requirements listed in question not addressed e.g. Property Asset info and Customer preferences. Housing side very busy in appearance with lots of tabs. Erroe messages appeared which did not give detail of the error. Did not appear particularly user-friendly. Customisable but how much? File limits shown on screen. Latest Tenancy password shown in 360 view in Back Office which raises security concerns. Would assist with Role out to customer.Can track how often it is visited. Poor around booking appts and changing a ticket etc.
8.1 (h) Customer Portal	10		8		2	
	2.50%		2.50%		0.50%	Data Migration process explained. Tenancy Analytics demo'd-use of pre-determined Metrics. Demo consisted of slides/screenshots not test or live. Data Dashboard not addressed or mentioned as in development. Retention Reports appeared to reference Housing only. Better demonstration of how or if errors can be automatically identified without manual intervention. A number of areas not yet available.Future development is data into an Azure environment and PowerBI gateway. Supplier understands that requirements of the Specification would need to be in place by their respective target dates.
8.1 (i) Reporting	10		10		2	
	2.50%		0.50%		1.25%	Demo focussed more on Housing less so on Commercial. Prepared mock reports may have helped this demo? Some debate across the evaluating team as to how user friendly the system was with slow login in and lots of menus to navigate. The demo did not illustrate signs of a seamless integrated solution. Reporting mentioned Raw SQL insteadrather than simple tools for reporting. SOR's had to be bulk loaded to Accuserv. Asset Mobile Data collection, Energy Module, 360 view of customer contact centre all positive.
8.1 (j) Asset Lifecycle	10		2		5	
	2.50%		1.25%		1.25%	Mostly slide-based presentation. Met majority of requirements. 30yr Asset Mgt Plan. Lacked detail around allocation of costs,codes, jobs. Link to Sub-Contractor Portal. Mobile device usage
8.1 (k) Planned Works	10		5		5	
	3.00%		0.60%		1.50%	All bullets in the Scenario addressed to some degree. Focus on Housing rather than Commercial/Civic Buildings.Could not see link to Survey Report. Some concern over the function of
8.1 (l) Asbestos	10		2		5	
	3.00%		1.50%		2.00%	Good building categories sub groups. Housing Focussed. Dashboards & Reporting Tools. Mobile app. Project modules demonstrated.Linkage to central heating able to view summary record. Asset Tagging to be developed.
8.1 (m) Asset and Compliance Activity	10		5		8	
System Demo Day 2						
	2.50%		1.25%		1.25%	Appeared slow and cumbersome. Scenario understood and followed but not all functionality present with some apps/functionality down in future development. Find My Engineer app and configurable auto-completion funtion good. Calendar on demo did not work. SAR (Self-assess Repairs) mentioned but not expanded upon.
8.1 (n) Responsive Repairs	10		5		5	
	2.50%		2.00%		0.50%	Could not demonstrate or discuss some areas in detail as currently do not have a DRS. Suggestion was that NTC would have to acquire this from 3rd party which is a major concern! There is a tool currently under evaluation for automatic scheduling. Google Maps still to incorporate. Appointments based on distance is not necessarily the best fit. What was presented appeared slow, complicated and disjointed
8.1 (o) Dynamic Resourcing	10		8		2	
	3.00%		2.40%		0.60%	This solution felt antiquated and required a degree of manual intervention. It appeared slow and confusing. It combined two systems which may contribute to the performance. It did contain some good features e.g. MOT Servicing, Text Services with Customer reply option & downloadable Manufacturers manuals, customer feedback option. The Mobile side of things clearer than Back Office which may cause issues.
8.1 (p) Gas Servicing	10		8		2	

Item	Weight	Score	Comments	Weight	Score	Comments
8.1 (a) Material Direct Purchases	10	2	Difficult to assess given that this supplier currently does not have a system for this therefore what was presented was very much conceptual albeit already underway for their organisation. 100 days development has been committed to this for NTC. Some good aspects described which included a Database to be tailored to NTC. Commitment of Finance Team resource and description of other functionality once developed.	2	0.60%	Touched upon all points but did not necessarily demonstrate them. Use MFA. An audit/financial and security concern would be allowing a user to approve their own P.O. a number of error messages appeared. Could not show uploading an invoice. Better data preparation may have helped to avoid this error.
8.1 (f) Subcontractors	10	5	Broad overview, generally all things mentioned but not necessarily well covered. Customisable elements, Logical & Easy to navigate. More Detail concerning labour & Material costs & CIS registration in 'other' fields would have been beneficial. Building retentions, Multiple sets of SOP's small and larger SC's considered. Can check asbestos info but did not describe how? Contractor Site - Separate web-based portal. Payment side not demo'd.	2	0.50%	"long-winded" "Complicated" Split across 2 platforms. Work to be done. System did not appear to work. Would this require "work-rounds"? On Roadmap to be improved.
8.1 (i) Internal Stores System Demo Day 3	10	8	Full configurability. Mandatory fields. Bar Coding. Hazardous Product detail. Items on hold during Stock take. User defined fields available. Ranked supplier functionality. Generally all points well covered.	2	0.60%	Not live/Real-time. Looked like supplier configuration would be required to do. Click & Collect for stores not addressed. Nothing on Bar-coding or similar. Stock batching info - long winded way to retrieve information. Van Stock facility also protracted. Processing exchange between web and windows. No auto PO creation demonstrated. No audit trail for price changes demonstrated.
8.1 (t) Anti-Social Behaviour	10	5	Would utilise separate tiles for types of ASB. Can upload MP3 & 4 files.Tasks into Task Mgr - link to Workflow.Key details e.g Warnings remain displayed.Anonymised data. Appt creation, Case summaries - data dictionary. Config would be needed re: public places. Unclear around anonymity of reporting person. Not enough detail in the mock demo for creating a complaint.Reporting - ability to drill down to 'ward' detail etc not demo'd which is a really important requirement. Generally Good Potential	2	0.50%	Demo based on a current system. Much remains in development to meet requirements. How to record/report ASB in Public spaces unclear. Roadmap referred to. Unclear/question marks around: Alerts, Video/Noise files, document size limits and automated workflow
8.1 (u) Empty Homes/Void Properties	10	8	Good functionality and configurable to meet our needs. Good to see property history and that Properties can be added to advert mid-cycle as can Items. Portal updates in 'real-time' Mobile-Back office linked. A good-end to end demo.	2	0.50%	Branding and Tiles configurable. Some detail missing and the fact that this was across two systems didn't give the impression that it was user-friendly or very pleasing on the eye. Location Map which provided position of operatives a good feature. Multiple/Single SOR features positive.
8.1 (v) Income Collection and Former Tenant Arrears	10	5	Can self-configure through Tiles. Covered all aspects. Data source for analytics unclear. Some concerns around Budget & Income calculator not being integrated	2	0.60%	Presentation mostly through slides, can be difficult to relate without a system demo. Visually strong particularly around analytics. Some concern around assumption of data source for UC/Income details. Some areas mentioned but not addressed with detail. Lots of Tabs to use on-screen could lead to confusion and add additional navigational steps.
8.1 (w) Tenancy Management	10	8	Customisable, easy to follow, good linkage to other pages/areas. Lots of different features. Didn't appear to address the Creation and Managing Tenancy Workflow and lacked innovation but does do what is required.	5	1.50%	Some good features. At the outset it looked as though the solution provided a good 360 customer view. Analytical Tools/Aspects present but not explored in demo. Likewise it was felt that the configurable functionality could have been better integrated. Navigation appeared quite busy "Important information" moved off-screen when moving to other details.
8.1 (x) RTB/Leasehold/Freehold	10	5	Dashboard links straight to system. All aspects covered. Good Automation. Verifications, Warnings/Alerts good. Some clarity around Direct Debit creation account or invoice based or if they link would've been useful. Facility to upload documents	2	0.50%	All aspects covered. Multiple tabs having to be open does not make user experience particularly good. Pre-determined amendable drop down options. Could not log repairs against RTB Properties. Service Charges would be a new product.Looked as though there is capacity to carry out more functionality.
8.1 (y) Homelessness	10	8	The demo made this look a little complicated but the evaluators understood that configuration to suit would improve this. Difficult to understand whether or not case notes were restricted in terms of volume. Visualisation of a timeline for cases would have been useful to see. Good use of bringing fund information into the solution.	2	0.50%	Dashboard attractive. Errors ought to have been picked up earlier. Can the Dashboard be configured/relevant to specific user. No indication as to how long it takes to create a customer. Rough Sleeper Portal not shown. Case notes not addressed. Ability to ask and record additional questions not addressed/free text capability. Prompts for stages when letters must be issues would have been useful. More detail on types of temp accommodation. Domestic abuse not addressed in detail as this is required for whole Authority.
8.1 (z) Housing Options (Allocations)	10	8	An introduction starting with the portal view may have been useful. Rapid reporting looked good. Evaluators liked performance widgets in dashboard. A little concern over the process of quarantining duplicate applications. This looked a little complicated and seemed like a slightly odd way of preventing duplicates. It was unclear as to whether there was anything to stop someone creating a new application within 28 days? (Clarity to be sought if successful)	2	2.00%	Appeared to be quite user friendly at the outset. Some functionality not addressed.Database configurable and widgets were positive. Shortlist display configurable. No 2 person Warning visible on demo but could be configured. Tenancy can be auto-created. Direct linkage to ASB, homeless TA cases + rent balances. Application to be fully verified
Overall Quality % Score		48.12%			25.98%	

			Tenderer 1			Tenderer 2		
			Total Cost	Weighted		Total Cost	Weighted	
Total Cost (Automatically pro-rata's from lowest price)	29.00%	£2,313,732.00	£2,313,732.00	29.00%		£9,311,095.31	7.21%	
Total Score (Quality + Cost)			77.12%			33.19%		
			100.00%			100 Percent		
			Evaluation Comments					
			Criteria Met	Notes		Criteria Met	Notes	
8.2 - Insurance	Pass/Fail	Bidders will confirm they have or will obtain the relevant insurances to pass. Copies of insurance certificates will only be requested from the successful tenderer(s).	Pass			Pass/Fail	Query if preferred	
8.3 - Compliance with equality legislation	Pass/Fail	Bidders must confirm their compliance with equality legislation to Pass.	Pass			Pass		
8.4 - Environmental Management	Pass/Fail	Bidders must confirm they have not had any convictions for breaching environmental legislation, or have provided a copy of the conviction or notice together with details of remedial action taken to pass.	Pass			Pass		
8.5 - Health and Safety Low Risk	Pass/Fail	Bidders must confirm compliance with legislative requirements, provide details of any enforcements and sub-contractor checks to pass.	Pass			Pass		
			RANKING			RANKING		
			1			2		

