

## Appendix B – Evaluation Summary

---

### 1 Further Competition Stage

- 1.1 Further competition documentation was advertised on 15th February 2022 to the twenty-two suppliers on the Crown Commercial Services Insurance Services 3 Dynamic Purchasing System (DPS) seeking expressions of interest from organisations who wished to tender, with an original return date of 18th March 2022. Due to volume of clarifications received, the deadline was extended to 22nd March 2022 to allow tenderers more time to complete their tender response. Five organisations responded by submitting a tender and the remaining seventeen effectively withdrew themselves at this stage by not returning the tender. The names of the five organisations that submitted a tender are detailed Appendix C – Exempt information.
- 1.2 Questions were raised by tenderers during the tender period and these were addressed by issuing clarifications to all tenderers and requesting these were incorporated into their submission.
- 1.3 Stage 1 Assessment (Pass/Fail)
- 1.3.1 All tenderers passed the Stage 1 assessment and proceeded to the next stage with the exception of Bidder E who submitted a non-compliant tender by returning missing tender documentation and was therefore discounted from the process.
- 1.4 Invitation to Tender Evaluation Summary
- 1.4.1 The evaluation summary and recommendation for the award of a contract for each lot are detailed below:

#### **Lot 1: Material Damage and Business Interruption (encompassing fire)**

The results of the evaluation are shown below:

<b>QUALITY (including social value)</b>		
<b>Company</b>	<b>Bidder A</b>	<b>Bidder B</b>
Score (Max Score 100)	79.85	75.35
Score (Max 40)	40.00	37.75
<b>Rank</b>	<b>1</b>	<b>2</b>
Bidders A and B scored above the threshold of 60 marks for quality to proceed to the next stage.		
There were no specific issues that arose with the quality evaluation.		
<b>PRICE</b>		
<b>Company</b>	<b>Bidder A</b>	<b>Bidder B</b>
Score (Max 60)	60.00	58.95
<b>Rank</b>	<b>1</b>	<b>2</b>
There were no specific issues that arose with the price evaluation		
<b>OVERALL SUMMARY</b>		

Company	Bidder A	Bidder B
Quality	40.00	37.75
Price	60.00	58.95
<b>TOTAL</b>	100.00	96.70
<b>Rank</b>	<b>1</b>	<b>2</b>

#### Recommendation

It is recommended that the contract be awarded to Bidder A for this insurance on the basis of being ranked first, following the quality (including social value) and price evaluation.

### **Lot 2: Commercial and Industrial Properties**

The results of the evaluation are shown below:

<b>QUALITY (including social value)</b>		
Company	Bidder A	Bidder B
Score (Max Score 100)	94.40	49.75
Score (Max 40)	40.00	21.08
<b>Rank</b>	<b>1</b>	<b>2</b>
Bidder A scored above the threshold of 60 marks for quality to proceed to the next stage. The tender from Bidder B scored below the threshold of 60 marks for quality to proceed to the next stage and was therefore discounted from the process.		
There were no specific issues that arose with the quality evaluation		
<b>PRICE</b>		
Company	Bidder A	Bidder B
Score (Max 60)	60.00	n/a
<b>Rank</b>	<b>1</b>	n/a
There were no specific issues that arose with the price evaluation		
<b>OVERALL SUMMARY</b>		
Company	Bidder A	Bidder B
Quality	40.00	n/a
Price	60.00	n/a
<b>TOTAL</b>	100.00	n/a
<b>Rank</b>	<b>1</b>	n/a

#### Recommendation

It is recommended that the contract be awarded to Bidder A on the basis of being the only tender submission for this insurance policy with satisfactory quality (including social value) and price scoring.

### **Lot 3: Leaseholder Right to Buy**

The results of the evaluation are shown below:

<b>QUALITY (including social value)</b>		
<b>Company</b>	<b>Bidder A</b>	<b>Bidder B</b>
Score (Max Score 100)	63.85	50.57
Score (Max 40)	40.00	31.68
<b>Rank</b>	<b>1</b>	<b>2</b>
Bidder A scored above the threshold of 60 marks for quality to proceed to the next stage. The tender from Bidder B scored below the threshold of 60 marks for quality to proceed to the next stage and was therefore discounted from the process.		
There were no specific issues that arose with the quality evaluation		
<b>PRICE</b>		
<b>Company</b>	<b>Bidder A</b>	<b>Bidder B</b>
Score (Max 60)	60.00	n/a
<b>Rank</b>	<b>1</b>	n/a
There were no specific issues that arose with the price evaluation.		
<b>OVERALL SUMMARY</b>		
<b>Company</b>	<b>Bidder A</b>	<b>Bidder B</b>
Quality	40.00	n/a
Price	60.00	n/a
<b>TOTAL</b>	100.00	n/a
<b>Rank</b>	<b>1</b>	<b>n/a</b>

#### **Recommendation**

It is recommended that the contract be awarded to Bidder A on the basis of being the only tender submission for this insurance policy with satisfactory quality (including social value) and price scoring.

### **Lot 4: Casualty (encompassing Employers Liability, Personal Accident and Travel, Public Liability and Fidelity Guarantee)**

The results of the evaluation are shown below:

<b>QUALITY (including social value)</b>		
<b>Company</b>	<b>Bidder A</b>	<b>Bidder B</b>
Score (Max Score 100)	89.40	79.55
Score (Max 40)	40.00	35.59
<b>Rank</b>	<b>1</b>	<b>2</b>
Bidders A and B scored above the threshold of 60 marks for quality to proceed to the next stage.		

There were no specific issues that arose with the quality evaluation.

#### **PRICE**

<b>Company</b>	<b><i>Bidder A</i></b>	<b><i>Bidder B</i></b>
Score (Max 60)	60.00	41.76
<b>Rank</b>	<b>1</b>	<b>2</b>

There were no specific issues that arose with the price evaluation.

#### **OVERALL SUMMARY**

<b>Company</b>	<b><i>Bidder A</i></b>	<b><i>Bidder B</i></b>
Quality	40.00	35.59
Price	60.00	41.76
<b>TOTAL</b>	<b>100.00</b>	<b>77.35</b>
<b>Rank</b>	<b>1</b>	<b>2</b>

### Recommendation

It is recommended that the contract be awarded to Bidder A for this insurance on the basis of being ranked first, following the quality (including social value) and price evaluation.

### **Lot 5: Engineering Insurance and Inspection**

The results of the evaluation are shown below:

#### **QUALITY (including social value)**

<b>Company</b>	<b><i>Bidder A</i></b>	<b><i>Bidder B</i></b>
Score (Max Score 100)	70.77	87.35
Score (Max 40)	32.41	40.00
<b>Rank</b>	<b>2</b>	<b>1</b>

Bidders A and B scored above the threshold of 60 marks for quality to proceed to the next stage.

There were no specific issues that arose with the quality evaluation.

#### **PRICE**

<b>Company</b>	<b><i>Bidder A</i></b>	<b><i>Bidder B</i></b>
Score (Max 60)	60.00	58.41
<b>Rank</b>	<b>1</b>	<b>2</b>

There were no specific issues that arose with the price evaluation.

#### **OVERALL SUMMARY**

<b>Company</b>	<b><i>Bidder A</i></b>	<b><i>Bidder B</i></b>
Quality	32.41	40.00
Price	60.00	58.41

<b>TOTAL</b>	92.41	98.41
<b>Rank</b>	<b>2</b>	<b>1</b>

### Recommendation

It is recommended that the contract be awarded to Bidder B for this insurance on the basis of being ranked first, following the quality (including social value) and price evaluation.

### **Lot 6: Property Terrorism**

The results of the evaluation are shown below:

<b>QUALITY (including social value)</b>				
<b>Company</b>	<b>Bidder A</b>	<b>Bidder B</b>	<b>Bidder C</b>	<b>Bidder D</b>
Score (Max Score 100)	79.43	81.40	65.80	50.81
Score (Max 40)	39.03	40.00	32.34	24.97
<b>Rank</b>	<b>2</b>	<b>1</b>	<b>3</b>	<b>4</b>
Bidders A, B and C scored above the threshold of 60 marks for quality to proceed to the next stage. The tender from Bidder D scored below the threshold of 60 marks for quality to proceed to the next stage and was therefore discounted from the process.				
There were no specific issues that arose with the quality evaluation				
<b>PRICE</b>				
<b>Company</b>	<b>Bidder A</b>	<b>Bidder B</b>	<b>Bidder C</b>	<b>Bidder D</b>
Score (Max 60)	60.00	49.81	37.33	n/a
<b>Rank</b>	<b>1</b>	<b>2</b>	<b>3</b>	n/a
There were no specific issues that arose with the price evaluation.				
<b>OVERALL SUMMARY</b>				
<b>Company</b>	<b>Bidder A</b>	<b>Bidder B</b>	<b>Bidder C</b>	<b>Bidder D</b>
Quality	39.03	40.00	32.34	n/a
Price	60.00	49.81	37.33	n/a
<b>TOTAL</b>	99.03	89.81	69.67	n/a
<b>Rank</b>	<b>1</b>	<b>2</b>	<b>3</b>	n/a

### Recommendation

It is recommended that the contract be awarded to Bidder A for this insurance on the basis of being ranked first, following the quality (incl. social value) and price evaluation.

## **Lot 7: Motor Fleet**

The results of the evaluation are shown below:

<b>QUALITY (including social value)</b>		
<b>Company</b>	<b><i>Bidder A</i></b>	<b><i>Bidder B</i></b>
Score (Max Score 100)	84.40	68.33
Score (Max 40)	40.00	32.38
<b>Rank</b>	<b>1</b>	<b>2</b>
Bidders A and B scored above the threshold of 60 marks for quality to proceed to the next stage.		
There were no specific issues that arose with the quality evaluation.		
<b>PRICE</b>		
<b>Company</b>	<b><i>Bidder A</i></b>	<b><i>Bidder B</i></b>
Score (Max 60)	29.06	60.00
<b>Rank</b>	<b>2</b>	<b>1</b>
There were no specific issues that arose with the price evaluation.		
<b>OVERALL SUMMARY</b>		
<b>Company</b>	<b><i>Bidder A</i></b>	<b><i>Bidder B</i></b>
Quality	40.00	32.38
Price	29.06	60.00
<b>TOTAL</b>	69.06	92.38
<b>Rank</b>	<b>2</b>	<b>1</b>

### Recommendation

It is recommended that the contract be awarded to Bidder B for this insurance on the basis of being ranked first, following the quality (including social value) and price evaluation.