



TRAFNIDIAETH
CYMRU
TRANSPORT
FOR WALES

Wales and Borders Rail Service and South Wales Metro

Invitation to Submit Final Tender

Volume 2: Evaluation Model

Issue Date 30 November 2017

Audience	Bidders
Confidentiality	CONFIDENTIAL
Version	Conformed
Date	30 November 2017



Contents

1.	INTRODUCTION	1
2.	PROCESS OF EVALUATION	2
3.	SCORING METHODOLOGIES	3
4.	CVL CONCEPT DESIGN	13
5.	[REDACTED] ERROR! BOOKMARK NOT DEFINED.	
6.	APPENDIX 2.A - WORKSHOP SCORING MATRICES	15
7.	APPENDIX 2.B - CORPORATE INTERVIEW SCORING MATRICES	18
8.	APPENDIX 2.C - CONTRACT VISITS SCORING MATRICES	20

I. Introduction

- I.1 This document sets out the Authority's strategy for evaluation of Final Tender submissions.
- I.2 The Response to each Question in Volumes 3 – 12 of this ITSFT pack will be assessed by the Evaluation Team based on the Final Tender (submitted according to the Volume 13 Response Template instructions) and any subsequent clarifications. The Bidder's solution described in the Final Tender response is termed the "**Solution**" in this ITSFT.
- I.3 The Authority has made the ITSFT as complete as possible, and Bidders should be able to rely on the ITSFT as a 'standalone' document set. The Authority recognises that dialogue has shaped Bidders' Solutions and therefore Final Tender submissions. The Record of Dialogue has been jointly maintained throughout dialogue by the Bidder and the Authority to record discussions and conclusions from dialogue.
- I.4 To avoid possible ambiguity, where a Bidder feels that the ITSFT is unclear or contradicts the Record of Dialogue and/or wishes to rely on a statement in the Record of Dialogue, the Bidder should seek to clarify this by raising a Request for Clarification ("RFC") as soon as possible. In the case of apparently contradictory statements, the ITSFT will take precedence over the Record of Dialogue unless stated otherwise by way of Clarification.
- I.5 Subject to paragraph 1.7 below, the Response to each Question will be scored as a whole, even where a Question requires a number of elements of information. Any such individual elements will not be separately scored and the Evaluation Team will review the totality of the Response against the relevant scoring methodology set out in section 3 of this Volume.
- I.6 Responses must be provided to all Questions, even if the Response is not directly evaluated for Quality or Deliverability, or Numerically (each as defined in section 3 below). Responses should be consistent with the remainder of the Final Tender. Inconsistencies between two or more Responses and/or other elements of the Final Tender may reduce confidence in all relevant Responses and affect scoring. The Authority reserves the right to seek clarifications from Bidders regarding inconsistencies where this is appropriate and compliant with the provisions of the 2016 Regulations but is not bound to do so.
- I.7 Some Responses to Questions will be evaluated separately in respect of the CVL Rail Services and the Wales and Cross-Border Lines Services. These Requirements can be identified because they appear twice in the table of evaluation weightings. In proposing Responses to such Questions, Bidders are required to identify areas of the Response which are common across the Rail Service and those which apply specifically to the CVL Rail Services or the Wales and Cross-Border Lines Services. The Authority will assign separate scores in respect of the CVL Rail Services and the Wales & Cross-Border Services:

- a) In respect of the CVL Rail Services, considering the areas of the Response which are common across the Rail Service and those which apply specifically to the CVL Rail Services; and
 - b) In respect of the Wales and Cross-Border Lines Services, considering the areas of the Response which are common across the Rail Service and those which apply specifically to the Wales and Cross-Border Lines Services.
- 1.8 Responses should be clear and concise. Vague or nebulous Responses, or those merely stating “to be considered” or “to be discussed” or similar do not provide confidence and will be evaluated accordingly.

Compliance

- 1.9 The ODP Grant Agreement sets out mandatory requirements. In the ITSFT, the Authority has set out further Requirements and has explicitly referenced mandatory minimum Requirements in some sections such as stations and rolling stock. In others, the word ‘must’ or ‘minimum’ denotes a mandatory minimum Requirement (a "**Minimum Requirement**").
- 1.10 The Authority may deem a Final Tender non-compliant and exclude the Bidder from the tender process if it determines that there is:
- a) An issue with a Response which is sufficiently serious that the Authority believes it compromises the Bidder's ability to deliver a materially compliant Solution; or
 - b) A gap in a Response which is so severe that the Authority cannot evidence that the Bidder can deliver a materially compliant Solution; or
 - c) A material failure to comply with instructions to the extent that the Final Tender cannot properly be evaluated in that respect; or
 - d) A score for a Response is below the stated minimum threshold where a minimum threshold has been identified in the Award Weightings spreadsheet in Section 5 below.

2. Process of evaluation

- 2.1 The evaluation process is expected to operate as outlined below:
- a) Specialist teams will report on technical appendices and models to advise evaluators;
 - b) Specialist teams of at least three specialist evaluators (collectively the "Evaluation Team") will evaluate each Volume, agree a team score for each relevant Response and record the rationale for the score;
 - c) Specialist legal and other external advisers, ORR, Network Rail, Transport Focus and Department for Transport may be asked to provide advice to the Evaluation Team on aspects of Final Tenders; and

- d) Quality assurers will work across the above mentioned teams to ensure that each team applies the process fairly and consistently, and to check for errors.
- 2.2 The Evaluation Team may, but is not obliged to, seek and consider Clarification from Bidders where Final Tenders are unclear (to the extent this is appropriate and compliant with the 2016 Regulations).
 - 2.3 The Evaluation Team will produce an evaluation report which will set out the scores for each Final Tender and recommend a winning bid on the basis of the highest score, calculated as set out in this Volume.
 - 2.4 Unsuccessful Bidders will be provided with a breakdown of the scores, the rationale for the scores and the scores and characteristics of the winning bid as per the requirements of the 2016 Regulations.

3. Scoring Methodologies

- 3.1 The Authority has assigned a scoring methodology to each Question. The Evaluation Team will use the scoring methodologies and the Requirement (which together set out the characteristics of a good Response) as a guide to assigning scores to each Response.
- 3.2 There are four basic scoring techniques:
 - a) **Quality** – the Authority’s assessment of the quality of the relevant areas of the Solution described in the Response;
 - b) **Technical Quality** – the Authority’s assessment of the technical quality of the relevant areas of the Solution described in the Response, using a higher-level assessment than quality;
 - c) **Deliverability** – the Authority’s confidence that the relevant areas of the Solution described in the Response will be delivered; and
 - d) **Numerical assessment** – a numerical formula set out in the Award Weightings spreadsheet in Section 5 below.
- 3.3 'Confidence' in quality methodologies relates to how confident the Authority is that the relevant elements of the Solution specified in the Response will meet the Requirement if they are delivered, rather than confidence in the deliverability of such elements of the Solution.
- 3.4 Some Responses will be assessed by more than one methodology. For instance, some Questions seek a Response which demonstrates both quality and deliverability. In these cases, the Award Weightings spreadsheet in section 5 below shows how scores will be combined (using the key set out at paragraph 3.10 below).
- 3.5 The Authority appreciates that the CVL Concept Design and Infrastructure Manager Services are at a relatively early stage of development and are based largely on desk-based analysis. Your Responses on these matters will be evaluated in this context – you are not expected to have progressed beyond

CVL Concept Design stage. To score the maximum score for quality or deliverability, your Response should show a level of maturity appropriate to this stage of the project based on the information available to you.

Quality

3.6 The table below shows score bands for quality. The right-hand column shows the numerical value out of 100 to which each descriptor relates:

1	Excellent Response	100
	The Response identifies and demonstrates strong insight and understanding of the Requirement	
	There is high confidence that the relevant elements of the Solution will be excellent quality in terms of the Requirement, considering affordability	
	There is high confidence that the quality will lead to a compliant Solution	
	Any novel elements of the Response or value judgments are supported by satisfactory evidence, for instance by means of survey, analysis or experience in a similar environment	
	No material Authority dependencies other than those agreed	
2	High quality Response	80
	The Response identifies and demonstrates strong insight and understanding of the Requirement	
	There is high confidence that the relevant elements of the Solution will be high quality in terms of the Requirement, considering affordability	
	There is high confidence that the quality will lead to a compliant Solution	
	Any novel elements of the Response or value judgments are supported by satisfactory evidence, for instance by means of survey, analysis or experience in a similar environment.	
	No material Authority dependencies other than those agreed	
3	Quality Response	70
	The Response identifies and demonstrates strong insight and understanding of the Requirement	
	There is confidence that the relevant elements of the Solution will be high quality in terms of the Requirement, considering affordability	
	There is high confidence that the quality will lead to a compliant Solution	
	Any novel elements of the Response or value judgments are supported by limited evidence, for instance by means of survey, analysis or experience in a similar environment.	
	No material Authority dependencies other than those agreed	
4	Response meets basic requirements	40
	The Response identifies and demonstrates basic insight and understanding of the Requirement	
	There is confidence that the relevant elements of the Solution will meet the Requirement at a basic level and reasonable stakeholder expectations , considering affordability	
	There is confidence that the quality will lead to a compliant Solution	
	Any novel elements of the Response or value judgments are supported by limited evidence, for instance by means of survey, analysis or experience in a similar environment.	
	Some Authority dependencies which introduce moderate additional risk to the Authority	
5	Poor Response	0
	The Response does not meet any one or more of the criteria for level 4 above	

Technical Quality

- 3.7 The table below shows score bands for technical quality. The right-hand column shows the numerical value out of 100 which each descriptor relates to:

1	High confidence of quality	100
	The response demonstrates strong understanding of the Requirement	
	There is high confidence that the relevant elements of the Solution will meet the Requirement	
	Any novel elements of the Response or value judgments are supported by satisfactory evidence, for instance by means of survey, analysis or experience in a similar environment	
	No material Authority dependencies other than those agreed	
2	Some confidence of quality	70
	The response demonstrates basic understanding of the Requirement	
	There is confidence that the relevant elements of the Solution will meet the Requirement but with moderate reservations	
	Any novel elements of the Response or value judgments are supported by limited evidence, for instance by means of survey, analysis or experience in a similar environment.	
3	Poor Response	0
	The Response does not meet any one or more of the criteria for level 2 above	

Deliverability

3.8 The table below shows score bands for deliverability. The right-hand column shows the numerical value out of 100 which each descriptor relates to.

1	High confidence in deliverability	100
	The Authority has high confidence that the relevant elements of the Solution can be delivered as proposed	
	Risks which the Bidder cannot fully control are appropriately identified, and contingency plans demonstrate alternatives which will still deliver the relevant elements of the Solution with high confidence	
	Risks under the Bidder's control are appropriately identified and contingency plans demonstrate alternatives which will still deliver the relevant elements of the Solution with high confidence	
	No material Authority dependencies other than those agreed.	
2	High confidence in deliverability save for external dependencies	90
	The Bidder is proposing an innovative Solution and the innovations will deliver additional benefit to the Authority but necessarily import some risk which the Bidder cannot fully control. The Authority has high confidence that the relevant elements of the Solution can be delivered as proposed save for reasonable external dependencies which the Bidder cannot control.	
	Risks which the Bidder cannot fully control are appropriately identified, and contingency plans demonstrate alternatives which will still deliver a compliant Solution with high confidence	
	Risks under the Bidder's control are appropriately identified and contingency plans demonstrate alternatives which will still deliver the relevant elements of the Solution with high confidence	
	No material Authority dependencies other than those agreed.	
3	Confidence in deliverability of basic compliant Solution	80
	The Authority has confidence that the relevant elements of the Solution can be delivered as proposed	
	Risks which the Bidder cannot fully control are appropriately identified, and contingency plans demonstrate alternatives which will still deliver a basic, compliant Solution with high confidence	
	Risks under the Bidder's control are appropriately identified and contingency plans demonstrate alternatives which will still deliver the relevant elements of the Solution with confidence	
	No material Authority dependencies other than those agreed.	
4	Low confidence in deliverability	40
	The Authority has low confidence that the relevant elements of the Solution can be delivered as proposed	
	Risks which the Bidder cannot fully control are partially identified, and contingency plans demonstrate alternatives which will still deliver a basic, compliant Solution with confidence	
	Risks under the Bidder's control are partially identified and contingency plans demonstrate alternatives which will still deliver a basic, compliant Solution with confidence	
	Some Authority dependencies which introduce moderate additional risk to the Authority	
5	No confidence	0
	The Response does not meet any one or more of the criteria for level 4 above	

- 3.9 In the table above, an 'innovative' element of the Solution refers to a key commitment where the Bidder has used imagination and initiative to generate significant benefit to relevant stakeholders such as passengers, staff and the Authority.

Scoring Methodologies for Questions

- 3.10 The Award Weightings spreadsheet in Section 5 below shows how quality, deliverability and numerical assessments are applied to each Question. The key for the letter against each Question is below:

Key	Scoring Methodology
A	The Response will be scored for quality and deliverability and the quality and deliverability scores will be multiplied together and divided by 100. Bidders should set out key relevant passenger (or other key stakeholder if relevant) requirements based on market expertise as well as Authority requirements. The Response should provide proportionate information on deliverability focused on any deliverability challenges. The Authority has incentivised Bidders to exceed the basic requirements of passengers. Responses should demonstrate excellent passenger service relative to reasonable passenger expectations. Bidders should note that passengers' expectations will reflect experience of the current franchise and will be informed by what is available elsewhere in the UK rail network.
B	Numerical assessment as set out in the Award Weightings spreadsheet
D	Deliverability assessment
D_n	Deliverability score evaluated over a group of responses to Questions in aggregate. The Questions belonging to the relevant group are identified in the S (Scores) worksheet (for instance, all Questions marked 'D1' are evaluated in aggregate, all Questions marked 'D2' are separately evaluated in aggregate etc.)
G	The Response will be scored for quality and deliverability and the quality and deliverability scores will be multiplied together and divided by 100. The Response should provide proportionate information on deliverability focused on any deliverability challenges.
H	The Response will be scored for technical quality and deliverability and the quality and deliverability scores will be multiplied together and divided by 100. The Response should provide proportionate information on deliverability focused on any deliverability challenges.
I	Technical quality assessment. Deliverability is normally separately evaluated through other Responses.
L	No specific evaluation, but Response will be reviewed by experts. Experts' views will be made available to Evaluators and will be factored into evaluation of relevant scored Responses. 'L' Responses may also be checked for consistency with other Responses, and this may influence the Evaluators' confidence in other Responses. See paragraphs 3.11 - to 3.14 for further details.
O	Concept Design maturity - see Section 4 below.
P	Collaborative and Behavioural Assessment; see paragraphs 3.15 to 3.28 for further details.

Scoring Methodology L

- 3.11 For Questions identified with scoring methodology 'L', the ITSFT requires Bidders to comply with mandatory requirements and (in many cases) to submit reference documents which will be assessed by technical experts.
- 3.12 Where the Question requires a simple statement of compliance (e.g. 'Confirm you have done X'), then the assessment will focus on whether the compliance has been confirmed. Where the Question sets out minimum content required in the Response, the Bidder should provide the required content. In the case of suggested content for reference documents, the Bidder should provide substantially the same content but need not adhere strictly to the content suggested if greater clarity can be provided using an alternative. However, if a Response deviates materially from the content suggested, or leaves major topics unaddressed, then it may be deemed non-compliant.
- 3.13 No reference documents requested in 'L' Questions will be evaluated directly, but they may be used to inform evaluation of other Responses. Where the reference documents are directly factored into evaluation of other Responses, the relevant cross references are signposted in the 'Feeds into' column on the Award Weightings spreadsheet in this Volume.
- 3.14 Note that the Authority will consider consistency across all Responses, including reference documents, and inconsistency may reduce evaluators' confidence. Evaluators may also use information provided in reference documents to resolve ambiguity in any Responses and factor this into evaluation.

ODP Collaborative and Behavioural Assessment Criteria and Scoring

- 3.15 The collaborative and behavioural assessment has been structured around two building blocks:
- a) Approach – the theory and understanding of the what, why and how of collaboration and collaborative behaviours; and
 - b) Deployment – the practice and demonstration of collaboration and collaborative behaviours
- 3.16 Each stage of the assessment will test these two building blocks;
- c) The workshop will look for evidence of both the approach and the deployment, each being assessed separately and then combined to give an overall score per criterion, i.e. the Authority's assessment team will be looking for theory and practice,
 - d) The interviews with Board Members will look for evidence of the approach to collaboration and collaborative behaviours at a corporate level; and
 - e) The contract visits will look for evidence of the deployment of collaboration and collaborative behaviours.

- 3.17 Throughout the assessment the Authority's assessment teams will be focused on seeking evidence that the Bidder can deliver the Authority's requirements as contained in Section 2 of Volume 11 of the ITSFT.

The workshops: assessment criteria and scoring methodology

3.18 Assessment Criteria.

- a) The assessment criteria for the workshops are set out below. Each Bidder will be assessed against each criterion for demonstration of their level of understanding (approach) and demonstration of the behaviours needed (deployment) as described in Appendix 2.A.

i) Criterion 1: Leadership

The Bidder team demonstrates an understanding of and exhibits the behaviours needed for effective leadership in collaborative working arrangements.

ii) Criterion 2: The Team

The Bidder team demonstrates a common understanding of and exhibits the behaviours needed to make collaborative working a reality.

iii) Criterion 3: Stakeholders

The Bidder team demonstrates a common understanding of the need for collaborative relationships with a range of internal and external stakeholders and exhibits the behaviours required to optimise those stakeholder relationships.

3.19 The Scoring Methodology.

- a) Each member of the Authority's collaborative and behavioural assessment team will record their observations of the Bidder team's level of demonstration of understanding (approach) and the behaviours needed (deployment) for each of the criteria identified in 3.18 above. Each member of the team will then use those observations to allocate scores independently as follows:
- i) Score between 0 and 5 for the level of understanding (approach) demonstrated by the Bidder team for each of the criteria;
 - ii) Score between 0 and 5 for the level of demonstration of the behaviours (deployment) by the Bidder team for each of the criteria;
 - iii) The scores allocated by each individual assessor pursuant to 3.19(a)i and 3.19(a)ii will be averaged to produce a score per criterion for the level of understanding (approach) and a score per criterion for the level of demonstration of the behaviours (deployment);
 - iv) The two scores for each criterion (approach and deployment) derived pursuant to 3.19(a)iii will be multiplied by each other to produce an overall score per criterion;

- v) The overall score per criterion derived pursuant to 3.19(a)iv will be adjusted by the weighting for that criterion in accordance with Appendix 2.A of Volume 2 to produce a final score per criterion. Thus, demonstration of a good understanding but poor deployment will result in a lower score whereas demonstration of a good understanding and good deployment will result in a higher score;
 - vi) The final scores per criterion derived in accordance with 3.19(a)v will be totalled to produce the final score for the workshop; and
 - vii) The final score for the workshop derived pursuant to 3.19(a)vi will be combined with the final scores for the corporate interview and the contract visit to produce the overall Bidder score.
- 3.20 Following the initial allocation of the scores referred to in 3.19(a)i and 3.19(a)ii the Authority's assessment team will discuss and review the scores. That review and discussions of the scores will be independently facilitated. The role of the independent facilitator will be to ensure clarity of the discussion and consistency of approach, but not to score. Any changes to the scores arising from that review and discussion will be recorded by a representative of the Authority.

The Corporate (Board Members) interviews: assessment criteria and scoring methodology.

3.21 Assessment Criteria.

- a) The assessment criteria for the Corporate interviews are set down below. Each Bidder will be assessed against the criteria as described in Appendix 2.B.
 - i) Criterion 1: Leadership
The Bidder demonstrates an understanding of effective leadership to enable collaborative working arrangements.
 - ii) Criterion 2: Collaborative Strategy
The Bidder demonstrates a common understanding of collaboration as an effective business strategy.
 - iii) Criterion 3: Stakeholders
The Bidder demonstrates an understanding of the need to collaborate with a range of internal and external stakeholders.

3.22 The Scoring Methodology.

- a) Each member of the Authority's collaborative and behavioural interview team will record their observations of the Bidder against each of the criteria identified in 3.21 above. Each member of the team will then use those observations to allocate scores independently as follows:
 - i) Score between 0 and 5 for each of the criteria,
 - ii) The scores allocated by the individual assessors pursuant to 3.22.(a).i) will be averaged to produce a single score for each criterion,

- iii) The scores derived pursuant to paragraph 3.22.(a).ii) will be adjusted by the weighting for that criterion in accordance with Appendix 2.B,
 - iv) The scores for each criterion derived pursuant to paragraph 3.22.(a).iii) will be totalled to give a final score for the interviews; and
 - v) The final score for these Corporate interviews derived pursuant to 3.22.(a).iv) will be combined with the final scores for the workshop and the contract visit to produce the overall Bidder score.
- b) Following the allocation of scores referred to in 3.22.(a).i). the Authority's assessment team will discuss and review the scores. That review and discussions of the scores will be independently facilitated. The role of the independent facilitator will be to ensure clarity of the discussion and consistency of approach, but not to score. Any changes to the scores arising from that review and discussion will be recorded by a representative of the Authority.

The Contract Visits: assessment criteria and scoring methodology.

3.23 Assessment Criteria:

- a) The assessment criteria for the Contract Visits are set down below. Each Bidder will be assessed as described in Appendix 2.C against the criteria.
 - i) Criterion 1: Leadership
The Bidder representatives exhibit the behaviours needed for effective leadership in collaborative working arrangements.
 - ii) Criterion 2: Implementation of a collaboration
The Bidder representatives demonstrate that collaboration is at the heart of their approach to delivery.
 - iii) Criterion 3: Stakeholders
The Bidder representatives demonstrate they have collaborative relationships with a range of stakeholders.

3.24 The Scoring Methodology:

- a) Each member of the of the Authority's collaborative and behavioural contract visit team will record their observations of the Bidder representatives against each of the criteria identified in 3.23 above. Each member of the team will then use those observations to independently allocate scores as follows:
 - i) Score between 0 and 5 for each of the criteria,
 - ii) The scores allocated by the individual assessors pursuant to 3.24.(a).i) will be averaged to produce a single score for each criterion,
 - iii) The scores derived pursuant to paragraph 3.24.(a).ii) will be adjusted by the weighting for that criterion in accordance with Appendix 2.C,
 - iv) The scores for each criterion derived pursuant to paragraph 3.24.(a).iii) will be totalled to give a final score for the interviews; and

- v) The final score for the contract visits derived pursuant to 3.24.(a).iv) will be combined with the final scores for the corporate interview and the workshop to produce the overall Bidder score.
- b) Following the allocation of scores referred to in 3.24.(a).i) the Authority's assessment team will discuss and review the scores. That review and discussions of the scores will be independently facilitated. The role of the independent facilitator will be to ensure clarity of the discussion and consistency of approach, but not to score. Any changes to the scores arising from that review and discussion will be recorded by a representative of the Authority.

Combining the Scores.

- 3.25 The overall Bidder score will be derived by combining the final score for the workshop, corporate interview and contract visit as follows:
- a) Final Score workshop x Final Score corporate Interview x Final Score contract visit = a total score per Bidder.
- 3.26 The score for the highest scoring Bidder derived pursuant to paragraph 3.25 will be uplifted to the total available score across the workshop, interview and visit (625). All other Bidder scores will be uplifted on a pro rata basis.
- 3.27 The highest uplifted score will be awarded a final score of 0.47% (equal to the full weighting) and the remainder allocated final scores pro rata to their uplifted scores. See 3.28 Table I for an illustrative example.
- 3.28 Table I:

	Total Score	Uplifted Score	Final Score
Bidder 1	500	625	0.47%
Bidder 2	300	375	0.28%
Bidder 3	150	188	0.14%
Bidder 4	80	100	0.08%

4. CVL Concept Design

- 4.1 The CVL Concept Design is submitted for assessment at several points during dialogue and in the Final Tender as described in Volume I.
- 4.2 Technical experts in the relevant fields will assess a Red/Amber/Green rating for each element of the CVL Concept Design at various stages of the procurement as set out in Appendix I.B of Volume I.
- 4.3 The Authority will assess the CVL Concept Design documentation submitted by Bidders against:
- a. Technical maturity reasonably expected at CVL Concept Design stage A/B as detailed within Appendix I.B of Volume I;
 - b. Consistency across the CVL Concept Design documentation products; and
 - c. Delivery of Authority requirements as set out in the ITSFT (and specifically the CVL Capital Budget, Appendix I.B, Appendix I.D and Appendix I.E of Volume I).
- 4.4 For each element, the Authority will assign a rating of:
- a. **Green:** the Authority has high confidence that the CVL Concept Design will meet Authority requirements, demonstrated consistently in sufficiently mature design documentation; or
 - a. **Amber:** the Authority has confidence that the CVL Concept Design will meet Authority requirements, demonstrated consistently. There are gaps in design documentation or issues with design; or
 - b. **Red:** the Authority has low confidence that the CVL Concept Design will meet Authority requirements. There are major gaps in documentation or issues with design such that the Authority cannot evidence that Authority requirements will be delivered. At submission of the final CVL Concept Design where a 'Red' rating is assessed, this will be validated by an independent expert appointed by the Authority.
- 4.5 The Authority will provide a clear commentary on what has reduced its confidence in the case of Red and Amber ratings. Bidders are required to maintain a CVL design development status schedule. The Authority may require Bidders to submit the CVL design development status schedule and any documents referenced by the CVL design development status schedule to supplement CVL Concept Design products and provide confidence on technical maturity, consistency and delivery of the CVL Concept Design.
- 4.6 There are 20 CVL Concept Design products, of which the Authority has designated 6 as key products:
- a) High Level Programme;
 - b) Design Development Commentary;
 - c) Accessibility Model Input Proforma;

- d) RailSys and Traction Power Simulations;
 - e) Extendibility Outline Response; and
 - f) Cost Templates.
- 4.7 In evaluation of Final Tenders, the Authority will allocate score S249 for the maturity of the CVL Concept Design based on its assessment of the CVL Concept Design submitted as part of the Final Tender.
- 4.8 S249 will be scored according to the table below (where all conditions in a row must be met to qualify for the relevant row score and a blank cell indicates a condition is not relevant for that row):

Score	Number of Concept Design products		Additional requirements
	Red	Green	
100	0	≥ 17	6 key products Green
90	0	≥ 15	6 key products Green
80	0	≥ 13	5 key products Green
30	0	≤ 12	
30	1		
30	0		≤ 5 key products Green
0	> 1		

5. [redacted]

5.1 [redacted]

6. Appendix 2.A - Workshop Scoring Matrices

Workshop criterion 1: Leadership			Weighting
The Bidder team demonstrates an understanding of and exhibits the behaviours needed for effective leadership in collaborative working arrangements.			40%
UNDERSTANDING		DEPLOYMENT	
	Score Available		Score Available
Level of evidence achieved		Level of evidence achieved	
There is no evidence that the Bidder team demonstrates an understanding of the behaviours needed for effective leadership in collaborative working arrangements.	0	There is no evidence of the Bidder team exhibiting the behaviours needed for effective leadership in collaborative working arrangements.	0
There is evidence that a minority of the Bidder team demonstrate an understanding of the behaviours needed for effective leadership in collaborative working arrangements.	1	There is evidence of a minority of the Bidder team exhibiting the behaviours needed for effective leadership in collaborative working arrangements.	1
There is evidence that a majority of the Bidder team demonstrate an understanding of the behaviours needed for effective leadership in collaborative working arrangements.	3	There is evidence of a majority of the Bidder team exhibiting the behaviours needed for effective leadership in collaborative working arrangements.	3
There is evidence that all the Bidder team demonstrate an understanding of the behaviours needed for effective leadership in collaborative working arrangements.	5	There is evidence of all the Bidder team exhibiting the behaviours needed for effective leadership in collaborative working arrangements.	5

Workshop Criterion 2: The Team			Weighting
The Bidder team demonstrates a common understanding of and exhibits the behaviours needed to make collaborative working a reality.			30%
UNDERSTANDING		DEPLOYMENT	
	Score Available		Score Available
Level of evidence achieved		Level of evidence achieved	
There is no evidence that the Bidder team demonstrates a common understanding of the behaviours needed to make collaborative working a reality.	0	There is no evidence of the Bidder team exhibiting the behaviours needed to make collaborative working a reality.	0
There is evidence that a minority of the Bidder team demonstrate a common understanding of the behaviours needed to make collaborative working a reality.	1	There is evidence of a minority of the Bidder team exhibiting the behaviours needed to make collaborative working a reality.	1
There is evidence that a majority of the Bidder team demonstrate a common understanding of the behaviours needed to make collaborative working a reality.	3	There is evidence of a majority of the Bidder team exhibiting the behaviours needed to make collaborative working a reality.	3
There is evidence that all the bidder team demonstrate a common understanding of the behaviours needed to make collaborative working a reality.	5	There is evidence of all the bidder team exhibiting the behaviours needed to make collaborative working a reality.	5

Workshop Criterion 3: Stakeholders			Weighting
The bidder team demonstrates a common understanding of the need for collaborative relationships with a range of internal and external stakeholders and exhibits the behaviours required to optimise those stakeholder relationships.			30%
UNDERSTANDING		DEPLOYMENT	
	Score Available		Score Available
Level of evidence achieved		Level of evidence achieved	
There is no evidence that the Bidder team demonstrates a common understanding of the need for	0	There is no evidence of the Bidder team exhibiting the behaviours needed to optimise internal and external stakeholder relationships.	0

collaborative relationships with a range of internal and external stakeholders.			
There is evidence that a minority of the Bidder team demonstrate a common understanding of the need for collaborative relationships with a range of internal and external stakeholders.	1	There is evidence of a minority of the Bidder team exhibiting the behaviours needed to optimise internal and external stakeholder relationships.	1
There is evidence that a majority of the Bidder team demonstrate a common understanding of the need for collaborative relationships with a range of internal and external stakeholders.	3	There is evidence of a majority of the Bidder team exhibiting the behaviours needed to optimise internal and external stakeholder relationships.	3
There is evidence that all the Bidder team demonstrate a common understanding of the need for collaborative relationships with a range of internal and external stakeholders.	5	There is evidence of all the Bidder team exhibiting the behaviours needed to optimise internal and external stakeholder relationships.	5

7. Appendix 2.B - Corporate Interview Scoring Matrices

Corporate Interview Criterion 1: Leadership	Weighting
The Bidder demonstrates an understanding of effective leadership to enable collaborative working arrangements.	40%
Level of evidence achieved	Score Available
There is no evidence of the Bidder demonstrating an understanding of the requirements for effective leadership to enable collaborative working arrangements.	0
There is poor evidence of the Bidder demonstrating an understanding of the requirements for effective leadership to enable collaborative working arrangements.	1
There is substantial evidence of the Bidder demonstrating an understanding of the requirements for effective leadership to enable collaborative working arrangements.	4
There is comprehensive evidence of the bidder demonstrating a full understanding of the requirements for effective leadership to enable collaborative working arrangements.	5

Corporate Interview Criterion 2: Collaborative Strategy	Weighting
The Bidder demonstrates a common understanding of collaboration as an effective business strategy.	30%
Level of evidence achieved	Score Available
There is no evidence of the Bidder demonstrating a common understanding of the requirements for collaboration as an effective business strategy.	0
There is poor evidence of the Bidder demonstrating a common understanding of the requirements for collaboration as an effective business strategy.	1
There is substantial evidence of the Bidder demonstrating a common understanding of the requirements for collaboration as an effective business strategy.	4
There is comprehensive evidence of the Bidder demonstrating a common understanding of the requirements for collaboration as an effective business strategy.	5

Corporate Interview Criterion 3: Stakeholders	Weighting
The Bidder demonstrates an understanding of the need to collaborate with a range of internal and external stakeholders.	30%
Level of evidence achieved	Score Available
There is no evidence of the Bidder demonstrating an understanding of the requirements to collaborate with a range of internal and external stakeholders.	0
There is poor evidence of the Bidder demonstrating an understanding of the requirements to collaborate with a range of internal and external stakeholders.	1
There is substantial evidence of the Bidder demonstrating an understanding of the requirements to collaborate with a range of internal and external stakeholders.	4
There is comprehensive evidence of the Bidder demonstrating an understanding of the requirements to collaborate with a range of internal and external stakeholders.	5

8. Appendix 2.C - Contract Visits Scoring Matrices

Contract Visits Criterion 1: Leadership	Weighting
The Bidder representatives exhibit the behaviours needed for effective leadership in collaborative working arrangements.	40%
Level of evidence achieved	Score Available
There is no evidence of the Bidder representatives exhibiting the behaviours needed for effective leadership in collaborative working arrangements.	0
There is poor evidence of the Bidder representatives exhibiting the behaviours needed for effective leadership in collaborative working arrangements.	1
There is substantial evidence of the Bidder representatives exhibiting the behaviours needed for effective leadership in collaborative working arrangements.	4
There is comprehensive evidence of the Bidder representatives exhibiting the behaviours needed for effective leadership in collaborative working arrangements.	5

Contract Visits Criterion 2: Implementation of a collaboration	Weighting
The Bidder representatives demonstrate that collaboration is at the heart of their approach to delivery.	30%
Level of evidence achieved	Score Available
There is no evidence of the Bidder representatives demonstrating that collaboration is at the heart of their approach to delivery.	0
There is poor evidence of the Bidder representatives demonstrating that collaboration is at the heart of their approach to delivery.	1
There is substantial evidence of the Bidder representatives demonstrating that collaboration is at the heart of their approach to delivery.	4
There is comprehensive evidence of the Bidder representatives demonstrating that collaboration is at the heart of their approach to delivery.	5

Contract Visits Criterion 3: Stakeholders	Weighting
The Bidder representatives demonstrate they have collaborative relationships with a range of stakeholders.	30%
Level of evidence achieved	Score Available
There is no evidence of the Bidder representatives demonstrating that they have collaborative relationships with a range of stakeholders.	0
There is poor evidence of the Bidder representatives demonstrating that they have collaborative relationships with a range of stakeholders.	1
There is substantial evidence of the Bidder representatives demonstrating that they have collaborative relationships with a range of stakeholders.	4
There is comprehensive evidence of the Bidder representatives demonstrating that they have collaborative relationships with a range of stakeholders.	5