

ANNEX A

FOI DOF/2021-0370

Request – relating to NICSHR L&D Collaborative Learning and Development Framework 2021-2024

1. In relation to Lots 1, 3 and 4, do you confirm that only 1 tenderer passed the qualitative criteria assessment by achieving a score of 3, 4 or 5 in the Award Criteria questions i.e. only one tenderer progressed to the quantitative (cost) evaluation?

2. Do the tenderer's lowest qualitative scores presented for Lot 2 relate to the same tenderer as the presented lowest quantitative (cost) score of 38.38?

3. If the response to question 2 is yes, how did this tenderer progress to the quantitative (cost) evaluation given that it was awarded a 2 for L2AC2 and a 1 for L2AC7 i.e. it did not achieve a 3, 4 or 5 and should have been excluded from the evaluation process.

4. If the response to question 2 is no, the qualitative scores presented for Lot 2 are misleading because they are not relevant to the award decision i.e. the basis by which tenderers that had passed the stated qualitative standard were ranked from highest to lowest based on their overall award score (qualitative + quantitative scores).

Please, therefore provide the detailed qualitative, quantitative and final award scores for all the tenderers that progressed beyond the qualitative evaluation stage for Lot

2. Note that we do not require the identity of the tenderers.

5. Please provide the number of tenders submitted for each of the four lots i.e. not the information presented in the contract award notice which implied that 13 tenders were received for each Lot.

Response

The Department has completed its search in relation to your request and, in balancing the reasons for and against disclosure, has provided a response to each of your questions below:

1. The Department confirms that there was only 1 tenderer in each of lots 1, 3 and 4 who passed the qualitative criteria assessment.
2. The Department confirms that the range of qualitative scores presented in the Fol letter on the 17 May 2021, included those tenderers who failed to meet the minimum qualitative score to progress to the quantitative assessment.
3. N/A
4. The evaluation scores for the second ranked tenderer in Lot 2 are provided in the table below:

Criteria	Weight	Score	Weighted Score
AC1	6.048	3	3.6288
AC2	8.064	4	6.4512
AC3	4.032	4	3.2256
AC4	3.024	3	1.8144
AC5	2.016	4	1.6128
AC6	2.016	4	1.6128
AC7	8.4	4	6.72
AC8	6	4	4.8
AC9	6	3	3.6
AC10	4.8	4	3.84
AC11	4.8	4	3.84
AC12	4.8	3	2.88
Award Total			44.03
Cost			38.38
Total			82.41

5. Details of the number of tenderers per lot are provided in the table below:

Lot	Number of Tenderers
1	4
2	4
3	3
4	5