



Making Sense of Tender Evaluations

Lunchtime Webinar Series 2022

27 April 2022

The session will begin at 12.30 PM ...
(sound is currently off – chat box is open so feel free to say Hello!)

Agenda

- Upcoming Webinars
- Hot topics & technical update
- Tender Evaluations – Part 1

Upcoming Lunchtime Webinars

Lunch & Learn	
25 May 2022 (12.30 – 13.15)	Writing Effective Service Level Agreements
18 July 2022 (12.30 – 13.15)	Framework Agreements
19 September 2022 (12.30 – 13.15)	Tender Evaluation Part 2

If you would like to pre-book attendance, please email:
walter.akers@rsmuk.com or mohamed.hans@cipfa.org

Conferences

Conferences (in person)	
30 June 2022 (10.00 – 16.00)	Leeds (40 attendees)
6 July 2022 (10.00 – 16.00)	London (80 Attendees)

If you would like to pre-book attendance, please email:
walter.akers@rsmuk.com or mohamed.hans@cipfa.org

About your hosts

Walter Akers

Head of Projects & Commercial, RSM

Walter specialises in advising enterprises on procurement, commercial contract risk and maximising value from complex commercial arrangements. He is a guest lecturer at University College London on their MSc and commercial training programmes and he is an accredited assessor on the UK Government's Commercial Capability Programme. Walter is a fellow of the World Commerce & Contracting Association (IACCM, International Association for Contract & Commercial Management).

DL 07561327662

E walter.akers@rsmuk.com

Mohamed Hans, Solicitor

Principal Procurement Advisor, CIPFA Procurement Network

Mohamed is a highly experienced procurement solicitor who manages the CIPFA Procurement Network, which has over 130 subscribing authorities. He represents CIPFA at key procurement events, organises and speaks at workshops and conferences, produces newsletters, as well as supports practitioners with legal and procurement queries.

DL 07717345188

E mohamed.hans@cipfa.org

Technical Update

- Update on Transforming Public Procurement Green Paper

<https://www.gov.uk/government/consultations/green-paper-transforming-public-procurement/outcome/transforming-public-procurement-government-response-to-consultation>

- Excession Technologies Limited v Police Digital Service [2022] EWHC 413 (TCC)
- Buyer Beware – Auditors are fishing for procurement irregularities

Tender Evaluation and Moderation – Part 1

General Poll



- **Have you had any previous training on undertaking tender evaluations?**
- **A: Yes – It was covered as part of my formal professional training**
- **B: Yes – It was explained to me by a senior colleague**
- **C: Yes – I trained myself**
- **D: No – No formal training, but have been involved in tender evaluations**
- **E: No – I have not had any formal training, all this is new to me**

Why is Evaluation Important?

- Supplier to deliver specification
- Determine how well bidders have submitted proposals
- Must not allow personal opinions or views to influence scoring
- Note – this areas is very litigious!
- Stick to the rules!



Why Moderate Tender Scores?

Evaluator	Score Awarded			Final Score
Boris	4	How do you resolve the different scores?	Averaging Score?	
Sajid	3		Is this compliant?	
Rishi	1			
Total	8		2.66	

Conducting the evaluation meeting(s)

Allow each panel member to **individually** score each response, and then, for each question, average the panel scores to give a final score for each question.

Bidder #1			
Evaluator	Question 1	Question 2	Question 3
Boris	4	2	4
Sajid	10	8	4
Rishi	7	8	6
AVG. SCORE	7	6	4.66

Discussion point: Is this a good approach?

Conducting the evaluation meeting(s)

Allow each panel member to **individually** score each response, and then, hold a panel discussion to debate the scores assigned, and, as a panel, agree final **consensus** scores.

Bidder #1			
Evaluator	Question 1	Question 2	Question 3
Boris	4	2	4
Sajid	10	8	4
Rishi	7	8	6
MODERATED SCORE	4	8	4

Discussion point: What about this approach?

Conducting the evaluation meeting(s)

Allow the panel some reading time at the start of the meeting – but not beforehand. Do not record or report individual scores. Debate the quality of the responses ***as a panel***, and agree a **consensus score** only.

Bidder #1			
Evaluation Panel: J. Smith, D. Evans, B. Spence			
	Question 1	Question 2	Question 3
<i>Panel's Verdict</i>	6	8	4

Discussion point: What about this approach?

Plenary Session - Discussion, Summary & Close

If you have any questions, please contact:

Mohamed Hans

CIPFA

Mobile: 07717 345188

Email: mohamed.hans@cipfa.org

Walter Akers

RSM

Mobile: 07561327662

walter.akers@rsmuk.com

The information contained herein is of a general nature and is not intended to address the circumstances of any particular individual or entity. Unless otherwise stated copyright in the whole and every part of the information belongs to CIPFA /RSM, and may not be used, sold, licensed, copied or reproduced in whole or in part in any manner or form or in any media to any person without **written consent**. Although care has been taken to ensure the content accurate and timely, there can be no guarantee that such information is accurate as of the date it is received or that it will continue to be accurate in the future. CIPFA and RSM therefore accepts no liability for loss of any kind incurred as a result of reliance on the information or opinions provided in this presentation. No one should act on such information without appropriate professional advice after a thorough examination of the particular situation.