

## Appendix 1: Evaluation Criteria and Scoring Matrix

Final tenders were evaluated against:

- Price (50% weighting)
  - Prices are evaluated in accordance with the Chartered Institute of Public Finances and Accountancy (CIPFA) model
- Quality (50% weighting)

The quality of the business plan was assessed against the following criteria:

<b>CRITERIA</b>	<b>Weighting</b>
<p><b>About your group or organisation</b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Demonstrate that your group has adopted a suitable legal structure OR has identified your preferred legal structure and is taking steps to adopt that structure</li> <li>• Demonstrate that your group has the capacity and, where possible, the experience to deliver its proposals.</li> </ul>	10%
<p><b>Vision for a community managed library</b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Provide strong evidence of future demand for proposed services</li> <li>• Describe how services will be provided</li> <li>• Demonstrate how your proposal benefits the community</li> <li>• Demonstrate that the future sustainability of the proposal is credible</li> <li>• Demonstrate community support for your proposal</li> </ul>	15%
<p><b>Management and staffing</b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Clear management structures are in place</li> <li>• Sufficient levels of skills and expertise are available to manage the service</li> <li>• Volunteers are recruited or there is a plan to recruit them</li> <li>• For proposals that include paid staff, the implications of TUPE have been considered and planned for.</li> </ul>	10%
<p><b>Opening hours</b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• The existing number and pattern of opening hours are maintained</li> <li>• Extension to opening hours have been considered where possible</li> </ul>	10%

<p><b>What assets will you need to provide the service?</b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Clearly identify the assets required to deliver the proposal</li> <li>• Set out a plan for securing additional assets where required</li> <li>• Where the proposal seeks to relocate the library to alternative premises, clear information is provided to confirm that the premises is, or will be, adequate for the provision of a library service.</li> </ul>	10%
<p><b>Book Stock management</b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Confirm that Council stock will be managed in accordance with the policy</li> <li>• Identify how any non-Council book stock will be managed, if applicable.</li> </ul>	5%
<p><b>Financial projections and cash flow</b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Set out all known and anticipated costs, demonstrating an understanding of what is involved in providing a community managed library</li> <li>• Be clear about how income of support for revenue costs will be secured</li> <li>• Provide a cash flow statement including realistic estimates of expenses and income which demonstrates the viability and sustainability of the proposal.</li> </ul>	20%
<p><b>Compliance with legal requirements</b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Clearly identify the legal requirements arising from your proposal</li> <li>• Demonstrate how these requirements will be fulfilled</li> </ul>	5%
<p><b>Risk awareness and mitigation</b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Provide a risk analysis which includes actions for mitigation</li> <li>• Demonstrate that risks have been considered and evaluated and that actions for mitigation are proposed.</li> </ul>	5%
<p><b>Sustainability and improvement</b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Demonstrate that you have a sustainable model for service delivery</li> <li>• Identify methods for seeking to improve or adapt the service to changing community needs</li> <li>• Provide evidence that you have processes to ensure business continuity</li> <li>• Analyse the impact of your proposal on your organisation.</li> </ul>	5%
<p><b>Review of Legal Agreements</b> Likelihood of a satisfactory commercial outcome based on the submitted mark-up of legal agreements</p>	5%

The quality of the initial business plan proposals were scored in accordance with the scoring matrix below:

	Score	
Fail	0	<b>No response to the criteria.</b>
	1-2	<b>Very poor</b> - criteria not addressed or processes not acceptable
	3-4	<b>Poor</b> – missing major areas and not showing sufficient understanding of the key requirements
Pass	5-6	<b>Minimum / satisfactory</b> – awareness of the issues, but with some reservations
	7-9	<b>Good</b> – competent response, showing a high level of understanding and working practices
	9-10	<b>Excellent</b> – detailed understanding with a high level of understanding of the requirements, of working practices and of quality measures that provide the potential for real service provision, with no reservations.

The proposals had to achieve a consensus unweighted score of 5 or above for each of the criteria in order to be considered for recommendation for contract award.