

Evaluation Criteria and Weightings

No.	Criteria	Weighting for ITT Submissions Evaluation	Specific Areas Requirements
1.	Delivery Methodology	50%	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Detailed description of your proposed approach to meet Outcome 1: to improve and maintain local green spaces. • Detailed description of your proposed approach to meet Outcome 2: to develop and engage with a volunteer group to support the maintenance and long-term stewardship of the green spaces. • Confirmation you will achieve the outputs/outcomes set out in the specification. • Explanation of how the grant will be used as an investment to establish a legacy and long-term future for both the green spaces and the base of volunteers. <p><i>No more than 2,000 words</i></p>
2.	Social Value	25%	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Social value is closely linked to the ethos of the project, the volunteer programme, regeneration of public realm and green spaces and the project's potential to have a positive impact on the wider community. Please outline your approach to delivering social value. • This may be illustrated by relevant examples of social value in past projects. • The Authority will be assessing the level of clear commitments, inputs and outputs put forward. <p><i>No more than 2,000 words</i></p>
3.	Team & Experience	25%	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Set out the relevant skills and experience your organisation can provide. • Provide details for your proposed team including management, volunteer training, landscaping work. • Provide a CV for your lead point of contact and any partners you propose to work with. • Provide two relevant case studies that provide evidence of working on similar projects. • Provide the names of two referees that can provide assurance of your capability to deliver the requirement. <p><i>No more than 2,000 words. CVs and an Organogram can be appended and will not be counted towards the word limit. CVs should be no longer than 2 pages A4 per person.</i></p>

Quality Scoring Methodology

Score	Scoring Methodology Category	Scoring Narrative
5	Excellent	A comprehensive well evidenced submission, clearly demonstrating expertise and knowledge incorporating value added benefits/social value attributes & other points of innovation. The bid is deemed to offer little or no risk and fully captures the understanding of the steps involved to deliver the aspects of the question posed, giving a very high level of confidence in the Bidder's expertise and ability.
4	Good	The level of detail / supporting examples gives a high level of confidence in the Bidder's expertise and ability. The Bidder clearly has the potential to deliver and / or has clearly demonstrated that it will be able to meet an acceptable standard.
3	Adequate	There is adequate detail / supporting examples giving a reasonable level of confidence in the Bidder's expertise and ability. The Bidder appears to have the potential to deliver as required / to meet a reasonable standard and there are only minor concerns about the Bidder's expertise.
2	Weak	The response contains some omissions and / or is not well supported by evidence / examples. Some concerns about the Bidder's ability to deliver / to meet a reasonable standard.
1	Poor	The response contains material omissions and / or is supported by limited evidence / examples. Major concerns that the organisation has the potential to deliver / to meet a reasonable standard.
0	No Submission	Unable to score