

Tender Evaluation

Company A

Criteria	Weighting (%)	Scoring (0-100)	Conversion Formula (Score × Weighting)
Public Liability Insurance	20%	100	Score × 0.20 = 20
Work Programme (Outputs & Results)	40%	75	Score × 0.40 = 30
Price	20%	90	Score × 0.20 = 18
Health & Safety Assessment	10%	100	Score × 0.10 = 10
Experience in the Sector	10%	80	Score × 0.10 = 8
Total Score	100%		Sum of weighted scores = 88%

Public Liability Insurance: Provided.

Work Programme / Outputs: Clear scope, limited detail on biodiversity.

Price: Competitive.

Health & Safety: Licensed operators, PPE, barriers.

Experience with Sector: Machinery-heavy approach suggests competence.

Comments: Competitive bid, competent machinery use, but waste management (burning brush onsite) is against instructions.

Company B

Criteria	Weighting (%)	Scoring (0-100)	Conversion Formula (Score × Weighting)
Public Liability Insurance	20%	100	Score × 0.20 = 20
Work Programme (Outputs & Results)	40%	90	Score × 0.40 = 36
Price	20%	70	Score × 0.20 = 14
Health & Safety Assessment	10%	100	Score × 0.10 = 10
Experience in the Sector	10%	80	Score × 0.10 = 8
Total Score	100%		Sum of weighted scores = 88%

Public Liability Insurance: Provided.

Work Programme / Outputs: Very clear plan, winter timing, biodiversity and waste minimisation well-considered. Only submitted total quote (not separated).

Price: Mid-range.

Health & Safety: Comprehensive H&S measures including first-aiders and spotters.

Experience with Sector: Method statement suggests experience.

Comments: Strong methodology and H&S; environmentally sensitive approach; total quote slightly reduces clarity on cost allocation.

Company C

Criteria	Weighting (%)	Scoring (0-100)	Conversion Formula (Score × Weighting)
----------	---------------	-----------------	--

Public Liability Insurance	20%	100	Score × 0.20 = 20
Work Programme (Outputs & Results)	40%	100	Score × 0.40 = 40
Price	20%	70	Score × 0.20 = 14
Health & Safety Assessment	10%	80	Score × 0.05 = 8
Experience in the Sector	10%	100	Score × 0.10 = 10
Total Score	100%		Sum of weighted scores = 92%

Public Liability Insurance: Provided. Score: 100

Work Programme / Outputs: Very detailed plan including coppicing, crown lifting, plot reinstatement, and woodchip management; environmentally considerate.

Price: Upper range.

Health & Safety: Uses BS3998 standards, PPE implied.

Experience with Sector: Tree surgeon with detailed methods.

Comments: Most comprehensive and detailed method statement, excellent environmental and technical measures, but a higher cost. Likely offers best long-term value.

Company D

Criteria	Weighting (%)	Scoring (0-100)	Conversion Formula (Score × Weighting)
Public Liability Insurance	20%	100	Score × 0.20 = 20
Work Programme (Outputs & Results)	40%	60	Score × 0.40 = 24
Price	20%	60	Score × 0.20 = 12
Health & Safety Assessment	10%	80	Score × 0.05 = 8
Experience in the Sector	10%	100	Score × 0.10 = 10
Total Score	100%		Sum of weighted scores = 74%

Public Liability Insurance: Provided. Score: 100

Work Programme / Outputs: Method statement lacks detail; limited detail on biodiversity.

Price: Highest price.

Health & Safety: Operators trained, PPE, signage/barriers.

Experience with Sector: Experienced tree surgeon

Comments: High cost and method statement is less detailed than other companies.

Company E

Criteria	Weighting (%)	Scoring (0-100)	Conversion Formula (Score × Weighting)
Public Liability Insurance	20%	100	Score × 0.20 = 20
Work Programme (Outputs & Results)	40%	70	Score × 0.40 = 28
Price	20%	95	Score × 0.20 = 19
Health & Safety Assessment	10%	50	Score × 0.05 = 5
Experience in the Sector	10%	90	Score × 0.10 = 9
Total Score	100%		Sum of weighted scores = 81%

- Public Liability Insurance: Insurance up to £5m confirmed, copy available.
- Work Programme / Outputs: Clear scope with two Part 1 options (cut back vs. coppice), removal of self-seeded trees, crown lifting, and Part 2 plot reinstatement and bank repair. Method shows understanding of tree work techniques. No detail on biodiversity or waste management, though all arisings removed.
- Price: Competitive pricing.
- Health & Safety Assessment: Risk Assessment and method statement to follow.
- Experience with the Sector: Being a tree surgeon, demonstrates relevant professional expertise.

Comments: Provides a cost-effective option with a clear understanding of tree work and hedge management. Further detail on H&S practices and biodiversity would strengthen the proposal.

Conclusion:

- **Company C** scored highest (92%), offering a detailed and comprehensive plan including coppicing, crown lifting, plot reinstatement, and woodchip management. Their environmentally sensitive and technically robust approach provides strong long-term value, although their price (£9,300) is higher than other bids.
- **Company A** scored 88%, being competitively priced (£5,500) with competent machinery use, but with less detail on biodiversity.
- **Company B** scored 88%, with clear methodology and strong health and safety measures. Price (£7,980) is mid-range, but the quote was not separated for the two parts of the work.
- **Company E** scored 81%, Competitive cost, clear understanding of tree work and hedge management. Strong insurance coverage and professional expertise. Less detail on H&S procedures and biodiversity.
- **Company D** scored 74%, experienced and competent, but the method statement lacked detail, and the price (£14,740) was highest.

Final Comments for Councillors

All companies were met on site prior to submitting their tenders. During discussions, several contractors noted that the tender document could have been clearer in some areas. It did not specify whether the hedge was to be coppiced or simply cut back, which may have influenced the methods proposed and the resulting costs. The tender also did not explicitly address the work required on the trees, such as crown lifting branches over the sheds.

It is likely that these points of ambiguity contributed to the wide variation in the quotes received. Councillors may wish to take these factors into consideration when evaluating the tenders and making a decision.

All applicants were informed that, in accordance with the Environmental Protection Act 1990 and the Waste Management Licensing Regulations, no hedge or tree waste is to be burned on site, and all arisings must be removed or otherwise disposed of legally.