

1. Purpose

1.1 This document details the specifics and proposed methodology used to evaluate the organisations' requirements prior to submitting an offer.

2. Criteria

2.1 The criteria is designed to define how to submit the most advantageous offer that best represents the Organisations.

2.2 The SwissSCWeb AG will apply the following criteria when evaluating the applicable parts of the offer:

- General details – An initial evaluation is made following the general details we will receive. If the Organisation does not meet our requirements further assessment will not be made. Pass/fail-
- Financial – Whole life costs including System installation/connection and on-going maintenance, licenses & support. Other suppliers should be aware of the budget allocation for this project. On-going maintenance and support contract costs will be stated annually for a period of 5 years and fall outside of the cost budgeted for the system. Core System Cost; Additional Module Cost (included and optionals); License/s Cost/s; Interface Costs; Maintenance / software support Costs.
- Technical – Customer Experience and Ability; Work flow and requirement suitability; IT requirements; Customer support and development (IT Department; Infrastructure and communication network).

3. Evaluation Methodology

- Customer requirements will be appraised both qualitatively and quantitatively but SwissSCWeb reserves the right not to follow through with any requests which demonstrate an abnormally high or low budget. In these circumstances, SwissSCWeb may request further information in order to evaluate a suitable solution and may at its own discretion (following receipt of this information) decide to send the offer or not.
- A request shall only be accepted if it complies with the requirements set out below .

Assessment Score Interpretation		
Excellent	5	Exceeds the requirement: The response meets the required standard in all material respects and exceeds some or all of the major requirements. The response identifies factors that will offer potential added value, with evidence to support the response.
Good	4	Satisfies the requirement with minor additional benefits: The response meets the required standard in all material respects. The response identifies factors that will offer potential added value, with evidence to support the response.

Acceptable	3	Satisfies the requirement: The response meets the required standard in most material respects, but is lacking or inconsistent in others.
Minor Reservations	2	Satisfies the requirement with minor reservations: The response falls short of meeting the required standard in more than one identifiable respects.
Serious Reservations	1	Satisfies the requirement with major reservations: The response significantly fails to meet the required standard and/or contains significant shortcomings
Unacceptable	0	Does not meet the requirement: Does not comply and/or insufficient information provided. The response fails to meet the required standard.