

Confidential Appendix A: Population Segmentation and Economic Modelling Tender Evaluation Results

EVALUATION CRITERIA: QUALITY (70%)

BIDDER 1: KPMG

No.	Quality Criteria (70%)	Weighting	Raw Score (0 - 4)	Average Weighted Score	Comments
1	Please demonstrate your understanding of the requirements of the work strand and how the findings/deliverables relate to the overall objectives of the London Health Commission.	7%	1	2%	Narrowly focused, treated as 'mechanical' modelling task. Weak on elements 4 and 5 of specification. Very NHS focused, little reference to public health or local authority / social care aspects.
2	Please outline how you will deliver this project in terms of individual elements of analysis and the overall working relationship with the LHC team and Expert Groups. Please set out your understanding of the key deliverables and products and set out what you would expect to handover to the LHC team upon project completion. Provide an overall project plan/approach showing how this will be achieved.	21%	1	5%	Modelling focus very narrow, didn't address wider issues of PH and LA in approach. Did not demonstrate Insufficient understanding of population segmentation approaches. Silently n working with LHC and weak on non-modelling elements i.e helping expert groups to frame recommendations.
3	Please demonstrate that your organisation has the appropriate resources available with the capacity to deliver work in the required timescale. Please set out details of the experience of key members of the project team.	21%	2	11%	Reasonable balance of senior / middle / junior but overall still felt light relative to the scale, complexity and intensity of the work to be done over next 12 weeks.
4	Provide evidence of relevant past experience and deep understanding of the health and social care system in London, the UK and internationally.	14%	2	7%	Basics covered but relatively weaker on London and international 'thought' pieces vs more technical modelling.
5	Demonstrate your understanding of any risks associated with this project and how these can be mitigated/managed. Please use a risk management plan to support your response.	7%	1	2%	Response felt v mechanical / generic. No reference to complexity of stakeholder environment or politics
	TOTAL	70%		26.25%	

Confidential Appendix A: Population Segmentation and Economic Modelling Tender Evaluation Results

BIDDER 2: Deloitte					
No.	Quality Criteria (70%)	Weighting	Raw Score (0 - 4)	Average Weighted Score	Comments
1	Please demonstrate your understanding of the requirements of the work strand and how the findings/deliverables relate to the overall objectives of the London Health Commission.	7%	1	2%	Too narrow an interpretation of the brief - 'mechanical' modelling task, very weak on elements 4 and 5 of specification – i.e supporting LHC team and expert panels to develop and model lines of enquiry/options.
2	<p>Please outline how you will deliver this project in terms of individual elements of analysis and the overall working relationship with the LHC team and Expert Groups.</p> <p>Please set out your understanding of the key deliverables and products and set out what you would expect to handover to the LHC team upon project completion. Provide an overall project plan/approach showing how this will be achieved.</p>	21%	2	11%	Reasonable approach and frameworks set out for modelling. Evidence of understanding re population segmentation. BUT no reference to working with LHC team and how make that work effectively and weak on non-modelling elements i.e helping expert groups to frame recommendations.
3	Please demonstrate that your organisation has the appropriate resources available with the capacity to deliver work in the required timescale. Please set out details of the experience of key members of the project team.	21%	1	5%	<p>Team very junior / insufficient senior oversight. No thought leadership contribution.</p> <p>Significant Underestimate of requirements.</p>
4	Provide evidence of relevant past experience and deep understanding of the health and social care system in London, the UK and internationally.	14%	3	11%	Solid but less track record of big thought pieces
5	Demonstrate your understanding of any risks associated with this project and how these can be mitigated/managed. Please use a risk management plan to support your response.	7%	1	2%	<p>Response felt v mechanical / generic.</p> <p>No reference to complexity of stakeholder environment or politics</p>
TOTAL		70%		29.75%	

Confidential Appendix A: Population Segmentation and Economic Modelling Tender Evaluation Results

BIDDER 3: McKinsey & Co					
No.	Quality Criteria (70%)	Weighting	Raw Score (0 - 4)	Average Weighted Score	Comments
1	Please demonstrate your understanding of the requirements of the work strand and how the findings/deliverables relate to the overall objectives of the London Health Commission.	7%	3	5%	Understood scope and how various strands fit together. Clear sense of Added value.
2	<p>Please outline how you will deliver this project in terms of individual elements of analysis and the overall working relationship with the LHC team and Expert Groups.</p> <p>Please set out your understanding of the key deliverables and products and set out what you would expect to handover to the LHC team upon project completion. Provide an overall project plan/approach showing how this will be achieved.</p>	21%	4	21%	<p>Detailed lead explanation of approach and how builds on previous experience and work undertake In London. Covered full range of the LHC scope – e.g approach to modelling LA position, allocation formula build on existing and be clear where additional lines of enquiry genuinely add value. Strong on working with the LHC team / team approach and how would add value to work with expert groups / lever in benefits and expertise of McKinsey in international context. (Noted significantly exceeded word count)</p> <p>REF WORD COUNT - it was noted that McKinsey had exceeded word count and felt that weaknesses in KPMG and Deloitte bids did not relate to being constrained on word count but on too narrow an interpretation of the brief</p>
3	Please demonstrate that your organisation has the appropriate resources available with the capacity to deliver work in the required timescale. Please set out details of the experience of key members of the project team.	21%	3	16%	<p>Strong and very senior team with lots of relevant experience and clear understanding of issues / ability to help shape thinking.</p> <p>To get 4 added assurance re team capacity and availability over next 6-12 weeks.</p>
4	Provide evidence of relevant past experience and deep understanding of the health and social care system in London, the UK and internationally.	14%	4	14%	Extensive London, national and international experience. Ability to set work in international context. Depth and breadth and ability to mobilise rapidly. (noted significantly exceeded word count)
5	Demonstrate your understanding of any risks associated with this project and how these can be mitigated/managed. Please use a risk management plan to support your response.	7%	3	5%	Key risks and issues identified. Understanding of importance of political and stakeholder context to this work and how that will need to be factored In to the he approach.
	TOTAL	70%		61.25%	

Confidential Appendix A: Population Segmentation and Economic Modelling Tender Evaluation Results

EVALUATION CRITERIA: PRICE (30%)

		Price (excl. VAT)	Score
Bidder 1	KPMG	£392,900	14.51%
Bidder 2	Deloitte	£190,000	30.00%
Bidder 3	McKinsey & Co	£845,280	6.74%

EVALUATION CRITERIA: VALUE FOR MONEY (QUALITY + PRICE)

		VFM Score
Bidder 1	KPMG	40.76%
Bidder 2	Deloitte	59.75%
Bidder 3	McKinsey & Co	67.99%