

Pre-submission review: what this report looks like

This is an illustrative sample. The organisation, tender and quoted text below are fictional composites built for demonstration. The structure, depth and directness are exactly what a real Rapid Check returns — typically within 72 hours of receiving your near-final draft, often faster for a single document.

Job ticket	DD-SAMPLE
Document	Method statement — grounds maintenance framework, Lot 2
Client	Regional SME contractor (anonymised composite)
Question weighting	Quality 60% · Social value 10% · Price 30%
Received	Tue 09:40 · Returned Thu 15:10

THE VERDICT, FIRST

Submittable, but currently a mid-band answer chasing a top-band contract

The draft is compliant and readable, and the delivery model is genuinely strong — but the answer keeps asserting quality instead of evidencing it, and question 3b does not answer the question asked. As drafted we'd expect this to score 3/5 on the two highest-weighted questions. The eight findings below are ranked by marks at stake; the first four are where the contract is won or lost.

FINDINGS 1-4 · HIGH IMPACT

01

Q3a — opens with the company, not the question

"Established in 2009, GreenScope has grown into one of the region's most trusted providers..."

Why it loses marks: The question asks how you will maintain service quality across dispersed sites.

Assessors score the answer to the question, and this answer takes 90 words to start giving one.

The fix: Open with the mechanism: "Service quality across all 43 sites is controlled through a three-layer inspection regime: operative self-checks per visit, supervisor audits of 20% of sites weekly, and a monthly client-scored review against the KPI schedule at Appendix B."

02

Q3a — 'rigorous quality procedures', no evidence

"We operate rigorous quality assurance procedures to ensure consistently high standards."

Why it loses marks: Assertion, not evidence. This sentence scores nothing and spends 13 of your 500 words doing it.

The fix: Replace with the number and the proof: "Across our current 31-site contract, supervisor audits have returned a 96.4% first-time pass rate over the last 12 months (client-verified KPI reports available)."

03

Q3b — answers 'what you do', not 'how you will mobilise'

Whole answer (412 words) describes the existing service offer.

Why it loses marks: The question asks for a mobilisation plan with timescales. There is no timeline, no named mobilisation lead, no TUPE position, no risk register reference. On a 5-point scale this is the difference between a 2 and a 4.

The fix: Restructure to a week-by-week plan (weeks 1-8), name the mobilisation manager and their last two mobilisations, state the TUPE approach in two sentences, and reference the risk register you already hold from the ISO work.

04

Social value — generic pledges the buyer can't score

"We are committed to supporting local communities and reducing our environmental impact."

Why it loses marks: This authority scores social value against TOMs-style measures. Commitments without numbers, dates or a named measure score in the bottom band.

The fix: Commit to what you can evidence: "Two apprenticeship starts within 6 months of award (NM17); fleet already 40% electric, rising to 60% by contract year 2; quarterly reporting against the authority's measurement framework."

FINDINGS 5-8 · MARKS AND COMPLIANCE

- 05** Numbers disagree between narrative and pricing schedule — Q2 says 6 dedicated operatives; the pricing schedule resources 5.2 FTE. An assessor who spots this doubts every other number in the bid.
- 06** Q4 is 78 words over the limit — The portal states answers over limit 'may not be evaluated in full'. Your strongest evidence is in the final paragraph — the part at risk of being ignored. Cut the throat-clearing in paragraph one instead.
- 07** 'We will endeavour to attend emergency callouts promptly' — Hedge plus vague. The specification asks for a response standard. Commit: '2-hour attendance for P1 callouts, 24/7, measured monthly, with the last 12 months' performance at 98.7%.'
- 08** No named contract manager anywhere in the quality answers — Buyers score delivery credibility. Name the manager, their qualification (e.g. BALI-registered, IOSH), and their tenure. If the person might change, say 'or equivalent-qualified replacement approved by the authority'.

WHAT YOU GET, EVERY TIME

Every Rapid Check returns this report: findings ranked by marks at stake, the exact quoted text, why it loses marks against this buyer's criteria, and the specific fix — plus the compliance snags (limits, mandatories, attachments) checked line by line. You apply the fixes, or we do: if the review shows it needs a full rebuild, we tell you straight and the work moves up to the Sprint — nothing wasted.

deadlinedesk.co.uk/bid-review · hello@deadlinedesk.co.uk · Same-day reply with fit and a fixed price

Illustrative sample. All organisations, tenders and quoted text are fictional composites. Deadline Desk provides drafting, editing and document-improvement services; nothing here is legal, regulatory or procurement advice. © 2026 Deadline Desk.