

PROCUREMENT GATEWAY 3 - CONTRACT AWARD REPORT - PART I

20138 – Old Town Street/New George Street Public Realm



- 1. INTRODUCTION**
- 2. BACKGROUND**
- 3. PROCUREMENT PROCESS**
- 4. TENDER EVALUATION CRITERIA**
- 5. SUMMARY OF EVALUATION**
- 6. FINANCIAL IMPLICATIONS**
- 7. RECOMMENDATIONS**
- 8. APPROVAL**

1. INTRODUCTION

This contract award report is in relation to the procurement of the main construction contract for the Old Town Street and New George Street Public Realm works. The scope of the requirement includes: Public realm works including drainage, highway and footway surfacing, street lights, street furniture, street trees and landscaping.

Contract Duration: 12 months

2. BACKGROUND

Plymouth City Council is investing in a major regeneration to improve this part of the city for residents, businesses and visitors.

Key features of the project include:

- Improved public realm that promotes pedestrian priority
- New tree planting carefully arranged to allow clear sightlines to shopfronts
- High quality natural stone paving
- New modern seating and street furniture
- Improved pedestrian connection between the city centre, Drake Circus and the Barcode
- Space for new on-street retail new pavilions

3. PROCUREMENT PROCESS

A competitive procurement was run utilising the Hampshire Gen 4-2 Civil Engineering, Highways and Transportation Collaborative Framework under Lot 2 which is specific to the South West, with 8 appointed suppliers on this Lot.

Suppliers appointed on the framework have already been suitability pre-qualified to be able to deliver a project of this value and nature, at framework assessment level.

4. TENDER EVALUATION CRITERIA

Award Criteria and Methodology

The high level weighting criteria for this procurement is as follows:

Price	60%
Quality	40%
TOTAL	100%

1. Tender Assessment Methodology

The assessment of tenders shall be carried out in two separate evaluations; one based upon price and the other on quality.

The tender will be evaluated on the basis of the Quality/Price ratio. Price – 60% Quality 40%.

1.1 Price Assessment

An evaluation of the rates and prices submitted by each tenderer will be made by the Employer. Tender totals will be ranked using the outcome of the Tender Assessment Sheet with the lowest tender total given 100 marks and all other totals will have one mark deducted for each percentage point (rounded to the nearest integer) by which the total exceeds the lowest.

1.2 Quality Assessment

Tenders are to provide responses and information as detailed below. Quality Statements submitted by each tenderer will be evaluated by a Quality Assessment Panel (independently from those persons assessing Price) using marks allocated using the evaluation criteria also shown below.

Quality Questions

The quality questions are contained in **Appendix B – Quality submission**

Evaluation Criteria for the Quality Questions and Social Value (Qualitative)

Evaluation Criteria	
Explanation	Mark
A fully compliant, comprehensive response which provides a highly relevant and detailed description, fully addresses all of the question and demonstrates an extensive understanding of the areas/matters to which the question refers and how the requirement/outcomes will be met in full. Overall, the response provides a high level of confidence in the Tenderer's approach.	100

The response provides a relevant and detailed description, addresses all of the question with only minor instances of missing detail and demonstrates a good understanding of the areas/matters to which the question refers and how the requirements/outcomes will be fulfilled. Overall, the response provides a good level of confidence in the Tenderer's approach.	75
The response provides a relevant description, demonstrates a reasonable understanding of the areas/matters to which the question refers and how the requirements/outcomes will be fulfilled but some of the question has not been covered with sufficient depth and understanding. Overall, the response provides a satisfactory level of confidence in the Tenderer's approach.	50
A response which provides only a partially relevant description, demonstrates little understanding of the areas/matters to which the question refers and how the requirements/outcomes will be fulfilled. The majority of the question has not been covered with sufficient depth and understanding. Overall, the response only provides a low level of confidence in the Tenderer's approach.	25
No or inadequate response is provided or, a response is provided which is not relevant, does not address the requirements and/or fails to provide any confidence in the Tenderer's approach. Fails to demonstrate an ability to meet the requirement/deliver the required outcomes.	0

Evaluation Criteria for Social Value Commitment (Quantitative)

$$\left(\frac{\text{Tenderer's Total Social Value Commitment (£)}}{\text{Highest Total Social Value Commitment (£)}} \right) \times \text{Weighting} = \text{Weighted score}$$

Quality Statement Categories

Question	Question Weighting (%)
Experience and Lessons Learnt	9.00
Proposed Team	3.00
Health, Safety, Quality & Environment	8.00
Climate Emergency, & Sustainability	3.00
Risk and Change Management	3.00
Programme & Logistics	9.00
Social Value Commitment (Quantitative)	2.00

Social Value Method Statement (Qualitative)	3.00
	40.00

Rounding Protocol:

All marks shall be rounded to the nearest integer

Pass/Fail Questions

Questions identified as PASS/FAIL will be evaluated on a pass/fail basis. Each question will clearly indicate what response constitutes as PASS and what response constitutes as FAIL. In the event of the Tenderer being awarded a 'fail' on any of the criteria, the remainder of your Tender will not be evaluated and you will be eliminated from the process. Your company will be disqualified if you do not submit these completed questions.

National Skills Academy will be assessed on a **PASS/FAIL** basis.

Quality Statement Requirements

The written Quality Statements submitted by a tenderer must be kept to the maximum word limits detailed at the bottom of each question. Any information that exceeds the word limits stated will be redacted from the bottom of the response up and will be excluded from the evaluation.

Where a plan or other documentary evidence is specifically requested, this should be provided in Annex format. You should clearly identify which question you are answering by using headings and sub-headings.

5. SUMMARY OF EVALUATION

The procurement was issued electronically to 8 suppliers via the, The Supplying The South West Portal on 4th December 2020 with a submission date of 19th February 2021.

The tender submission was independently evaluated by Council Officers and external consultants to the project, all of whom have the appropriate skills and experience, in order to ensure transparency and robustness in the process. The resulting scores are contained in the confidential paper.

Price clarifications were evaluated by the external Quantity Surveyor and managed through The Supplying The South West Portal.

In order to ensure fairness of the process the evaluation of Quality and Price were split, with Price information being held back from the Quality evaluators.

6. FINANCIAL IMPLICATIONS

Financial provision has been made for this contract within the project budget. Details of the contractual pricing are contained in the confidential paper – Part II.

7. RECOMMENDATIONS

It is recommended that a contract be awarded to the successful supplier on NEC4 Engineering & Construction – Contract Option A Terms & Conditions.

This award will be provisional and subject to no challenge being made during the Council's call in period.

8. APPROVAL

Authorisation of Contract Award Report

Author (Responsible Officer / Project Lead)			
Name:	Tom Lowry		
Job Title:	Design and Delivery Coordinator		
Additional Comments (Optional):			
Signature:		Date:	06/04/2021
Head of Service / Service Director [Signature provides authorisation to this award report and award of Contract]			
Name:	Paul Barnard		
Job Title:	Service Director Strategic Planning and Infrastructure		
Additional Comments (Optional):			
Signature:		Date:	8 April 2021