

**PROCUREMENT GATEWAY 3 -
CONTRACT AWARD REPORT -
PART I - OFFICIAL**



**OLEV
On-Street Electric Vehicle
Charging Infrastructure
Procurement Reference No.
20284**

Table of Contents

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

I. INTRODUCTION

This report is in relation to the process undertaken and recommendation related to the award of Contract for On-Street Electric Vehicle Charge Point Provider & Installation.

This contract will be executed under Crown Commercial Service RM6213 Call off Terms & Conditions and will run for the duration of the project.

Contract Duration: The intended duration of the contract is for 36 months.

2. BACKGROUND

Plymouth City Council declared a climate emergency in March 2019 with a pledge to become carbon neutral by 2030. To achieve this there is an urgent need to reduce carbon emissions from transport, which accounts for 28% of all Plymouth's carbon emissions. In order to achieve the require carbon reduction Plymouth City Council recognises the need to provide a substantial electric vehicle (EV) charging network across the city, consisting of a variety of technologies, locations and chargepoint styles.

One area identified is the need for public on-street EV charging targeted at local residents. In order to achieve this Plymouth City Council successfully bid for Office for Low Emission Vehicles (OLEV) funding as part of the 'On-street Residential Charging' scheme.

Through the project Plymouth City Council aim to install up to 50 7kW chargepoints across up to 20 hub locations. Plymouth City Council were awarded a grant from OLEV on-street charging scheme and any installation must adhere to the criteria of the grant.

The Council are responsible for locating suitable sites. The appointed chargepoint contractor will provide the charge point unit, undertake the civils and installation of the charging units. The winning contractor will be responsible for its operation and maintenance for a period of up to 3 years in accordance with OLEVs guidelines.

Funding for the project is time limited and Plymouth City Council would expect the installations to start before February 28th and chargepoints to be installed by 31st May 2021. The Council will liaise with the DNO to ensure grid capacity is available at each site but the installer will be required to submit the connection application and work with the DNO (the Council will pay the DNO directly so bidders do not need to provide grid connection costs)

3. PROCUREMENT PROCESS

Following a procurement options appraisal, it was determined that undertaking a tender exercise through a Predetermined EU compliant Dynamic Purchasing System (DPS) was the most appropriate route to market to procure this requirement, with the following considered the most suitable:

Crown Commercial Service (CCS) –RM6213 – Vehicle Charging Infrastructure Solutions Dynamic Purchasing System.

This DPS was established in accordance with EU procurement regulations; it is a Public Sector sourcing tool for services and goods, and is similar to a framework, with new suppliers able to join at any time. It provides a quick, simple and competitive route for a wide range of vehicle charging infrastructure solutions.

4. TENDER EVALUATION CRITERIA

Overview of Process

CCS formed the DPS through advertising within the Official Journal of the European Union (OJEU) on 8th April 2020 under contract notice reference 2020/S 072-173486 and will expire on 7th April 2024. CCS are responsible for managing the DPS processes and suppliers at agreement level and for providing us with the advice and guidance to help Councils get the best out of the agreement when creating an Order Contract (also known as a Call-Off Contract).

Suppliers have been assessed on their financial standing at the point of them joining the DPS. Suppliers have also agreed to the terms and conditions of the DPS, and the subsequent call-off schedules.

Evaluation of the Call-Off Tender exercise was undertaken in accordance with the overall evaluation strategy for the project.

The Council evaluated tender submissions as a two stage process. The first stage is known as the GDPR compliance stage and the second as the award stage.

The first stage consisted of an assessment of the Tenderer's suitability in principle to meet the requirements of the Council as detailed in the ITT document. Only Tenderers passing this first stage had their Tenders evaluated at the second stage.

The award stage considered the merits of the eligible Tenders in order to assess which is the most economically advantageous. At award stage only technical, social value and pricing criteria that are linked to the subject matter of the contract were used.

Stage 1 - GDPR Compliance

Tenderers were asked to provide a number of method statement responses to GDPR related questions within the ITT return document, which were intended to explain how they will meet specific requirements.

These method statement responses were scored on a PASS/FAIL basis:

Each question clearly indicated 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 the Tender would not be evaluated and they will be eliminated from the process.

Tenderer's would be disqualified if they did not submit these completed questions.

Stage 2 – Award Criteria and Methodology

Evaluation of Tenders

All responses were assessed against the Evaluation Criteria set out below:

EVALUATION CRITERIA	WEIGHTING
Price	30%
Quality	60%
Social Value	10%

A Tender may not have been accepted that significantly failed to satisfy any specific criterion, even if it scored relatively well against all other criteria.

In the event that evaluating officers, acting reasonably, considered that a Tender was fundamentally unacceptable on any issue, then regardless of the Tender's other merits or its overall score, and regardless of the weighting scheme, that Tender may have been rejected.

Price – 30% Weighting

Tenderers were asked to complete the Price Schedule within the ITT Document.

Tenderers' price scores were calculated based upon the lowest price submitted by Tenderers.

$$\left(\frac{\text{Lowest Total Tender Sum}}{\text{Tenderer's Total Tender Sum}} \right) \times \text{Weighting} = \text{Weighted score}$$

The Tenderer with the lowest price were awarded the full score of 30 [30%], with the remaining Tenderers gaining pro-rata scores in relation to how much higher their prices were when compared to the lowest price.

Table A – Price evaluation model

Example below shows maximum points available = 30 (30%)

Tenderer	Price	Calculation	Final Score
1	£100,000	100,000/100,000 x 30	30.00
2	£105,000	100,000/105,000 x 30	28.57
3	£117,500	100,000/117,500 x 30	25.53
4	£150,000	100,000/150,000 x 30	20.00

Quality – 60% Weighting

Tenderers were asked to provide a number of method statements within the Invitation to Tender document, which were intended to explain how they would meet specific requirements.

Each method statement was scored on a scale of 0 to 5 points, in accordance with the following scheme:

Response	Score	Definition
Excellent	5	Response is completely relevant and excellent overall. The response is comprehensive, unambiguous and demonstrates a thorough understanding of the requirement/outcomes and provides details of how the requirement/outcomes will be met in full.
Very good	4	Response is particular relevant. The response is precisely detailed to demonstrate a very good understanding of the requirements and provides details on how these will be fulfilled.

Good	3	Response is relevant and good. The response is sufficiently detailed to demonstrate a good understanding and provides details on how the requirements/outcomes will be fulfilled.
Satisfactory	2	Response is relevant and acceptable. The response addresses a broad understanding of the requirements/outcomes but lacks details on how the requirement/outcomes will be fulfilled in certain areas.
Poor	1	Response is partially relevant and poor. The response addresses some elements of the requirements/outcomes but contains insufficient/limited detail and explanation to demonstrate how the requirements/outcomes will be fulfilled.
Unacceptable	0	No or inadequate response. Fails to demonstrate an ability to meet the requirement/deliver the required outcomes.

Tenderers had to achieve a score of 2 or more for each scored item. Any scored criteria item receiving less than 2 would result in the Tender being rejected and Tenderers being disqualified from the process.

Tenderers scores for each method statement were multiplied by the relevant weighting to result in a 'weighted score' for that method statement. The weighted scores were then totalled, with the total expressed as an overall score out of 60.

Method Statements		Tier 1	Tier 2
Non-Price		60%	
MS1	Contract Management / Mobilisation		15%
MS2	Understanding of Project		5%
MS3	Approach to Installation, including Health & Safety, and CDM Regulations		5%
MS4	Previous Experience		10%
MS5	Selection of Chargepoint Infrastructure		15%
MS6	Usage, Operations and Maintenance Provision		10%

Social Value – 10% Weighting

Social value commitments were evaluated against the criteria below, based on a combination of quantitative and qualitative assessment.

Social Value	Tier 1	Tier 2
Total Social Value	10%	
Social Value - Quantitative		5%
Social Value - Qualitative		5%

Social Value Quantitative Assessment

The Quantitative assessment was based on the total £SV submitted by the Tenderer through using the TOMs Procurement Calculator. The Tenderer submitting the highest social value offer were

scored full marks for this section. The Tenderer's Total £SV was evaluated using the scoring system below:

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

Social Value Qualitative Assessment

The qualitative assessment was based on the method statement in column N of the TOMs Procurement Calculator. Commitments were evaluated in the same way in which Quality in the rest of the Tender submissions are evaluated, in line with the 0 – 5 scoring matrix above. The weighted scores were rounded to 2 decimal places.

Tenderers were made aware for 'Record Only' Criteria, the higher the percentage recorded, the higher the points would be awarded.

Total Social Value Evaluation Score

The total Social Value score was calculated from the scores of the quantitative and qualitative Social Value assessments.

Total Evaluation Methodology (100% of weighting)

To determine the overall total score and corresponding ranking for each Tenderer, it was necessary to add the total weighted price points score with the total weighted quality points score, and total weighted social value score.

Moderation

Moderation was only undertaken where there was a difference in evaluator scoring of more than 1 point. This was to ensure no omissions had been made in the evaluation process. An example has been provided below:

E.g. Scores received of 3, 3 and 4= No moderation undertaken

Scores received of 2, 3 and 4= moderation undertaken

5. SUMMARY OF EVALUATION

The Invitation to Tender was published electronically via, The Supplying the South West Portal – the Council's chosen procurement portal on 12th January 2021 with a Tender submission date of 15th February 2021.

The received Tender submissions, were evaluated in accordance with the overall evaluation strategy set out above, and were independently evaluated by Council Officers, all of whom had the appropriate skills and experience, in order to ensure transparency and robustness in the process.

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.

The resulting quality and financial scores are contained in the confidential paper.

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.

7. RECOMMENDATIONS



It is recommended that a contract be awarded to the highest scoring Tenderer for the Provision of On-Street Electric Vehicle Charging Infrastructure. Details of the successful Tenderer have been set out in the confidential paper.

This award will be provisional and subject to the receipt from the highest scoring Tenderer of the satisfactory self-certification documents detailed in the suitability assessment questionnaire.

In the event the highest scoring Tenderer cannot provide the necessary documentation, the Council reserves the right to award the contract to the second highest scoring Tenderer.

8. APPROVAL

Authorisation of Contract Award Report

Author (Responsible Officer / Project Lead)			
Name:	Dan Turner		
Job Title:	Low Carbon City Officer		
Additional Comments (Optional):			
Signature:		Date:	19/04/2021
Head of Service / Service Director / Strategic Director [Signature provides authorisation to this award report and award of Contract]			
Name:	Paul Barnard		
Job Title:	Service Director – Strategic Planning & Infrastructure		
Additional Comments (Optional):			
Signature:		Date:	19.4.21