

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



**Outdoor Play Improvements  
Phase 3 & 4**

**Procurement Reference No.  
21232**

**Table of Contents**

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

## **1. INTRODUCTION**

This report is in relation to the process undertaken and recommendation related to the award of Contract for Outdoor Play Improvements – Phase 3 & 4.

This contract will be executed under further competition conducted under ESPO Framework Agreement - 115\_21 Outdoor Playground, Fitness & Sports Facilities and Equipment Call off Terms & Conditions and will run for the duration of the project.

Contract Duration: The intended duration of the contract is for approx. 18 months.

## **2. BACKGROUND**

Building on work already carried out by Outdoor Play Improvements Phases 1&2, Plymouth City Council (PCC) is looking to appoint a suitably qualified and experienced supplier to deliver further improvements to our play provision within the city.

This initial tender seeks to improve the outdoor play offer across Plymouth through delivering capital improvements to approximately 10 sites between September 2021 and March 2022 as Phase 3.

The project value in this financial year equates to £335k.

There is potential to extend the contract to a further similar number of sites with additional funding of a similar value in 2022-2023 in a Phase 4. This is subject to availability and approval.

## **3. PROCUREMENT PROCESS**

Following a procurement options appraisal, it was determined that undertaking a further competition tender exercise through the ESPO Framework Agreement - 115\_21 Outdoor Playground, Fitness & Sports Facilities and Equipment was the most suitable option providing a quick, simple and competitive route to enable the works to begin as soon as possible.

## **4. TENDER EVALUATION CRITERIA**

### **Overview of Process**

A further competition was carried out via ESPO Framework Agreement - 115\_21 Outdoor Playground, Fitness & Sports Facilities and Equipment. Suppliers have been assessed on their financial standing at the point of them joining the Framework. Suppliers have also agreed to the terms and conditions of the Framework.

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

The Council evaluated tender submissions which 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.

## Award Criteria and Methodology

### Evaluation of Tenders

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

EVALUATION CRITERIA	WEIGHTING
Price	5%
Quality	85%
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 – 5% 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 5 [5%], 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 = 5 (5%)

Tenderer	Price	Calculation	Final Score
1	£100,000	100,000/100,000 x 5	5.00
2	£105,000	100,000/105,000 x 5	4.76
3	£117,500	100,000/117,500 x 5	4.26
4	£150,000	100,000/150,000 x 5	3.33

### Quality – 90% 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 85.

Method Statements			
<b>Non-Price</b>			<b>85%</b>
<b>MS1</b>	<b>Design</b>		<b>40%</b>
<b>MS2</b>	<b>Equipment &amp; Landscaping</b>		<b>15%</b>
<b>MS3</b>	<b>Value for Money</b>		<b>15%</b>
<b>MS4</b>	<b>Quality &amp; Capacity</b>		<b>15%</b>

### **Social Value – 10% Weighting**

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

<b>Social Value</b>	<b>Tier 1</b>	<b>Tier 2</b>
<b>Total Social Value</b>	<b>10%</b>	
<b>Social Value - Quantitative</b>		5.00%
<b>Social Value - Qualitative</b>		5.00%

#### 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 cored 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 15th September 2021 with a Tender submission date of 5th October 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 funding received. 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 Outdoor Play Improvements – Phase 3 & 4. This award will be provisional and subject to the receipt from the highest scoring Tenderer of the satisfactory self-certification documents.

## 8. APPROVAL

### Authorisation of Contract Award Report

Author (Responsible Officer / Project Lead)			
Name:	Zoe Sydenham		
Job Title:	Natural Infrastructure Projects and Partnerships Manager		
Additional Comments (Optional):	.		
Signature:		Date:	18.10.21
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		
Additional Comments (Optional):			
Signature:		Date:	18.10.21