

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



Purchase of Trees for Civic Square

Procurement Reference No.

21526

Table of Contents

1. INTRODUCTION	3
2. BACKGROUND	3
3. PROCUREMENT PROCESS	3
4. TENDER EVALUATION CRITERIA	3
5. SUMMARY OF EVALUATION	7
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 The purchase of Trees for Civic Square.

Contract Duration: The intended duration of the contract is for 16 months.

2. BACKGROUND

The approach has been to restore and strengthen the infrastructure of Lime Trees to Royal Parade and centrally by the café terrace whilst introducing a series of specimen oak trees connected to North America reflecting the connection between Plymouth, the square and the USA. We have also replaced the lost Honey Locust Trees once gifted to the Square in the 1970s. The tree species have been noted as adaptable to climate change and are appropriate for the coastal location.

There are two options to be costed

- Option 1 allows for the trees to be lifted this year and containerised allowing for the trees to be planted August/September 2022.
- Option 2 allows for the trees to be root balled to be planted in November 2022 – February 2023.

Purchase of trees in accordance with the Macgregor Smith Ltd Specification for Soft Landscape Works for Civic Square, Plymouth 1286-SP-01.

3. PROCUREMENT PROCESS

Following an options appraisal, in line with the council's Contract Standing Order's a technical request for quote (TRFQ) was carried. 4 suppliers showed an interest and submitted bids.

4. TENDER EVALUATION CRITERIA

Overview of Process

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

The Council evaluated tender submissions as a two stage award process.

The first stage consisted of an assessment of the Tenderer's suitability in principle to deliver the Goods as detailed in the ITT document pack by meeting the Mandatory Requirements. Only Tenderers passing this first stage had their Tenders evaluated at the second stage.

The second stage considered the merits of the eligible Tenders in order to assess which was the most economically advantageous. In this stage only quality (including social value), and price criteria that are linked to the subject matter of the Contract were used.

Stage I- Mandatory Requirement

Stage I assessments were made against the responses to the Mandatory Requirements questionnaire included at Schedule I in the ITT Return Document.

Evaluation Criteria and Methodology

All Mandatory Requirement questions were evaluated 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 the Tender would be eliminated from the process. A Tenderer would've been disqualified if they did not submit these completed questions.

Stage 2- AWARD

Tenderers passing all the pass/fail criteria in stage I had their responses made within Schedules 2-8 evaluated by the Council to determine the most economically advantageous Tender based on the quality (inclusive of social value), and price and criteria that are linked to the subject matter of the Contract.

Award criteria

The high level award criteria was as follows:

Criteria	Weighting
Price	55%
Quality	40%
Social Value	5%
TOTAL	100%

Weightings for individual sub-criteria contained under each of the above are detailed below and in the return document.

Evaluation Methodology

PRICE

Evaluation made against comparison of pricing schedules.

PRI Total Tender Sum

The Tenderer's Total Tender Sum was evaluated using the scoring system below:

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

The Tenderer with the lowest price was awarded the full score of 55 [55%], with the remaining Tenderers gaining pro-rata scores in relation to how much higher their prices are when compared to the lowest price.

The following table outlines how the above detail is to be managed, using the purchase price award criteria percentage of 55% in this illustration.

Table A – Price evaluation model

Example below shows maximum points available = 55 (55%)

Weighting	% Split
Purchase of Trees for Civic Square	55%

A. Purchase of Trees for Civic Square

Tenderer	Price	Calculation	Final Score
1	£30,000	30,000/30,000 x 55	55.00
2	£35,000	30,000/35,000 x 55	47.14
3	£40,000	30,000/40,000 x 55	41.25

Tenderer	Total Score	Ranking
1	55.00	1

QUALITY

Each quality question was clearly identified as being evaluated on a pass/fail or scored basis.

Tenderers were asked to provide a number of method statements responses within the ITT Return Document, which were intended to explain how they will meet specific requirements.

When responding to the method statement questions Tenderers had to make sure that, they answered what was being asked. Anything that was not directly relevant to the particular method statement question should not have been included, but wherever possible Tenderers should demonstrate how they will go further than what was being asked for, to add value.

Tenderers should also make sure that their answers inform not just what they will do, but how they will do it, and what their proposed timescales are (as relevant). It is useful to give examples or provide evidence to support their responses. The purpose should be to include as much relevant detail as required, so that the evaluation panel obtained the fullest possible picture.

Each method statement response was evaluated individually, one by one, and in order. When scoring each statement, no consideration was given to information included in other answers and Tenderer's were informed not cross reference to responses or information provided elsewhere in their tender submission.

Method statement responses were evaluated in accordance with the following sub-criteria and weightings:

Method Statements		
Quality		45%
MS1	Can you deliver the stock to Plymouth in the quantities and timescales specified in line with the schedule and specification?	25%
MS2	What measures do you have in place to mitigate the impact on the climate and can you demonstrate best practice in regards to sustainability?	10%
MS3	What measures do you have in place to meet biosecurity requirements?	5%
MS4	Please give details on social value within your organisation. For instance what percentage of your employees are local. What training do you as an organisation provide and how is staff welfare monitored	5%

Where individual questions carried either more or less importance than others they were grouped and weighted accordingly. Section weightings were identified at the top of each group of questions and sub-weightings were identified against individual questions. The question or group of questions were allocated a score and the appropriate weightings then applied. The weighted score was rounded to 2 decimal places.

Method statement responses were evaluated using the scoring system below:

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 an average score of 2 or more for each scored Quality item. Any scored criteria item receiving an average of less than 2 resulted in the Tender being rejected and Tenderer being disqualified from the process.

MODERATION

Moderation was only undertaken where there was a difference in evaluator scoring of more than 1 point. This was to ensure no errors have 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 11th January 2022 with a Tender submission date of 24th January 2022.

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 Supply of Trees for Civic Square. 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 within the Tender.

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:	Michelle Endacott
Job Title:	Investment Officer
Additional Comments (Optional):	
Signature:	Michelle Endacott
Date:	01/03/2022
Head of Service / Service Director	
[Signature provides authorisation to this award report and award of Contract]	
Name:	Anthony Payne

Job Title:	Strategic Director for Place		
Additional Comments (Optional):			
Signature:		Date:	02/03/2022