

PROCUREMENT GATEWAY 3 - CONTRACT AWARD REPORT - PART I

21550 – Demolition of Outland Road Depot



- 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 Demolition of Outland Road Depot. The scope of the requirement includes:

Plymouth City Council requires a contractor to demolish outbuildings within the former Plymouth City Council Parks Depot at Outland Road, to make way for a new adult social care facility. The contract comprises the removal of all of the outbuildings (temporary and permanent) within the former Depot site and offices

The intended duration of the Contract is for 3 months.

2. BACKGROUND

Plymouth City Council (“the Council”) sought quotations from 4 contractors to undertake 01927-18 Outland Road Depot Demolition, demolishing all of the outbuildings within the former Plymouth City Council Parks Depot at Outland Road, to make way for a new adult social care facility.

The contract comprises the removal of all of the outbuildings (temporary and permanent) within the Depot site, see plan below (within red line boundary).



3. PROCUREMENT PROCESS

A competitive procurement was run following the ‘Request for Quotation’ procedure as outlined in the Council’s Contract Standing Orders, in line with ‘Key Thresholds Table 1 – Quotation and Tendering Thresholds’. This is a one stage process incorporating contract award criteria. The opportunity was issued via Supplying the South West.

4. TENDER EVALUATION CRITERIA

Suitability (Schedule 1)

All suitability questions will be evaluated on a PASS/FAIL basis. Each schedule/section/question will clearly indicate what response constitutes as PASS and what response constitutes as FAIL. In the event of the Supplier being awarded a 'fail' on any of the criteria, the remainder of your Quotation 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.

Wherever possible the Council is permitting Tenderers to self-certify they meet the minimum PASS/FAIL requirements without the need to attached evidence or supporting information. However where the Council regards the review of certain evidence and supporting information, as critical to the success of the procurement this will be specifically requested.

The return document will clearly indicate whether 'Self-certification' is acceptable or whether 'Evidence is required' for each question.

Where Supplier are permitted to self-certify, evidence will be sought from the successful Supplier at contract award stage. Please note the successful Supplier must be able to provide all evidence to the satisfaction of the Council at contract award stage within a reasonable period, if the successful Supplier is unable to provide this information the Council reserves the right to award the contract to the next highest scoring Supplier.

Part 2 – Award

Method Statements (Schedule 2)

Suppliers passing all the pass/fail criteria in part 1 will have their responses made to part 2 evaluated by the Council to determine the most economically advantageous Tender based on the quality and price criteria that are linked to the subject matter of the contract.

The high level award criteria is as follows:

Criteria	Weighting
Price	60%
Quality	40%
TOTAL	100%

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

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.

Scored Questions - Questions identified as SCORED will be evaluated in accordance with the following sub-criteria and weightings:

Where individual questions carry either more or less importance than others they have been grouped and weighted accordingly. Section weightings are identified at the top of each group of questions and sub-weightings are identified against individual questions. The question or group of

questions will be allocated a score and the appropriate weightings will then be applied. The weighted score will be rounded to 2 decimal places.

Questions identified as SCORED will be evaluated using the Scoring Table I below:

Scoring Table I

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.

Moderation will only be undertaken where there is a difference in evaluator scoring of more than 1 point. This is 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

PRICE (Schedule 4) – 60% weighting

Evaluation made against comparison of Suppliers’ Total Tender Sum

The Supplier’s Total Tender Sum will be evaluated using the scoring system below:

$$\left(\frac{\text{Lowest Total Tender Sum}}{\text{Supplier's Total Tender Sum}} \right) \times 60\% = \text{Weighted score}$$

5. SUMMARY OF EVALUATION

The procurement documentation was issued electronically via Supplying the South West on 31st May 2022, with a tender submission date of 28th June 2022. Submissions was received from 3 suppliers.

The tender submissions were independently evaluated by a Council Officer and an external Consultant all of whom have 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.

Suitability

The pass/fail evaluation were undertaken by the Procurement Services Function. The minimum pass/fail suitability questions were evaluated by the evaluation panel. The results are contained in the confidential paper.

Quality

The tenders were evaluated by the evaluation panel all of whom had 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

Price clarifications were evaluated by the Consultant and managed through The Supplying the South West Portal. The 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 on **Agreement and Conditions of the National Federation of Demolition Contractors Form of Direct Contract 2015 Edition**

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

8. APPROVAL

Authorisation of Contract Award Report

Author (Responsible Officer / Project Lead)	
Name:	Gary Walbridge
Job Title:	Head of ASC and retained functions
Additional Comments (Optional):	

Signature:		Date:	12 July 2022
Head of Service / Service Director [Signature provides authorisation to this award report and award of Contract]			
Name:	Craig McArdle		
Job Title:	Strategic Director for People		
Additional Comments (Optional):			
Signature:		Date:	12 July 2022