

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



**Supply, Installation and Maintenance
of Bus Shelters and Information
Panels Including Right to Display
Advertising on Bus Shelters and
Information Panels in the City of
Plymouth**

**Procurement Reference No.
19440**

Table of Contents

1. INTRODUCTION	3
2. BACKGROUND	3
3. PROCUREMENT PROCESS	3
4. TENDER EVALUATION CRITERIA	4
5. SUMMARY OF EVALUATION	8
6. FINANCIAL IMPLICATIONS	9
7. RECOMMENDATIONS	9
8. APPROVAL	9

I. INTRODUCTION

This contract award report is in relation to the procurement of Supply, Installation and Maintenance of Bus Shelters and Information Panels Including Right to Display Advertising on Bus Shelters and Information Panels in the City of Plymouth.

This contract will be executed under a specifically tailored Contract for the Supply, Installation and Maintenance of Bus Shelters and Information Panels Including Right to Display Advertising on Bus Shelters and Information Panels in the City of Plymouth.

Contract Duration: Duration of the contract is 10 years, with the option to extend by a further 2 periods of 5 years each at the discretion of the Council.

2. BACKGROUND

This procurement seeks to secure a new contract for the provision and maintenance of bus shelters and associated highway advertising infrastructure (information panels). The new contract will see the investment and modernisation of public transport infrastructure together with delivery of an income stream for the Council through the sale of commercial advertising using the latest technical solutions both digital and non-digital.

The key objectives of this tender are to:

- Seek income for the Council through the sale of commercial advertising
- Invest in the modernisation of public transport infrastructure

The outcomes and benefits of this proposal are:

- The replacement of existing bus shelters with new, more modern shelter configurations using new technologies where appropriate
- Clean and well maintained public transport and associated advertising infrastructure, presenting a good image of the City and encouraging greater use of public transport services
- The Council receiving a share of the advertising revenue

The contract will stipulate that bus shelter infrastructure, maintenance and cleaning are provided at no cost to the Council with the supplier covering their costs through the sale of commercial advertising. There will therefore be no cost to the Council, over and above staff time, which is already funded, and therefore no additional Council funding is required.

3. PROCUREMENT PROCESS

In line with the Council's Contract Standing Orders, this requirement is classed as a High Value / High Risk Procurement, and as such, the estimated value exceeds the relevant World Trade Organisation (WTO) Agreement on Government Procurement (GPA) thresholds and is subject to the full public procurement regime as set out in the Public Concession Contract Regulations 2016 (CCR 2016).

Whilst CCR2016 does not stipulate different procurement procedures, subject to compliance with certain key principles and requirements it provides the Council with a level of freedom to choose how to organise its procurement.

Following a procurement options appraisal, it was determined that a competitive procurement exercise was undertaken utilising the 'Open' Procedure in accordance with the Public Contracts Regulations 2015. The 'Open' Procedure is a one-stage process comprising of an Invitation to Tender (ITT), which incorporates a suitability assessment and contract award criteria. Under this

process, any prospective supplier expressing an interest to participate in the procurement activity can submit a Tender.

4. TENDER EVALUATION CRITERIA

The following information concerning the evaluation criteria and scoring methodology was included in the ITT instructions.

A suitability assessment (also known as the selection stage) and an award stage.

Suitability Assessment

This section assessed the Tenderer's suitability to undertake the contract requirement. The questions included in this Schedule, as advised in PPN Action Note 8/16 9th September 2016, have been informed by the Crown Commercial Services Standard Selection Questionnaire (SQ), previously known as the Pre-Qualification Questionnaire.

Suitability Assessment Evaluation Methodology

For Information Only Schedules

The following schedules were for information only and were not evaluated.

Schedule - Suitability Assessment

- SA Section 1: Tenderer Information
- SA Section 5: Parent Company
- SA Section 8.2: Health and Safety: SA8.2.8
- SA Section 8.6: Business Capability
- SA Section 8.7: Safeguarding SA8.7.3 and SA8.7.4

Pass/Fail Questions

The following Schedules and questions were evaluated on a pass or fail basis. In the event of the Tenderer being awarded a 'fail' on any of the below criteria, the remainder of the Tender would not be evaluated and the Tenderer would be eliminated from the process. The Tender would be disqualified if a Tenderer failed submit these completed Schedules and questions.

Wherever possible the Council permitted Tenderers to self-certify they met the minimum PASS/FAIL requirements without the need to attach evidence or supporting information. However where the Council regarded the review of certain evidence and supporting information, as critical to the success of the procurement this would be specifically requested.

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

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

Schedule - Suitability Assessment

- SA Section 2: Grounds for Exclusion 1
- SA Section 3: Grounds for Exclusion 2
- SA Section 4: Economic and Financial Standing
- SA Section 6: Technical and Professional Ability

- SA Section 7: Modern Slavery Act 2015
- SA Section 8.1: Insurance
- SA Section 8.2: Health and Safety SA8.2.1 – SA8.2.7
- SA Section 8.3: Equality and Diversity
- SA Section 8.4: Environmental Management
- SA Section 8.5: Quality Management
- SA Section 8.7: Safeguarding – SA8.7.1 and SA8.7.2

Award Evaluation Criteria and Methodology

Tenderers satisfactorily meeting the Suitability Assessment evaluation had their Tender responses evaluated by the Council to determine the most economically advantageous Tender based on the quality, price and social value criteria that are linked to the subject matter of the contract.

This section assessed how the Tenderer proposed to deliver the required service as detailed in the specification.

The Council intends to award any Contract based on the most economically advantageous offer.

The Council would not be bound to accept the lowest price of any Tender submitted.

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

High-Level Award Criteria

The high-level award criteria for the project was as follows:

EVALUATION CRITERIA	WEIGHTING
Price (Fixed Payments & % Revenue Share)	50%
Quality	40%
Social Value	10%

A Tender may not have been accepted if it 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 is 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.

PRI Price (Fixed Payments & % Revenue Share) - 50% Total Weighting

Tenderers were required to complete both worksheets within Appendix C – Bus Shelter Concession – Price Schedule. One inclusive of TUPE costs and one excluding TUPE costs.

Evaluation was undertaken against comparison of pricing schedules excluding TUPE costs.

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

PRI.1 Fixed Annual Payment Total – 30% Weighting

Tenderer’s **Fixed Annual Payment Total** scores were calculated based upon the highest fixed annual payment total submitted by Tenderers.

$$\left(\frac{\text{Tenderer's Fixed Annual Payment Total}}{\text{Highest Fixed Annual Payment Total}} \right) \times \text{Weighting} = \text{Weighted score}$$

PRI.2 Percentage Revenue Share Per Year – 20% Weighting

Tenderer's **Percentage Revenue Share Per Year** scores were calculated based upon the highest percentage revenue share per year submitted by Tenderers.

$$\left(\frac{\text{Tenderer's \% Revenue Share Per Year}}{\text{Highest \% Revenue Share Per Year}} \right) \times \text{Weighting} = \text{Weighted score}$$

Tenderer's total scores for both Fixed Annual Payment Total and Percentage Revenue Share Per Year were added together to give the overall financial weighted score total out of 50% and relative ranking in order of overall competitiveness.

Section B: Additional Equipment was for information only and was not evaluated.

Please note: Should the proposed service be deemed unsustainable based on the Tender Sums provided, then any Tender may have be disqualified.

Quality – Pass / Fail Questions

The following Schedules and questions were evaluated on a pass or fail basis. In the event of the Tenderer being awarded a 'fail' on any of the below criteria, the remainder of their Tender would not be evaluated and they would be eliminated from the process. A Tenderer would be disqualified if they did not submit these completed Schedules.

Schedule 3 – Method Statements

- MS1: Compliance with Technical Specification
- MS2: Contract Management

Schedule 5 – Form of Tender

Schedule 6 – Declaration of Direct or Indirect Interest

Quality – For Information Only Questions

The following schedules were for information only and were not evaluated.

Schedule 3 – Method Statements

- MS3: Collaboration, Partnerships and Sub-Contracting
- MS4: Retrofitting of Help Points

Quality – Scored - 40% Total Weighting

Tenderers were asked to provide a number of method statements within the ITT Return 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 particularly 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 weighted 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 Tenderer 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 40.

Method Statement	Weighting	
	Tier 1	Tier 2
MS5 – Programme / Construction	9.00%	
MS5.1 – Programme / Construction		9.00%
MS6 – Infrastructure Design	19.00%	
MS6.1 – Overall Infrastructure Design		16.00%
MS6.2 – Technology		3.00%
MS7 – Cleaning and Maintenance	6.00%	
MS7.1 – Cleaning and Maintenance Regime		6.00%
MS8 – Environmental Policies	6.00%	
MS8.1 – Environmental Policies		6.00%
Total		40%

Social Value – 10% Total Weighting

Social value commitments were assessed based on a combination of quantitative and qualitative assessment.

SV1- Total Social Value Commitment (£) – 5.00%

The Tenderer's Total Social Value Commitment was evaluated using the quantitative scoring system below:

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

SV2 – Social Value Method Statements – 5.00%

The method statements submitted in support of the social value commitments made in SV1 was allocated a single score **for all method statements** and the appropriate weighting then applied. The weighted score was rounded to **2** decimal places.

The qualitative responses were evaluated in accordance with the scoring table detailed above.

Tenderers had to achieve a weighted 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 Tenderer being disqualified from the process.

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, and total weighted Social Value points.

Moderation

The Council decided to take a '**consensus**' scoring evaluation approach to this procurement. This means that, following the independent evaluation of submissions, where there was a difference in individual evaluator scoring for one or more individual questions, a moderation session took place to arrive at an agreed, consensus score. In the event that the evaluators could not agree on a final score, the score awarded by the majority would be the consensus score.

5. SUMMARY OF EVALUATION

A Concession Notice ref: 2022/S 000-005345 was published on the 25th February 2022 within the Find a Tender Service (FTS).

The Invitation to Tender was published electronically via, The Supplying the South West Portal – the Council's chosen procurement portal on 25th February 2022 with an initial Tender submission date of 1200hrs, 14th April 2022. Due to a late amendment to TUPE information the Tender submission date was subsequently amended to 1200hrs, 20th April 2022, to allow Tenderers more time to compile a Tender offer taking into consideration this amendment.

The Tender opportunity received a good level of interest, with 15 organisations registering an interest, of which 2 submitted Tenders, 3 opted out and a further 10 not providing a Tender response.

The received Tender submissions, were evaluated in accordance with the overall evaluation strategy set out above, and were independently evaluated by Council Officers and an external

consultant, 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, Social Value and Price were split, with Price information being held back from the Quality evaluators.

The resulting quality, social value 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, who is Clear Channel UK Ltd, for the Supply, Installation and Maintenance of Bus Shelters and Information Panels Including Right to Display Advertising on Bus Shelters and Information Panels in the City of Plymouth. The estimated value of this contract in its entirety is £70,000,000 for the full term of the Contract.

This award will be provisional and subject to the receipt from Clear Channel UK Ltd of the satisfactory self-certification documents detailed in the suitability assessment questionnaire.

In the event Clear Channel UK Ltd cannot provide the necessary documentation, the Council reserves the right not to award the Contract.

This award is also subject to the outcome of any challenge made during the mandatory standstill period.

8. APPROVAL

Authorisation of Contract Award Report

Author (Responsible Officer / Project Lead)	
Name:	Debbie Newcombe
Job Title:	Sustainable Transport Coordinator, Strategic Planning & Infrastructure
Additional Comments (Optional):	None
Signature:	<i>Debbie Newcombe</i>
Date:	20 May 2022
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 & Infrastructure
Additional Comments (Optional):	
Signature:	
Date:	20 May 2022