

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

23320 – Refurbishment of Ballard House Ground Floor Centre and  
East Wing



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

## **I. INTRODUCTION**

This contract award report is in relation to the procurement of refurbishment of the Ground Floor main entrance and the East Wing of Ballard House to enable the Children, Young People and Families (CYPF) customer facing service to relocate from Midland House.

Contract Duration: approx. 6 months

## **2. BACKGROUND**

The case for change relating to Midland House forms part of the Accommodation Framework whose vision is “to rationalise our need for accommodation, modernise our estate and grow our shared and income generating assets”. The Framework was approved by Cabinet in October 2020.

Ballard, Windsor and Midland House were identified for priority focus with an options appraisal mandated to explore alternative accommodation for Children, Young Peoples and Families (CYPF) staff and services currently located at Midland House.

The initial options appraisal was inconclusive with any temporary decant out of Midland House to allow for refurbishment being prohibitively costly and disruptive to the service. A further mandate was received to explore a permanent relocation for CYPF staff and services.

A primary requirement for the services was that back office and customer facing activity was not split between locations. This narrowed the search considerably and Ballard House demonstrated the only feasible option that would allow for the accommodation footprint required.

An Executive Decision was approved by the Leader of the Council on 2<sup>nd</sup> March 2022 (document [here](#)) to proceed with alterations to Ballard House to accommodate staff and functions from Midland House.

## **3. PROCUREMENT PROCESS**

A competitive procurement was run following the Invitation to Tender procedure in accordance with the Council’s Contract Standing Orders. This is a one stage process incorporating both suitability assessment criteria and contract award criteria. Under this process a minimum of 3 suppliers must be invited to submit written quotations. For this procurement, 5 suppliers were invited to this opportunity.

## **4. TENDER EVALUATION CRITERIA**

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

The Council will evaluate tender submissions as a two part process.

The first part will consist of an assessment of the Tenderer’s suitability in principle to deliver the goods, services and works as detailed in the ITT document pack and checking that all required documents are completed and submitted. Only Tenderers passing this first part will have their Tenders evaluated at the second part.

The second part is the award and considers the merits of the eligible Tenders in order to assess which is the most economically advantageous. In this part only quality, price and social value criteria that are linked to the subject matter of the contract are used.

### **Part I - Suitability Assessment - PAS9I**

Part I assessments are made against the responses to the suitability schedule included at Schedule #(1).

For ease of completion, where a question has been informed by PAS91 and you have completed a PAS91 for a separate procurement process, provided the PAS91 remains valid and accurate, you may submit this previously completed document as part of your response to this procurement process.

If it is your intention to submit a previous PAS91, where a question has been informed by PAS91 please insert 'SEE PAS91' into the response box provided and detail the relevant section number. Please Note: the submission guidance detailed above still applies to the PAS91 document and therefore you may be required to adapt your PAS91 as necessary.

Where the Council considers your PAS91 document as not providing a sufficient response to its question(s) you may be required to submit additional information.

Evaluation Criteria and Methodology

All Suitability Assessment questions 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.

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 Tenderers are permitted to self-certify, evidence will be sought from the successful Tenderer at contract award stage. Please note the successful Tenderer must 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.

**Part 2 - AWARD**

Tenderers 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, price and social value criteria that are linked to the subject matter of the contract.

Award criteria

The high level award criteria is as follows:

Criteria	Weighting
Price	50%
Quality	45%
Social Value	5%
TOTAL	100%

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

Evaluation Methodology

**PRICE (Schedule 4)**

Evaluation made against comparison of pricing schedules.

**PRI Total Tender Sum**

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

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

**QUALITY (Schedule 2 and Schedules 3, 5-6)**

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.
--------------	---	---

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

Moderation will be undertaken where there is a difference in evaluator scoring of more than 1 point. Moderation may also be undertaken where the Council deems it necessary. 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

### **SOCIAL VALUE (Schedule 3)**

Social value commitments will be assessed based on a combination of quantitative and qualitative assessment. Weightings are contained within the Return Document.

#### **SVI- Total Social Value Commitment (£)**

The Tenderer's Total Social Value Commitment will be 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**

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

The qualitative responses will be evaluated using **Scoring Table 1**.

## **5. SUMMARY OF EVALUATION**

The procurement documentation was issued electronically via the, The Supplying The South West on 27<sup>th</sup> February 2023, with a tender submission date of 31<sup>st</sup> March 2023. Submissions were received from 2 suppliers.

The tender submissions were independently evaluated by Council Officers 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 Procurement Services. 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 Council's Quantity Surveyor 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 within the part II document.

The form of contract to be used for the main contract works is 2016 JCT Minor Works with Contractor Design contract. Changes to the contract are possible through contract variations. It is anticipated that further value engineering options may be identified which would change the contract sum but these would be covered through these variations that the contract allows.


Further financial information is contained within the confidential report.

## 7. RECOMMENDATIONS

It is recommended that a contract be awarded to Ryearch Ltd on 2016 JCT Minor Works with Contractor Design contract Terms & Conditions.

## 8. APPROVAL

### Authorisation of Contract Award Report

Author (Responsible Officer / Project Lead)			
<b>Name:</b>	John London		
<b>Job Title:</b>	Senior Project Manager		
<b>Additional Comments (Optional):</b>	N/A		
<b>Signature:</b>		<b>Date:</b>	10.05.23
Service Director [Signature provides authorisation to this award report and award of Contract]			
<b>Name:</b>	Anthony Payne		
<b>Job Title:</b>	Strategic Director for Place		
<b>Additional Comments (Optional):</b>	N/A		
<b>Signature:</b>	<i>Anthony Payne</i>	<b>Date:</b>	16.05.23