

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



**Plymouth Mobility Hubs
Car Club Operator**

**Procurement Reference No.
20559**

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	8
7. RECOMMENDATIONS	8
8. APPROVAL	8

I. INTRODUCTION

This contract award report is in relation to the re-procurement of Plymouth Mobility Hubs Car Club Operator.

The re-procurement exercise is a result of the demise of Co Cars who were originally awarded the Contract in January 2022.

The scope of the requirement includes Plymouth City Council (“The Council”) is seeking to procure an experienced CoMoUK (or equivalent) accredited Car Club Operator to deliver and manage a publicly accessible electric vehicle Car Club scheme across a network of Mobility Hubs within Plymouth.

The Car Club Operator must deliver and operate a Car Club scheme of at least 10 vehicles accessible 24 hours a day, 365 days per year.

Contract Duration: Initial period of 4 Years, with the option to extend by 3 Years at the discretion of the Council.

2. BACKGROUND

The Council utilising funding from the Department for Transport’s Transforming Cities Fund is seeking to deliver a network of Mobility Hubs across Plymouth. These Hubs will comprise of electric vehicle charging infrastructure, an electric vehicle car club and e-bikes.

The size of the Hubs will vary according to the need at each location and in total will consist of electric vehicle charging points for a minimum of 300 parking bays, at least 10 electric car club vehicles and will support approximately 390 e-bikes.

For more information on the Mobility Hubs project see:

<https://www.plymouth.gov.uk/parkingandtravel/transportplansandprojects/transportplans/transformingcitiesfund/mobilityhubs>

3. PROCUREMENT PROCESS

In line with the Council’s Contract Standing Orders and based on the anticipated contract value, this requirement sat within the ‘Over £25k – relevant Government Procurement (GPA) thresholds’ and was therefore subject to the requirement for a competitive procurement exercise to be undertaken and seek three formal quotations (non-verbal) / tenders: Two from PL Postcodes where possible.

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.

Suitability Assessment Evaluation Methodology

For Information Only Schedules

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

Schedule - Suitability Assessment

- SA Section 5: Parent Company
- SA Section 9: Business Capability: SA9.1
- SA Section 10: Data Protection – General: SA10.2, SA10.4, SA10.7 – SA10.10
- SA Section 11: Data Protection – ICT Systems: SA11.1, SA11.3 – SA11.5

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 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 1: Tenderer Information
- SA Section 2: Insurance
- SA Section 3: Economic and Financial Standing
- SA Section 4: Health and Safety
- SA Section 5: Equality and Diversity
- SA Section 6: Modern Slavery Act 2015
- SA Section 7: Environmental Management
- SA Section 8: Technical and Professional Ability
- SA Section 9: Business Capability: SA9.2
- SA Section 10: Data Protection – General: SA10.1, SA10.3, SA10.5 and SA10.6
- SA Section 11: Data Protection – ICT Systems: SA11.2
- SA Section 12: CoMoUK Accreditation

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.

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

Award Criteria and Methodology

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.

High-Level Award Criteria

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

EVALUATION CRITERIA	WEIGHTING
Price	20%
Quality	70%
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.

Price (20%)

Tenderers were instructed to complete the Price Schedule within the ITT Document.

The price for each element submitted by a Tenderer was compared against the scores of other Tenderers by rank.

For example, if there were three Tenderers, the best priced (lowest) Tenderer would score '3' points, the second best Tenderer '2', and the least best priced Tenderer will score '1'. If there were four Tenderers, the best priced (lowest) Tenderer would score '4' points, the second '3' points and so on. Where prices are the same, the same (higher) score was applied.

The total score for each Tenderer accumulated from tables 1, 2 and 3 was then weighted against the 20% available for the pricing element of the Tender.

For example, if there were three Tenderers, the maximum score would be 30 (three points awarded for each of the ten pricing responses) and an example set of scores would be:

Tenderer 1 – 13 points in total out of 30 available = $(13/30) \times 20 = 8.67\%$

Tenderer 2 – 24 points in total out of 30 available = $(24/30) \times 20 = 16.00\%$

Tenderer 3 – 16 points in total out of 30 available = $(16/30) \times 20 = 10.67\%$

Quality – 70% 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 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 item. Any scored criteria item receiving an average of 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 70.

Method Statement	Weighting	
	Tier 1	Tier 2
MS1 – Team Experience	30.00%	
MS1.1 – Details of the Vehicles to be used for the EV Car Club		15.00%
MS1.2 – Approach to growing the network of EV Car Club vehicles within the network of Mobility Hubs over the contract period		5.00%
MS1.3 – Approach to Operations, Maintenance and Contract Management		10.00%
MS2 – User Experience, Customer Service and Marketing	25.00%	
MS2.1 – Customer Service		5.00%
MS2.2 – Marketing		5.00%
MS2.3 – User Experience and Inclusivity		15.00%
MS3 – Partnership Working and Innovation	10.00%	

MS3.1 – Approach Partnership Working		5.00%
MS3.2 – Innovation		5.00%
MS4 – Data Sharing	5.00%	

Social Value (10%)

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

SVI- Total Social Value Commitment (£) – 5%

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%

The method statements submitted in support of the social value commitments made in SVI 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.

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

The Invitation to Tender was advertised and published electronically via, The Supplying the South West Portal – the Council's chosen procurement portal and advertised through Contracts Finder – a UK Government online portal on 29th September 2023 with a Tender submission date of 1200hrs, 9th November 2023.

The Tender opportunity received a good level of interest, with 13 organisations registering an interest, of which 1 submitted a Tender, 2 opted out and a further 10 not providing a Tender response.

The received Tender submission, was evaluated in accordance with the overall evaluation strategy set out above, and was 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, 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 Co-Wheels CIC, for Plymouth Mobility Hubs Car Club Operator. The estimated value of this contract in its entirety is £1,000,000 for the full term of the Contract.

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

In the event Co Wheels CIC cannot provide the necessary documentation; the Council reserves the right not to award the Contract.

8. APPROVAL

Authorisation of Contract Award Report

Author (Responsible Officer / Project Lead)			
Name:	John Green		
Job Title:	Net Zero Delivery Manager		
Additional Comments (Optional):			
Signature:		Date:	04/01/2024
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:	04/01/2024