


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

Youth Centres Construction - 26596



- 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 works to three youth centres (Efford Youth Centre; Fredrick Street Youth Centre; and Honicknowle Youth Centre) within the city centre including remodelling, condition works, a new hub building and associated works.

The Council is seeking to appoint a single main contractor to undertake all works. However, to complete the works to all 3 buildings, there will be a separate contract for each building, and the works will be dealt with as 3 separate projects.

Contract Duration: Approx 6 months

2. BACKGROUND

A main contractor is required to undertake the following works:

Efford – Internal remodelling/refurbishment, new disabled access ramp, new roof covering and new external cladding.

Honicknowle – two new small extensions, internal remodelling/refurbishment, new roof covering and new external cladding.

Frederick Street – A new 2 storey hub building, internal remodelling/refurbishment, new access ramp and changes to the car park entrance plus works to replace the rain water goods as per condition report.

3. PROCUREMENT PROCESS

A competitive procurement was run undertaking an Invitation to Tender procedure. 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 formal quotations, 2 of whom should be local PL postcode suppliers, where possible, as outlined in the Council's Contract Standing Orders. For this procurement, 5 suppliers were invited (whom 5 are local) to this opportunity.

4. TENDER EVALUATION CRITERIA

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 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 (I).

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	45%
Quality	45%
Social Value	10%
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 (for all 3 youth centres) 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 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 1 or more for each scored item. Any scored criteria item receiving a score less than 1 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 I**.

Tenderers must achieve an average score of 1 or more for each scored item. Any scored criteria item receiving an average of less than 1 will result in the Tender being rejected and Tenderer being disqualified from the process.

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

5. SUMMARY OF EVALUATION

The procurement documentation was issued electronically via the, Supplying The South West portal on 17th June 2024, with a tender submission date of 26th July 2024. Submissions were received from 1 supplier.

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 was undertaken by Procurement. The financial evaluation was undertaken by the Finance department. The minimum pass/fail suitability questions were evaluated by the quality evaluation panel. The results are contained in the confidential paper.

Quality

The tenders were evaluated by the quality 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 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 as follows:

Efford Youth Centre: £408,852.07

Honicknowle: £557,462.54

Fredrick Street: £912,148.86

The budget for this overall scheme was deemed as appropriate for the works included. Value engineering did take place in advance of the tender to ensure that the tenders came back under budget. Time constraints related to the Youth Investment Funding have tight timescales for delivery and meeting those was key to the schemes being delivered successfully. There is a list of value engineered items that could be added back into the scheme provided they do not exceed the overall budgets for the 3 projects. A contingency is also required due to the nature of the youth centres condition.

The form of contract to be used for the main contract works is JCT Intermediate Contract 2016 with design portion. Changes to the contract are possible via contract variations, which may result in price increases. This may include for unforeseen works or works that become necessary. Variations will be dealt with by the standard JCT process, whereby the contractor is to provide a quote for any changes of scope, which the Contract Administrator assesses and challenges as necessary before a decision on whether to proceed is taken.

7. RECOMMENDATIONS

It is recommended that a contract be awarded, for each youth centre building, to TEC Construction (Holdings) Ltd based on JCT Intermediate Contract 2016 with design portion. This award decision includes 3 separate contracts in total, as follows:



- Efford Youth Centre – 1 contract
- Fredrick Street Youth Centre – 1 contract
- Honicknowle Youth Centre – 1 contract

This award will be provisional and subject to the receipt from the 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:	John London
Job Title:	Senior Project Manager
Additional Comments (Optional):	N/A

Signature:		Date:	05/08/24
Service Director [Signature provides authorisation to this award report and award of Contract]			
Name:	Matt Garrett		
Job Title:	Service Director for Community Connections		
Additional Comments (Optional):			
Signature:		Date:	07/08/2024