

CONTRACT AWARD REPORT PART I

Langage Business Park – Phase 2- PLA/16020



Contents

1. Introduction.....	3
2. Background.....	3
3. Procurement Process.....	3
4. Tender Evaluation Criteria.....	4
5. Summary of evaluation.....	4
6 Financial impact.....	5
7. Recommendations.....	5
8. Approval.....	6

1. INTRODUCTION

This contract award report is in relation to the procurement of a contractor for the construction of Langage Business Park – Phase 2. This process and evaluation criteria was approved by the Assistant Director for Economic Development on 8th March 2017.

2. BACKGROUND

Plymouth City Council (PCC) owns a prominent 3.09ha development and commercial site at Langage Business Park which has been identified as a priority for delivering high quality, sustainable employment space.

The proposed new development will be similar to phase one comprising c2,787sq m (30,000sqft) of high quality commercial workspace (subject to final designs). The scheme will incorporate sustainable technologies to minimise carbon emissions and running costs, potentially including: solar photovoltaic, increased levels of insulation, increased levels of natural daylight and ventilation and highly efficient heating systems.

The project itself will help facilitate and create new job opportunities. By using Government Best Practice it is estimated that around 80 jobs (1 job per 35sqm) could be supported as a result of this investment (excluding the temporary construction jobs). It could also safeguard existing jobs and promote growth - providing local businesses and inward investors with a ready supply of high quality employment space.

3. PROCUREMENT PROCESS

The Council used the below threshold procedure in accordance with The Public Contracts Regulations 2015. The procedure was run using the Council's e-tender portal Supplying The South West portal. This allowed for fair and equal access to the procurement documentation and enabled all questions and answers to be published for all parties to see.

4. TENDER EVALUATION CRITERIA

Suitability Criteria (Suitability Questionnaire – Appendix C)

Failure to provide a satisfactory response to any of the questions may result in the Council not proceeding further with the Supplier.

Information Only Questions

The following sections must be completed but was be used for information purposes only and not scored:

Part 1 Section 1 - Potential Supplier Information

Pass / Fail Questions

The following sections contain mandatory questions, the responses to which were reviewed and treated as pass or fail criteria:

Part 2 Section 2 - Grounds for Mandatory Exclusion

Part 2 Section 3 - Grounds for Discretionary Exclusion

Part 3 Section 4 and Section 5 (if applicable) – Economic and Financial Standing

Part 3 Section 7 –Modern Slavery Act 2015

Part 3 – Section 8 - Insurance

In the event of the supplier being awarded a 'fail' on any of the above criteria, the remainder of their Tender would not be evaluated.

Scored Questions

Part 4

The following sections contain mandatory questions, the responses to which were evaluated and scored. For some questions the response given were evaluated in terms of risk. If the risk is deemed to be high, this resulted in a fail for the question evaluated and the remainder of the Tender was not be evaluated.

Section 9 – Health & Safety Policy 25%

Section 10 – Health & Safety Management 25%

Section 11 – Quality Management 30%

Section 12 – Equalities & Diversities 20%

An overall threshold of 70% of the achievable marks will be required to determine whether Tenderers will proceed to be evaluated against the award criteria. Any Tenderer failing to achieve this threshold will not proceed any further within this procurement.

Suitability Assessment Questions (Tenderer Questionnaire – Appendix C)

Where questions are scored

Response	Score	Definition
Unacceptable	0	Nil or inadequate response. Fails to demonstrate an ability to meet the requirement.
Poor	2	Response is partially relevant and poor. The response addresses some elements of the requirements but contains insufficient/limited detail or explanation to demonstrate how the requirements will be fulfilled
Satisfactory	5	Response is relevant and acceptable. The response addresses a broad understanding of the requirements but may lack details on how the requirement will be fulfilled in certain areas.
Good	8	Response is relevant and good. The response is sufficiently detailed to demonstrate a good understanding and provides details on how the requirements will be fulfilled.
Excellent	10	Response is completely relevant and excellent overall. The response is comprehensive, unambiguous and demonstrates a thorough understanding of the requirement and provides details of how the requirement will be met in full.

Award Criteria

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

Evaluation will be undertaken in accordance with the overall evaluation strategy for the project. The high-level evaluation criteria for the project are as follows:

Commercial (Appendix A)

Schedule 8 – Pricing 55%

Technical (Appendix B):

Schedule 9 - Proposed Contracts, Collaborations and Partnerships 5%

Schedule 10 – Method Statements 40%

The Council will not be bound to accept the lowest price of any Tender submitted. Failure to provide a satisfactory response to any of the questions may result in the Council not proceeding further with the Tenderer.

Pass / Fail Schedules

The following Schedules will be evaluated on a pass or fail basis. Your tender will be disqualified if you do not submit these completed Schedules.

Schedule 1 (Appendix A) – Contract for the Provision of Works

Schedule 2 (Appendix A) – Form of Tender

Schedule 3 (Appendix A) – Declaration of Direct or Indirect Interest

Schedule 4 (Appendix A) – Certificate of Canvassing

Schedule 5 (Appendix A) – Certificate of Confidentiality

Schedule 6 (Appendix A) – Declaration

Schedule 9 (Appendix B) – Method Statements

- MS1 Zero Hours Contracts

- MS2 National Skills Academy Client Based Approach

Schedule 10 (Appendix B) – Contract Management and Information Requirements

Scored Schedules

The following Schedules will be evaluated using the scoring system detailed in each Schedule. Where the response is evaluated in terms of risk your tender will be disqualified if the risk is assessed as too high.

Schedule 7 (Appendix A) – Pricing Schedule

The following scoring system will be applied:

Scoring System
Lowest price tendered from all Tenders receives maximum % score (55%). Other Tenderers' prices are scored in accordance with the following equation:
$\% \text{ Score} = \frac{\text{Lowest Tender price} \times 55}{\text{Tenderer's price}}$

Schedule 8 (Appendix B) – Proposed Contracts, Collaborations and Partnerships

The following scoring system based on risk will be applied:

Risk Level	Score	Definition
High Risk	Disqualify tender	Unacceptable risk or risks identified
Medium to High Risk	1	A number of significant risks identified
Medium Risk	2	Significant risk or risks identified
Low to Medium Risk	3	A number of minor risks identified
Low Risk	4	One or two minor risks identified
Very Low Risk	5	No risks identified

Schedule 9 (Appendix B) – Method Statements; MS3, MS4, MS5, MS6, MS7

MS3 – Programme & Project Controls – 10%

MS4 – Risk Register – 5%

MS5 – Management – 5%

MS6 – CV's & Project Examples – 12.5%

MS7 – Innovation – 7.5%

The following scoring system will be applied:

Method Statement & Quality	Score	Definition
Unacceptable	0	Nil or inadequate response. Fails to demonstrate an ability to meet the requirement.
Poor	2	Response is partially relevant and poor. The response addresses some elements of the requirements but contains insufficient/limited detail or explanation to demonstrate how the requirements will be fulfilled
Satisfactory	5	Response is relevant and acceptable. The response addresses a broad understanding of the requirements but may lack details on how the requirement will be fulfilled in certain areas.
Good	8	Response is relevant and good. The response is sufficiently detailed to demonstrate a good understanding and provides details on how the requirements will be fulfilled.
Excellent	10	Response is completely relevant and excellent overall. The response is comprehensive, unambiguous and demonstrates a thorough understanding of the requirement and provides details of how the requirement will be met in full.

5. SUMMARY OF EVALUATION

A contract notice was dispatched to Contracts Finder inviting suppliers to take part in the procurement. The below threshold ITT was published electronically via the, The Supplying The South West Portal on 4th April 2017 with an original tender submission date of 23rd May 2017.

However, due to a number of client clarifications and an extension request from a number of the suppliers, the submission date was extended by a further two weeks with a new deadline of 5th June 2017.

Submissions were received on the 5th June from 8 suppliers.

9 suppliers formally opted out of the process, the majority stating either that the project was not related to their field of business or that they had insufficient resources at this time.

The 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. A tender evaluation meeting was held on the 19th June 2017 for moderation and compilation of the relevant scores. The resulting scores are contained in the confidential paper.

6. FINANCIAL IMPACT

Financial provision has been made for this contract within the Capital Budget. Details of the contract costs are contained in the confidential paper.

7. RECOMMENDATIONS

It is recommended that a contract be awarded to the successful tenderer. The details of the successful tenderer have been set out in the confidential Part II paper.

8. APPROVAL

AUTHOR:

Signature:

Print Name: Nathan Merrison-Fielder

Date: 23/06/2017

AUTHORISED SIGNATORY:

Signature:

Print Name:

Position:

Date: