

CONTRACT AWARD REPORT PART I

Better Places - Plymouth



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 consultant design team to support the Better Places – Plymouth programme. This process and evaluation criteria was approved by the Assistant Director for Strategic Planning & Infrastructure on 31st May 2017.

2. BACKGROUND

Following the recent publication of the City Centre Masterplan and the Joint Local Plan which set out the vision for Plymouth City Centre, Plymouth City Council has committed £27m over the next five years to transform public realm in the city centre under its Better Places - Plymouth programme. The City Council expects this commitment to be supplemented by grants and private sector contributions through Section 106 and the Community Infrastructure Levy (CIL).

The objectives of the programme are to address years of underinvestment in city centre streets and spaces; to transform the look and feel of the city centre; to support and lever in further inward investment in retail, leisure, employment and housing; to bolster local pride in the city centre and to enhance the overall experience and perceptions of the city centre.

A tender exercise has recently been undertaken in which a preferred design-led consultant team has been identified to work with Plymouth City Council to deliver significant public realm improvements in the city centre.

3. PROCUREMENT PROCESS

The Homes and Communities Agency (HCA) Multidisciplinary Framework was utilised for this tender exercise. The Framework consists of 16 pre-selected teams of consultants who were initially approached for expressions of interest. Eight teams responded to confirm their interest and these teams were asked to respond to a sifting brief, outlining their response to the project, team experience and team identification & calibre. The responses were assessed by the evaluation panel and four teams were selected to proceed to the mini-competition stage.

4. TENDER EVALUATION CRITERIA

Price 30%

Lowest price = 30%, remaining prices assessed according to the formula:

$(\text{Lowest price}/\text{tender price}) \times 30$

Technical submission (in response to mini-competition brief) 50%

Presentation and interview 20%

The technical submission and the presentation / interview were scored according to the following guidance:

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.

5. SUMMARY OF EVALUATION

Submissions were received on the 5th July from the four shortlisted bidders.

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 presentation and interview session for all the shortlisted bidders was held on 12th July 2017. The resulting scores are contained in the confidential Part II paper.

6. FINANCIAL IMPACT

Financial provision is being requested for this contract within the Capital Programme. Details of the contract costs are contained in the confidential Part II 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.

Following advice from Legal Services, the call off instruction under 'Services Requirements' through the Framework will include the whole of the services required, but will state that the appointment will be for the initial two phases only and that awards for further phases are conditional on funding being secured, the successful submission for these phases being suitable for the Council's requirements and within available budget.

8. APPROVAL

AUTHOR:

Signature:

Print Name: Nathan Sanders, Senior Project and Contract Manager

Date: 10/08/2017

AUTHORISED SIGNATORY:

Signature:

Print Name:

Position:

Date: