

APPENDIX 1

Tender Process and Evaluation of Parks Landscape Framework (Open version)

Tender Process

1. The Gateway 1 report for this framework procurement established that the estimated contract sum would be over the EU threshold for work.
2. The advertisement has been placed in the official journal of the European Union (OJEU) and via the Contract Finder on Pro-contract system on 10th March 2016.
3. The invitation to tender was published on the pro-contract system on 10th March 2016. The closing date for receipt of completed tender submission was 28th April 2016.
4. A total of 83 companies expressed their interests in tendering the contract.
5. Tender submissions were received from six companies.

Tender Evaluation

6. The tender evaluation panel consisted of:
 - Group Manager, Business Development (Parks and Leisure)
 - Senior Finance Manager, Finance and Governance
 - Council's appointed Landscape Design Consultant
 - Council's appointed Quantity Surveyor
7. Tender evaluation followed a weighted model of 60:40 price/quality as set out in the approved Gateway 1. This model has been used to ensure we deliver against the council's commitment on quality construction in all our projects under the framework.
8. Tender evaluation guidelines and the scoring matrix were included within the tender documentation.

Stage one – Compliance

9. Tender submissions were subject to an initial compliance check to confirm that they:
 - a) Had been submitted on time,
 - b) Were completed correctly and in full,
 - c) Met all the requirements of the Invitation to Tender
10. The tender submission received from all six companies passed this compliance check.

Stage Two – Suitability

11. The tender submissions received from all six companies completed all mandatory questions.
12. All six companies passed the suitability assessment.

Stage Three – Quality Evaluation (For full evaluation see closed version of the report)

13. Tenderers were required to submit method statements as part of the quality assessment.
The criteria assessed and weighting applied as follows:

Method Statement	Section Weighting	Question	Question Weighting	Max Score (if tenderer scored highest mark i.e. 5)	Minimum pass score
1. Hard and Soft Landscaping Contracts (Technical Ability & Understanding of Delivery Requirements)	25	Q 1.1	12.5	62.5	37.5
		Q 1.2	12.5	62.5	37.5
2. Contract Management and Delivery (Project and contract Management)	7	Q 2.1	7	35	21
3. Quality Control (Monitoring programme)	4	Q 3.1	1	5	3
		Q 3.2	2	10	6
		Q 3.3	1	5	3
4. Contract Resource (Staff profile, management & staff structure, site management)	4	Q 4.1	4	20	12
Total Quality Score	40			200	120

14. Responses were scored on each criteria using a 0-5 point range as follows:

Assessment	Score	Basis of score
Cannot be scored	0 points	No information provided or incapable of being taken forward either because the tenderer does not demonstrate an understanding of our requirements or because the solution is incapable of meeting our requirements
Unsatisfactory	1 point	Although the tenderer does demonstrate an understanding of our requirements there are some major risks or omissions in relation to the proposed solution to deliver the service and we would not be confident of our requirements being met
Less than satisfactory	2 points	A response which is capable of meeting our requirements but fail to provide adequate evidence that

		these requirements can be satisfied
Satisfactory	3 points	A response which shows that the tenderer demonstrates an understanding of our requirements has a credible methodology to deliver the service and could evolve into additional benefits.
Good	4 points	A response which shows that the tenderer demonstrates an understanding of our requirements, has a credible methodology to deliver the service alongside a clear process and plan to deliver additional benefits and deliver value
Very Good	5 points	A response which shows how the service can comprehensively be taken to the next level in terms of exceeding our requirements and/or offering significant added value to the council's overall strategic requirements and objectives.

15. In order to ensure quality was achieved across all areas, any tender submission scoring 3 or less for any single sub question of a method statement could be rejected on the basis of poor quality.

16. Evaluators reviewed each tender submission and awarded an initial quality score. The evaluation panel then conducted a 'consensus scoring process' where moderation of the scores awarded during the initial stage was undertaken.

17. Moderation resolved any variance in the scores between the evaluations and took account of clarification responses and written feedback from referees. A consensus score was agreed by evaluators for each of the evaluation criteria.

18. All six submissions met the minimum requirements for quality.

19. Warwick Landscaping Ltd achieved the highest quality score overall. The panel considered that their submission demonstrated a thorough understanding of the project, accurately identified project specific risk and included the most relevant case study examples of similar work.

20. The formula below was applied based on the price: quality ratio of 60:40.

$$\text{Weighted quality score}/200 \text{ (maximum score possible)} \times 40 = \text{total points}$$

21. Summary of Quality Evaluation score

Name of company	(Quality score ÷ 200 points x 40)	Ranking
Warwick Landscaping Ltd	32.3	1

Stage Four – Price Evaluation (For full evaluation see closed version of the report)

22. The tender price evaluation was undertaken by Pick Everard Ltd, the council's appointed quality surveyor. They compiled a price comparison and summary report.

23. The price evaluation score of 60% consisted of two parts, 20% score for a case study scenario (Pullens Garden) and 40% for the schedule of rates(SOR).

24. The Pullens Garden case study scenario submission from one company was abnormally low. We have benched marked their pricing for both the original submission as well as an adjustment after clarification, and found it still abnormally low. We have therefore removed that company due to high risk of uncertainty on price.

- LOT1 for all projects below £500K (Normalised)

Name of company	Total Score	Ranking
Warwick Landscaping Ltd	50.34	2

- LOT2 for all projects above £500K (Averaged). One company did not provide SOR for LOT2 and as such was non-complaint for this evaluation stage.

Name of company	Total Score	Ranking
Blakedown Landscapes SE Ltd	53.12	1
Ground Control Ltd	50.37	2
Tilhill Forestry Ltd	47.95	3

Summary of final scores

25. The methodology applied for total score comparison of the six tenders based on the price: quality ration of 60:40.

26. Lot 1: For all projects below £500k.

Summary below £500k (Lot 1)		
Name of Company	Total Score	Ranking
Warwick Landscaping Ltd	82.64	1

27. Lot 2: For all project over £500k

Summary over £500k (Lot 2) 6,12&18months Averaged		
Name of Company	Total Score	Ranking
Ground Control Ltd	79.66	1
Blakedown Landscapes SE Ltd	77.01	2
Tilhill Forestry Ltd	74.43	3

28. On the basis of the completed price and quality evaluation it is recommended that:

- Framework LOT 1: All projects under £500,000 to be awarded to Warwick Landscaping Ltd
- Framework LOT 2: All projects value over £500,000(not including Burgess Park West project) to be awarded to:
 - a. Ground Control Ltd
 - b. Blakedown Landscapes SE Ltd
 - c. Tilhill Forestry Ltd

29. The form of contract for this project is JCT Intermediate Contract with Contractor's Design 2011.