

APPENDIX 2

Tender Process and Evaluation for Burgess Park West main contract (Open Version)

Tender Process

1. The Gateway 1 report was joint with the Landscape Framework and established that the total estimated contract sum for both procurements would be over the EU threshold for construction works.
2. An advertisement was placed in the official journal of the European Union (OJEU) for the Landscape Framework on 10 March 2016. The Burgess Park West tender was not advertised using OJEU because the contract value is under the EU threshold.
3. The Burgess Park West tender opportunity was advertised via Contracts Finder using the Pro-contract system.
4. The invitation to tender was published using the Pro-contract system on 31 March 2016. The closing date fore receipt of completed tender submission was 28 April 2016. The closing date was extended to 5 May 2016 subsequent to requests by several prospective tenderers.
5. Total 85 companies expressed their interests in tendering the contract, 23 of them then chose to opt out and 57 did not respond.
6. Tender submissions were received from five companies.

Tender Evaluation

7. The tender evaluation panel consisted of:
 - Group Manager, Business Development (Parks and Leisure)
 - Programme Manager (Parks and Leisure)
 - Council's appointed Landscape Design Consultant, LDA Design
 - Council's appointed Quantity Surveyor, Appleyard and Trew LLP
8. 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.
9. Tender evaluation guidelines and the scoring matrix were included within the tender document.

Stage One - Compliance

10. Tender Submissions were subject to an initial compliance check to confirm that they
 - a) have been submitted on time,
 - b) are completed correctly and in full,
 - c) meet all the requirements of the Invitation to Tender
11. All five tender submissions met the compliance criteria.

Stage Two - Suitability

12. Tenderers were required to complete responses to the Suitability Assessment Questions.

13. All of the tenderers except for one company complied. Therefore, that company has been excluded for non-compliance.

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

Quality criteria

14. Tenderers were required to answer questions and 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. 5/5)	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)	4	Q 2.1	4	20	12
3. Procedure of Quality Control (Monitoring programme)	7	Q 3.1.1	2	10	6
		Q 3.1.2	3	15	9
		Q 3.2.1	2	10	6
4. Contract Resource (Staff profile, management & staff structure, site management)	4	Q 4.1	4	20	12
Total Quality Score	40			200	120

15. 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.

16. 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.

17. 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.

18. 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.

19. All four remaining companies met the minimum requirements for quality.

20. Ground Control Ltd achieved the highest quality score overall. The panel considered that their submission demonstrated a good understanding of the project, accurately identified project specific risks and included relevant case study examples of similar work.

21. The score for each question was weighted by applying the following formula:

(Score / 5) x weighting

22. The maximum possible total score is 40.

23. A summary of quality scores is below.

Name of company	Quality Score	Ranking
Ground Control Ltd	28.7	1

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

24. The tender price evaluation was undertaken by Appleyard and Trew LLP, the council's appointed quantity surveyor. They compiled a price comparison and tender report.

25. Errors in one company's tender were resolved via post tender queries.

26. The price evaluation score accounts for 60% of the final score.

27. The following methodology was applied for price comparison of the four tenders based on the price: quality ratio of 60:40

Price of lowest tender / price of tender X 60

Summary of final scores

28. Final scores are as follows:

Name of company	FINAL SCORE	Ranking
Ground Control Ltd	86.3	1

29. On the basis of the completed price and quality evaluation it is recommended that Ground Control Ltd is appointed for the Burgess Park West main contract.

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