



London Borough of Southwark

Tender Title	Fire Protection Works
Tender Reference:	Pro Contract Project Info ID - DN299431
Tender Deadline	5 February 2018 by 1pm

Section 6

Evaluation Information

(incorporating the Evaluation Methodology and Quality Submission Schedule)

TABLE OF CONTENTS

Contents

	Contents
Section 1	Evaluation Methodology
1	Introduction
2	Evaluation Stages
3	Evaluation Team
4	Stage One - Compliance
5	Stage Two - Quality
6	Quality Scoring Scale
7	Quality Thresholds
8	Stage Three - Price
9	Abnormally Low Tenders
10	Disclaimer
11	Stage Four – Final Selection and Recommendation
12	Tie Break
Section 2	Quality Submission Schedule
1	Introduction
2	Method Statement 1
3	Method Statement 2
4	Method Statement 3
5	Method Statement 4
6	Method Statement 5

Section 1: Evaluation Methodology

1. Introduction

- 1.1 This document sets out the methodology that will be used to evaluate tenders received in relation to the fire protection contract.
- 1.2 The Employer is seeking to appoint two (2) Contractors.
- 1.3 Following the evaluation stages described in this methodology, the Employer will evaluate the tender submissions using a weighted model of 70:30 price/quality.
- 1.4 The price model will be evaluated in two parts – 40 points for the lowest lump sum price and 30 points for the lump sum price that is closest to the mean average of all compliant lump sum tenders.
- 1.5 The award recommendations will be made on the basis of the most economically advantageous tenders (MEAT) evaluated as described in this methodology.

2. Evaluation Stages

- 2.1 The evaluation shall comprise of 4 stages:

Stage One - Compliance

Stage Two - Quality

Stage Three - Price

Stage Four - Final selection and recommendation

3. Evaluation Team

- 3.1 An evaluation team has been set up to undertake a comprehensive, systematic and consistent evaluation of each tender. This evaluation team will be split into two panels, one for quality and one for price. Both panels will be made up of officers with expertise in their specific areas i.e. the quality evaluation panel will include individuals experienced in fire protection provisions and the price evaluation panel will be made up of individuals with financial expertise.

4. Stage One - Compliance

- 4.1 Tenders will be checked initially for completeness and compliance with the Tender Documents. Whilst the Employer shall be entitled to seek clarification from tenderers in order to determine if a tender is complete and/or compliant, tenderers should note that the Employer reserves the right to reject tenders that are not complete and/or compliant. Tenderers are referred to the 'Checklist of Documents to be returned' in Section 8 of the Tender Documents.
- 4.2 For tendering purposes, tenderers are required to confirm as part of their tender that, if awarded a contract, they will be able to provide the required levels of insurance cover in the contract as set out in the Contract Particulars. The Employer regards this confirmation as a compliance issue and reserves the right to reject any tender, without further consideration, in the event that they fail to provide such confirmation as part of their tender.
- 4.3 Tenderers are required to submit the Parent Company Guarantee **Undertaking**, if applicable, as set out in the Tender Documents.
- 4.4 Tenders that pass this Stage One will be evaluated as detailed below.

5. Stage Two - Quality

- 5.1 Tenderers will be required to submit **five (5)** method statement proposals answering the questions contained within the Quality Submission Schedule in Section 2 of this document. These method statements, once approved by the Employer, will be incorporated into the Contract as the Contractor's planned way of working/operating throughout the Contract Period.
- 5.2 All submissions will be scored against the same criteria/ sub criteria and sub-weightings as set out in this schedule.
- 5.3 The weighting for each method statement proposal is set out in the following table:

Criterion	Requirement or sub-criteria in respect of Method Statements	Sub-Criteria Weighting	Criteria Weighting
Resources Method Statement 1	A. Resources for Mobilisation	2	4
	B. Information Technology & Communication	2	
Service Delivery Method Statement 2	A. Fire Protection Works		20
	i. Surveys to identify compartment breaches	5	
	ii. Communications	4	
	iii. Delivering Fire Protection Works	6	
	iv. Leaseholders	5	
Quality Control and Compliance Method Statement 3	A. Quality and compliance during and after the Works	2	4
	B. Improving Service Delivery	2	
London Living Wage (LLW) Method Statement 4	A. Administration of LLW	1	1
	B. Identification of Productivity Gains		
Modern Slavery Act 2015 Method Statement 5	Modern Slavery Act 2015: Requirements	1	1
Total Quality Score			30

6. Quality Scoring Scale

6.1 The scoring of a tenderer's method statement will be based on the following scale:

Score	Descriptions
0	Cannot be scored - No information provided or incapable of being taken forward either because the Contractor does not demonstrate an understanding of the Employer's requirements or because the solution is incapable of meeting our requirements.
1	Unsatisfactory - Although the Contractor does demonstrate an understanding of the Employer's requirements there are some major risks or omissions in relation to the proposed solution to deliver the Works and the Employer would not be confident of its requirements being met.
2	Satisfactory A response which is capable of meeting the Employer's requirements but is unlikely to go beyond this.
3	Good A response, which shows that the Contractor demonstrates an understanding of the Employer's requirements, has a credible methodology to deliver the Works and could evolve into additional benefits.
4	Very Good A response, which shows that the Contractor demonstrates an understanding of the Employer's requirements, has a credible methodology to deliver the Works alongside a clear process and plan to deliver additional benefits and deliver value.
5	Excellent A response which shows how the service can comprehensively be taken to the next level in terms of exceeding the Employer's requirements and/or offering significant added value to the Employer's overall strategic requirements and objectives.

6.2 Each question will be scored and then the sub-weighting applied to give a weighted score for quality. The score will be to the nearest two decimal points.

Examples

Points Awarded	Sub Criteria Score	Calculation	Total Score
1	3	$1/5 \times 3$	0.60
3	3	$3/5 \times 3$	1.80
5	3	$5/5 \times 3$	3.00

6.3 A tenderer's evaluation score will be based on the tenderer's written submission, but this will be clarified (and its veracity and accuracy verified) by the following methods:

- By responses to clarification questions raised by the Employer
- Clarification meetings/presentations
- Written feedback from referees.

6.4 Tenderers will not be able to address any omissions in their tender submission during any clarification process.

- 6.5 The initial score will be based on the evaluators' review of the tenderer's tender submission and be updated based on further clarification. The final score therefore may differ from the initial scores to reflect the full evaluation process undertaken by the quality evaluation panel. Overall scores will be calculated to ascertain the tenderer's overall percentage score.
- 6.6 The quality evaluation panel shall conduct a "consensus scoring process" where moderation of the scores awarded during the exercise will take place. The moderation shall give regard to any variance in the scores between the evaluators. A consensus score will be agreed by the evaluators for each of the evaluation criteria.

7. Quality Thresholds

- 7.1 The award criteria are set out at paragraph 5.2. Each response to the award criteria will be marked out of a possible score of 5. The scoring will be based on the general principles and descriptions shown in the table at paragraph 5.3.
- 7.2 Tenderer's should note that for method statements two (2), three (3) and four (4) a tenderer must score **3 (good)** for each of the sub-criteria otherwise it may be rejected.

8. Stage Three - Price

- 8.1 A price evaluation model ("the model") has been designed to help the Employer carry out a robust evaluation of price. The model has been prepared using historical data in relation to the service and predicted annual spend levels. The rates, prices and percentage adjustments captured in the Form of Tender (in Section 7 of the Tender Documents) will be used to populate the model.
- 8.2 The model has been produced in Microsoft Excel 2010.
- 8.3 Tenderers should note that all Schedule of Rates are pre priced except Annex 1, which needs to be priced. The tendered percentage adjustments should include for all costs as detailed within the Preliminaries and the Contract Documents. The total of each Annex will be calculated and carried to the summary page.
- 8.4 Where appropriate each Annex will be adjusted by the tendered percentage adjustments inserted in the Form of Tender (in Section 7 of the Tender Documents) as follows:

8.4.1 **Annex 1** - Tenderer's Pre Priced schedule for **fire stopping** maintenance works – subject to percentage adjustment A1 and multiplied by estimated indicative quantities.

8.4.2 **Annex 2** - Pre Priced Schedule of Rates for **fire doors** Maintenance Works - subject to percentage adjustment A2 and multiplied by estimated indicative quantities.

8.4.3 **Annex 3** – Pre Priced Schedule of Rates for **NHF fire codes** – subject to percentage adjustment A3 and multiplied by estimated indicative quantities.

8.4.4 **Annex 4** - Pre Priced Schedule of Rates for **fire associated works**- subject to percentage adjustment A4 and multiplied by estimated indicative quantities

8.4.5 **Annex 5** – Pre Priced Schedule of Rates for **scaffold** – subject to percentage adjustment A5 and multiplied by estimated indicative quantities.

8.4.6 **Annex 6** - Tenderers' Schedule of Hourly Charges to be inserted in the Form of Tender (in Section 7 of the Tender Documents) and multiplied by indicative number of hours.

8.5 The Employer will review information submitted by tenderers in the Form of Tender (in Section 7 of the Tender Documents) to satisfy itself that the prices and percentage adjustments submitted by tenderers are robust and sustainable.

8.6 The Employer reserves the right to clarify or hold clarification meetings with tenderers concerning any aspects arising from a tenderer's submission including without limitation, the tenderer's response to these sections.

8.7 The tenderer lump sum price of all the combined Annexes will then be evaluated as follows:

8.7.1 A - Lowest Lump Sum Price Score

The lowest lump sum price submitted will be evaluated as the baseline for establishing the % weighting for the remaining tenderers using the following formula:

The following formula will be used to evaluate the score - $(A/B) \times C$ - where:

A = Lowest Lump Sum Price

B = Next Lowest Lump Sum Price

C = Overall Weighting for Price

Example:

Lowest tender £400K Awarded 40 points

Next lowest tender £450k

$\frac{£400k}{£450k} \times 40\% =$ Awarded 35.6% points

For the avoidance of doubt, where the lowest price is scored this will be divided by itself as A/A rather than A/B so will score the maximum price score.

8.7.2 B - Mean Average Lump Sum Price Score

All compliant tendered lump sum prices will be totaled and divided by

the number of compliant tenders to obtain a mean average lump sum price.

The tendered price submission closest to the mean average lump sum price plus or minus will be awarded 30 points.

To achieve this, examples have been included in a table below:

Mean Average Lump Sum Price Evaluation Table Example

	Tenderers' Lump Sum Price	Price Difference	Create a Positive Value	Positive Value	Scoreable Value	Weighted Score
		Mean Average minus Tendered Price Sum equals Price Difference	IF Price Difference equals a negative value, this will be multiplied by -1 to create a positive value	Positive Value	Add Mean Average plus Positive Value equals Scoreable Value	Weighted Score
Tender 1	£501,035	£49,112	1	£49,112	£599,260	27.50
Tender 2	£550,000	£147.93	1	£147.93	£550,295	30.00
Tender 3	£450,000	£100,147	1	£100,147	£650,295	25.40
Tender 4	£650,000	-£99,852	-1	£99,852	£650,000	25.40
Tender 5	£400,000	£150,147	1	£150,147	£700,295	23.60
Tender 6	£700,000	-£149,852	-1	£149,852	£700,000	23.60
Tender 7	£600,000	-£49,852	-1	£49,852	£600,000	27.50
Mean Average	£550,147					

8.7.3 C – Overall Price Score

Each Tenderer's lowest lump sum price and mean average lump sum price will be added together to give it an overall price score.

9. Abnormally Low Tenders

9.1 The Employer will scrutinise very carefully any tender that contains a price which appears very low (having regard, amongst other things, to the prices submitted in the other tender submissions received). The Employer reserves the right to reject any tender submission that is abnormally low.

10. Disclaimer

- 10.1 The price will be evaluated by applying the figures in the tenderer's completed pricing evaluation model to the assumed volumes of Works. These assumed volumes are made by the Employer purely for the purpose of evaluating tender submissions and for no other purpose and are not an indication or prediction of the quantities of Works which the Employer will require or which the Contractor will provide under any awarded contract.
- 10.2 Save for the purpose of comparing tender submissions, the quantities inserted in the pricing evaluation model by the Employer, shall not bind the Employer in any way and does not constitute any warranty, representation, indication, estimate or prediction of the volumes and quantities of any Works which the Employer may require or the Contractor will provide under any awarded Contract.

11. Stage Four – Final selection and recommendation

- 11.1 The scores achieved for both quality and price will be added together to give an overall score. The overall scores will then be used to rank the tender submissions.
- 11.2 The top two (2) scoring tenderers shall be awarded a contract. Contract A will be awarded first to the successful tenderer achieving the lowest price and Contract B will be awarded to the second top scoring tenderer.

12. Tie Break

- 12.1 In the event of a tie break (where two or more top scoring tenderers have the same total weighted score including both quality and price), the Employer shall select from amongst those tenderers the submission of the tender with the highest weighted score for method statement 2. In the event that this still results in a tie break, the Employer shall select from amongst those tenderers the tender submission with the highest weighted score for price.

Section 2: Quality Submission Schedule

1. Introduction

- 1.1 Tenderers are advised to read the Preliminaries and the Technical Specification in Section 4 of the Tender Documents prior to answering the quality questions.
- 1.2 **A page limit is set out for each method statement.** Any information in excess of the page limit will be disregarded and not scored.

2. Method Statement 1: Resources

- 2.1 The successful Contractor is to ensure the efficient and effective mobilisation of the Contract on the Contract start date. The Contract includes the provision for a mobilisation period of three months and during this period, the successful Contractor shall undertake everything necessary to ensure Works commence.

A. Resources for Mobilisation (Sub-weighting 2)

Tenderers must submit a proposal setting out how mobilisation will be carried out and describe the resources required to be ready for Contract start.

B. Information Technology & Communication (Sub-weighting 2)

Tenderers must submit a proposal detailing the approach to the management of information technology and communication during the contract mobilisation phase and how it will support the delivery of service objectives through out the life of the contract.

*Page limit: **Four (4) A4 Pages Arial Font size 11 plus a separate structure chart.***

3. Method Statement 2: Service Delivery

- 3.1 Tenderers must submit proposals for detailing their approach for responsive work for each of the services set out below. The proposals should include the resources to be used and how the Works will be delivered:

I. Surveys to identify & compartment breaches (Sub-weighting 5)

Tenderers must submit a proposal detailing how they propose to carry out surveys to identify fire compartment breaches when requested by the Contract Administrator.

II. Communications (Sub-weighting 4)

Tenderers must set out their communication approach with the Contract Administrator to ensure effective and timely issue reporting on fire risks that have been identified.

III. Delivering Fire Protection Works (Sub-weighting 6)

Tenderers must provide a detailed description of how they will deliver fire protection works that reflects the variety of architectural types of properties found in Southwark's housing portfolio.

IV. Leaseholders (Sub-weighting 5)

Fire protection is recharged to homeowners as a service charge. Tenderers must submit a proposal setting out how they will provide all the necessary information and support for the Council in its achievement of raising and reclaiming leaseholder service charges for all communal repairs.

*Page limit: **Twenty (20)** A4 Pages Arial Font size 11.*

4. Method Statement 3: Quality Control and Improving Service Delivery

4.1 Tenderers must submit a proposal setting out how they will achieve quality and compliance of the Works.

A. Quality and compliance during and after the Works (Sub-weighting 2)

Tenderers should set out their quality control and compliance procedures for the Works and detail what reporting information will be provided to the Council.

B. Improving Service Delivery (Sub-weighting 2)

Tenderers should set out how their approach to Quality Control and Compliance will contribute to improving the service delivery.

*Page limit: **Four (4)** A4 Pages Arial Font size 11.*

5. Method Statement 4: London Living Wage (LLW) (Sub-weighting 1)

A. Administration of LLW

Tenderers are required to explain how the LLW will be administered, monitored and reported to the Council. The submission should specifically address its application to the tenderers directly employed staff and those of its sub-contractors.

B. Identification of Productivity Gains

Tenderers are also required to identify productivity gains and other benefits which they expect to result from the payment of the LLW and proposals setting out how these will be measured and reported to the Council.

*Page limit: **One (1)** A4 Pages Arial Font size 11*

6. Method Statement 5: Modern Slavery Act 2015: Requirements (Sub-weighting 1)

Are you a relevant commercial organisation as defined by section 54 ("Transparency in supply chains etc.") of the Modern Slavery Act 2015 ("the Act")?

Confirm you are compliant with the annual reporting requirements by providing the relevant url

OR

Provide an explanation if you are not compliant

*Page limit: **One (1)** A4 Pages Arial Font size 11.*