

Please ask for:

Geoff Rawling

Direct dial:

(023) 9254 5215

Fax:

(023) 9254 5587

E-mail:

geoff.rawling@gosport.gov.uk

09 November 2010

S U M M O N S

MEETING: Major Contracts Sub Board
DATE: 17 November 2010
TIME: 4.00 pm
PLACE: Council Chamber, Town Hall, Gosport
Democratic Services contact: Geoff Rawling

LINDA EDWARDS
BOROUGH SOLICITOR

MEMBERS OF THE SUB-BOARD

The Mayor (Councillor Allen) (ex-officio)
Chairman of the Policy & Organisation Board (Councillor Hook) (ex-officio)

Councillor Burgess
Councillor Carter, C R
Councillor Chegwyn
Councillor Mrs Forder

Councillor Langdon
Councillor Philpott
Councillor Wright

FIRE PRECAUTIONS

(To be read from the Chair if members of the public are present)

In the event of the fire alarm (continuous ringing sound) sounding, please leave the room immediately.

Proceed downstairs by way of the main stairs or as directed by GBC staff, following any of the emergency exit signs. People with disability or mobility issues please identify yourself to GBC staff who will assist in your evacuation of the building.

IMPORTANT NOTICE:

- If you are in a wheelchair or have difficulty in walking and require access to the Committee Room on the First Floor of the Town Hall for this meeting, assistance can be provided by Town Hall staff on request

If you require any of the services detailed above please ring the Direct Line for the Democratic Services Officer listed on the Summons (first page).

NOTE:

- i. Councillors are requested to note that, if any Councillor who is not a member of the Sub Board wishes to speak at the Sub Board meeting, then the Borough Solicitor is required to receive not less than 24 hours prior notice in writing or electronically and such notice shall indicate the agenda item or items on which the member wishes to speak.
- ii. Please note that mobile phones should be switched off for the duration of the meeting.

AGENDA

PART A ITEMS

1. ELECTION OF CHAIRMAN FOR THE MUNICIPAL YEAR 2010/11

2. ELECTION OF VICE-CHAIRMAN FOR THE MUNICIPAL YEAR 2010/11

3. APOLOGIES FOR NON-ATTENDANCE

4. DECLARATIONS OF INTEREST

All Members present are required to declare, at this point in the meeting or as soon as possible thereafter, any personal or personal and prejudicial interest in any item(s) being considered at this meeting.

5. DEPUTATIONS – STANDING ORDER 3.5

(NOTE: The Sub Board is required to receive a deputation(s) on a matter which is before the meeting of the Sub Board provided that notice of the intended deputation and its object shall have been received by the Borough Solicitor by 12 noon on Monday, 15 November 2010. The total time for deputations in favour and against a proposal shall not exceed 10 minutes).

6. PUBLIC QUESTIONS – STANDING ORDER 3.6

(NOTE: The Sub Board is required to allow a total of 15 minutes for questions from Members of the public on matters within the terms of reference of the Sub Board provided that notice of such Question(s) shall have been submitted to the Borough Solicitor by 12 noon on Monday, 15 November 2010).

7. TERMS OF REFERENCE OF THE SUB BOARD

PART II

Appendix approved at the council meeting on 29 September 2010.

Contact
Officer:
Linda Edwards
Ext 5401

8. MAJOR CONTRACT PROCUREMENT; PROGRESS TO DATE, AN OUTLINE OF THE EVALUATION PROCESS AND TIMETABLE

PART II

To inform Members of progress to date in the procurement of

Major Contracts Sub Board
17 November 2010

the Councils major contracts and to outline the proposed timetable and the methodology for the evaluation of contractor bids.

Contact
Officer:
Charles
Harman
Ext 5287

9. ANY OTHER ITEMS

-which the Chairman determines should be considered, by reason of special circumstances, as a matter of urgency.

MAJOR CONTRACTS SUB-BOARD

DELEGATED POWERS

1. To agree the arrangements for the evaluation of tenders in respect of the Asset Management; Environmental and Streetscene; Grounds Maintenance; Gas Repairs and Breakdowns Services ('the Services')
2. To make recommendations to Policy and Organisation Board on the award of contracts for the Services

AGENDA ITEM NO. 8

Board/Committee:	Major Contracts Sub Board
Date of Meeting:	17 th November 2010
Title:	Major Contract Procurement; Progress To Date, an Outline of the Evaluation Process and Timetable
Author:	Charles Harman & Stevyn Ricketts
Status:	For Decision

Purpose

To inform Members of progress to date in the procurement of the Councils major contracts and to outline the proposed timetable and the methodology for the evaluation of contractor bids.

Recommendation

That the Sub Board:

- 1) Note progress to date on the procurement of the Council's major contracts, in particular the shortlisted contractors in Appendix 2
- 2) Approve the evaluation process and timetable as detailed in Appendix 3

1.0 Background

- 1.1 On 25 January 2010 Policy And Organisation Board approved the overall procurement process and timetable for the procurement of a wide range of Council services.
- 1.2 A report to Policy And Organisation Board in September 2010 outlined the conclusions of the Procurement Options & Scoping Report and Members agreed a recommendation that a Sub-Board be constituted "to oversee the work of the evaluation panels"

2.0 Report

- 2.1 An officer group has been working throughout, initially canvassing industry opinion at a Suppliers Day event held in November 2009. The group has subsequently been advised by the South East Improvement Partnership and been receiving technical and administrative support from Echelon Consulting. The framework for the procurement process has been provided by the Gosport Borough Council Procurement Strategy 2009 – 2011.
- 2.2 In addition to support outlined in 1.2 above the Council has held a series of "hearts and minds" workshops facilitated by echelon Consulting in mid July involving residents, staff and Members. As well as outlining the process for the selection of the contractor(s) these workshops also helped to identify what Members, residents and staff wanted to see included in the delivery of the Housing, Asset Management, Environmental & Leisure Services Contracts in the future.
- 2.3 In August 2010 echelon Consulting undertook a Procurement Options & Scoping Report on behalf of the Council. The Report recommended that the Council adopt the following model:
 - Partnering contract to be adopted

- Lots to be defined [as detailed in Appendix 1]
- Potential for Single or Multiple Contractors to provide integrated service (i.e. multiple Lot bids)
- Contract let for a maximum of fifteen years (10+5) with 6-month determination for non-performance clauses
- 'Open book' model (providing access to Contractor's costs with a breakdown of labour, material, overhead and profit whilst maintaining a fixed cost process)
- Costs managed through annualized target cost and incentives
- Selection criteria to be 60% quality, 40% cost
- Affordability check as part of Selection criteria evaluation with abnormally low or high bids scored zero

2.4 The contract "lots" were subsequently advertised in the Official Journal of the European Union (OJEU) as follows:

1. Asset Management Services to all GBC owned housing & buildings
2. Environmental & Streetscene Services
3. Grounds Maintenance Services
4. Gas Installations, Servicing & Breakdowns & Electrical surveys & re-wires

A breakdown of these lots and their estimated value is provided in Appendix 1

2.5 echelon Consulting issued 78 Pre-Qualification Questionnaires (PQQs) on behalf of the Council to organisations that had expressed an interest in delivering one or other of the four Lots. 34 completed PQQs were returned by interested contractors. There were 7 contractors who withdrew from the process. These PQQs were shortlisted in a facilitated 2-day workshop. The results of this workshop, and the list of the shortlisted contractors, are detailed in the echelon Consulting report entitled 'PQQ Evaluation Report' (Appendix 2)

2.6 An overview of the process for the evaluation of bids and the future timetable are detailed in Appendix 3.

3.0 Risk Assessment

3.1 A risk assessment for this initiative has previously been undertaken and was last presented to Policy And Organisation Board in September 2010. That assessment is reproduced in Appendix 4.

4.0 Legal

4.1 The Council has been receiving specialist legal advice on contractual and procurement issues from Trowers & Hamlin.

5.0 Summary

5.1 The Council has been involved in a major procurement exercise to select contractor(s) to deliver the bulk of its services. That process has now reached the final key stage, the selection of contractors to provide those services

5.2 The Policy & Organisation Board in September 2010 constituted this Sub Board to oversee the final evaluation stage of that process.

Financial Services comments:	It is important that the areas of work contained in this procurement exercise are efficiently procured as soon as possible as they represent a major unknown when projecting future budget commitments.
Legal Services comments:	See 4.0
Service Improvement Plan implications:	Major Contract procurement is a SIP initiative for 2010-11 within Environmental and Housing Services
Corporate Plan:	<i>Prosperity</i> (theme); Attracting Investment to Gosport's economy & Maximising local employment opportunities(priorities). <i>Pursuit of Excellence</i> (theme); Delivering quality services(priority)
Section 17 Crime & Disorder Act 1998	Not applicable
Risk Assessment:	See Appendix 4
Background papers:	Gosport Borough Council Procurement Strategy 2009 – 2011 "Contract Procurement Process And Timetable" report to P&O Board on 25.1.2010 "Contract Procurement Process And Timetable" report to P&O Board on 15.09.2010
Appendices/Enclosures:	Appendix 1; Value And Description Of Gosport Borough Council Major Contracts Appendix 2; PQQ Evaluation Report Appendix 3; EXTRACT FROM: Procurement Options & Scoping Report Appendix 4; Risk Assessment
Report author/ Lead Officer:	Charles Harman (ext 5287) Stevyn Ricketts (ext 5282)

VALUE AND DESCRIPTION OF GOSPORT BOROUGH COUNCIL MAJOR CONTRACTS

The anticipated annual value of each Contract Lot (excluding VAT) is as follows for the Gosport Borough Council stock:

LOT 1 – ASSET MANAGEMENT SERVICES

Council Properties & Communal areas; reactive repairs service, Voids works, Door Entry Systems. Planned & cyclical works programmes.

Repair and maintenance of Council land and infrastructure and other Local Authority Assets including;

Town Hall repairs & maintenance,
Wilmott Lane Depot repairs & maintenance,
Club Hampshire maintenance,
Internal/external repairs; Nobes Hall, Compass Point, Bus station, Ancient monuments, No 2 Battery, Public Conveniences.
External repairs Alverbank Hotel, Park Lodge, Bus station (TIC), Mobile home park (communal building),
Play areas – replacement of equipment & vandalism repairs.

Repairs and maintenance to other council buildings, Sports Pavilions, ad hoc repairs to car parks, tenanted buildings (x2) and public conveniences.

Allotments; vandalism repairs. Beach huts; repair & maintenance.

LOT 1 VALUE = £5.60m per annum

* * * * *

LOT 2 – ENVIRONMENTAL & STREETSCENE SERVICES

Waste and recycling collection, bottle and can bank emptying and site cleaning, green waste collection, clinical waste collection, bulky waste collection (up to 5 items), special bulky waste collection (6 items and over), amenity skip delivery and collection.

Wheeled bin/sack provision, stock control, delivery and maintenance.

Street cleansing including; open spaces and amenity areas, bus shelters, street market and compound cleansing, public convenience cleansing, slipway cleansing, sports pavilion cleansing and cleansing of other ad hoc assets.

Litter and dog bin installation, maintenance and cleansing.

Future: possible kerbside glass collection (not incl in lot value)

LOT 2 VALUE = £2.46m per annum

* * * * *

LOT 3 – GROUNDS MAINTENANCE

Grounds maintenance including flower and shrub maintenance, grass cutting, maintenance of open spaces, sports pitch maintenance, cemetery and disused churchyard maintenance, hedge cutting and maintenance of seasonal displays.

LOT 3 VALUE = £0.89m per annum

* * * * *

LOT 4 – GAS & ELECTRICAL (Council Properties)

Gas servicing, breakdown repair service & gas h/hw system installations
(Council Properties)

Electrical surveys & re-wires (Council Properties)

LOT 4 VALUE = £1.05m per annum

EXTRACT FROM: Procurement Options & Scoping Report**9.0 Procurement Process****9.1 Introduction**

9.1.1 Following the conclusion of the review that the preferred option is to develop a Partnering Agreement with a number of contractors for all services the process for undertaking the procurement of the contract were considered.

9.1.2 The EU Procurement Rules, to which GBC are bound, identify two stages in the evaluation process leading to the award of contract:

- Contractor Selection Stage – evaluation of responses to OJEU Notice
- Award Stage – evaluation of Contractors tenders

9.1.3 Stage one (selection stage) focuses on the contractor, whilst stage two (award stage) focuses on their proposal.

9.1.4 This section provides outline proposals on the methodology for the selection process for the recommended procurement method. A detailed proposed timetable of events is provided below. All dates are provisional at this stage.

9.1.5 The Core Group that has assisted in the development of this review will continue to meet throughout the selection and implementation process and will be involved in all the key stages (evaluation, visits, interviews, etc.)

9.2 Stage 1: Pre Qualification Questionnaire

9.2.1 The first stage of the process will be the placing of the contract notice in the Official Journal of the European Journal, with a target date of 31/08/10.

9.2.2 Respondents who express an interest in the contract will be issued with a Pre Qualification Questionnaire (PQQ).

9.2.3 The PQQ will be a relatively technical document, specifically designed to act as a 'competence test' for market testing the repairs service.

9.2.4 The purpose of the PQQ is:

- To eliminate any contractors who fail to meet the base criteria
- To create a manageable shortlist of candidates to take forward to Stage 2
- To identify any clarification points

9.2.5 The PQQs that are received will be returned by the 08/10/10 and an evaluation workshop will be held on the 11/10/10 & 12/10/10 to assess the returned documents using a prescribed objective scoring mechanism.

9.3 Stage 2: Invitation to Tender (ITT)

9.3.1 The ITT is the tender documentation that will be sent to the Shortlisted contractors.

9.3.2 The ITT will include the following key documents:

- Instructions to Tenderers
- Background Information on contract
- Project objectives and aspirations
- Specification and scope of works
- Schedule of Rates/Open Book cost model – a hybrid model is recommended
- Qualitative Questionnaire - a series of questions to assess the contractors suitability/capability to deliver Gosport BC' aspiration, to include a detailed Method Statement and Case Study
- Each of Lots / Services will have a series of core questions and a number of service specific questions.
- Contract details
- Form of Tender

Tenders are evaluated on a 60% quality/40% cost ratio, whereby:

Qualitative (60%)

- 30% qualitative questionnaire
- 20% visit
- 10% interview

Quantitative (40%) – measured against each work stream / service

- 25% Schedule of Rates (Labour & Materials only or equivalent)
- 10% Project Overheads (lump sum in year one)
- 5% Head Office Overheads & Profit (an element of which will be linked to performance)

The reason that we have recommended the visit is evaluated so highly is that many contractors now employ the services of professional bid writers and often the reality of service delivery is somewhat different to the vision portrayed in the contractor's tender submission.

Our experience has shown us that a well managed visit is a real 'acid test' of how well the service is being delivered in relation to Gosport BC' aspirations and allows Gosport BC stakeholders to meet their peers from the client organisation on the visit.

Similarly we believe that the interview acts only as final validation of the rest of the process and as such have recommended only 5% of the marks. It is worth noting that the quantitative element will include an 'affordability check' based on an accepted benchmark cost for each service and any tenders that are assessed as being too expensive or too cheap will be rejected.

9.3.3 A mid-tender briefing session will be held to allow contractors the opportunity to ascertain more information in relation to the contract and raise any queries they have.

9.3.4 The return date for the Tenders is programmed as 24th November 2010

9.3.5 Following receipt of the Tenders an evaluation workshop will be held to assess the returned tenders objectively.

9.3.6 Following the Tenders evaluation workshop a shortlist of Contractors will be drawn up. Non-Shortlisted contractors will be provided with structured feedback on why they were not selected.

9.3.7 Shortlisted contractors will be visited as part of the assessment process. This will comprise a visit to another project where they are delivering a similar service and a standard scoring schedule will be used to act as a comparator.

9.3.8 The final stage of the selection process will be a formal interview of the contractor by the Core Group. The interviews will take place on 17th December 2010 followed by detailed 'Selection Report' that will be presented to the Council for approval.

9.3.9 This provides a minimum three-month mobilisation period to implement the new contracts. A key element of the selection of the contractor will be their ability to mobilise.

Major Contract Procurement: Timetable

Function & Proposed Date(s)	
Initial Meeting & develop project directory	Complete
Establish Core and Operational Working Groups	Complete
Residents Workshop x2	Complete
Internal Stakeholders Workshop	Complete
Resident Consultation morning	Complete
'Vision and Values' Workshop	Complete
Review Existing Service	Complete
Gather & Interpret KPI Data	Complete
Summary Report	Complete;
Undertake review of Procurement Options	Complete
Prepare Report	Complete
Present Report Draft	Complete; 12/08/10
Procurement Launch Meeting	Complete
Develop & Agree Cost Model	Complete
Award Criteria	Complete
Develop PQQ	Complete
Place OJEU/Adverts	Complete; 31/08/10
Process Map & Develop Specification	Complete
Develop KPI Handbooks	Complete
Contract Development	Complete
Develop ITT	Complete
PQQ Return Date	Complete; 8/10/10
Shortlist PQQs	Complete; 11&12/10/10
Issue ITTs	Complete; 14/10/10
Mid-Tender Briefing	Complete;
Train & Develop Evaluation Group & 1 st Sub Board Meeting	17/11/10
ITT Return Date	24/11/10
Evaluate ITTs	25 & 26/11/10
Evaluation Visits (2 week period allowed)	1/12/10 –15/12/10
Interviews (Assumes 1 day)	17/12/10
Preferred Bidder	20 or 21/12/10
10-day statutory standstill	20/12/10 - 03/01/11
Summary Report to (Extraordinary) P&O Board	21/12/10
Contract Award	03/01/11
Mobilisation workshop	05/01/11
Mobilisation of new Contract(s) (13 weeks)	03/01/11 – 01/04/11
Start on Site	April 2011

PQQ = Pre Qualification Questionnaire. A document completed by contractors answering a range of questions about their organisation and the experience they have at delivering similar contracts elsewhere. A Pre Qualification Questionnaire is essentially a means by which contractors are shortlisted.

ITT – Invitation to Tender. Shortlisted contractors are then invited to submit a formal bid, in a prescribed format , and are provided with significant detail about Gosport and the contracts in order to prepare that bid. Those bids are then evaluated through an assessment of price of the bid, the written submission, site visit and interview.

Mobilisation = with the successful contractors having been identified the period from award to starting on site, and the preparations required, is known as the mobilisation period.

APPENDIX 4

Risk Assessment

There are potential risks associated with the management of this initiative to procure services. The likelihood of the event(s) occurring (without controls) are shown in brackets.

Professional (Operational):

Inefficient and/or ineffective processes (medium)

Over reliance on key officers (medium)

Financial (Operational):

Failure of major project(s) (medium)

Failure to prioritise, allocate appropriate budgets and monitor (low)

Missed business and service opportunities (high)

Legal (Operational):

Breach of European Directives on Procurement of Services/Works (high)

Legal challenge as a consequence of the above (high)

Contractual (Operational):

Failure of contractor to deliver (see below) (low)

Political (Strategic)

Unfulfilled promises to electorate/customer base (medium)

Reputation Management (Strategic):

Negative publicity: (Public/press interest/ awareness) (medium)

The severity of the risks are assessed as follows (with controls):

- Breach of European Directives (low)
- Legal challenge (Medium – potentially in excess of £0.5M)
- Operational financial cost (High): (over £100k)
- Reputational risk - negative publicity (Medium): (Local or public interest/National public or press aware).

Likelihood	HIGH		H	H
	MEDIUM	L	Legal (b) & Reputation M	Financial H
	LOW	Legal (a) L	Negative publicity L	M
		LOW	MEDIUM	HIGH
		Severity (with Controls in Place)		

The controls in place to mitigate risk are as follows:

- An established procurement framework (Professional)
- Wide officer involvement in Procurement group (Professional)
- Advice sought from external procurement specialists (Legal/Financial)
- Advice sought from external Legal Procurement specialists (Legal/Financial)
- Regular (internal) budget meetings (Financial)
- Established consultation framework (Financial & Political)

The overall likelihood of risks materialising (3.1), with controls in place, (3.3) has previously been assessed **Medium**.



Pre-Qualification Questionnaire Evaluation Workshop Report

On behalf of

Gosport Borough Council

Held on

11th & 12th October 2010

At

**Council Chamber
Gosport Borough Council
Town Hall
High Street
Gosport
Hampshire
PO12 1EB**

PQQ Evaluation Report

Prepared by:

Luke Driscoll
echelon consultancy ltd

Phone: 01707 339800
Email luke@echelonconsultancy.co.uk
www.echelonconsultancy.co.uk

1.0 Scoring

- 1.1 echelon have issued 78 Pre-Qualification Questionnaires (PQQs) on behalf of Gosport Borough Council (GBC) to organisations that have expressed an interest in delivering one or other of the four Lots advertised by GBC through OJEU, namely:
- Lot 1 – Asset Management Services to all GBC owned buildings
 - Lot 2 – Environmental & Streetscene Services
 - Lot 3 – Grounds Maintenance Services
 - Lot 4 – Gas and Electrical (Council Properties)
- 1.2 In all, 34 completed PQQs were returned. There were 7 contractors who withdrew from the process. These PQQs were shortlisted in an echelon facilitated 2-day workshop and each PQQ was evaluated using a PQQ Evaluation Sheet **Appendix 2**.
- 1.3 During day one the attendee's as listed in **Appendix 1** completed a full evaluation of the PQQs scoring both the quantitative (Sections C to L) and qualitative sections (Section M & N). On day two the groups re scored the PQQs but only re evaluated the qualitative sections (Section M & N).
- 1.4 The scores were then entered onto the PQQ Evaluation Log **Appendix 3** and the Group made a decision on the Contractors that will be invited to the next stage of the Tendering process based on the scores from this process.
- 1.5 There were a number of contractors PQQ submissions that did not meet key requirements which GBC felt was essential to enable a contractor to be short listed for the ITT stage of the process. We decided that we would continue to score the whole submission in order to offer feedback to the unsuccessful contractors on their whole document. Details of these contractors can be found in **Appendix 4**.
- 1.6 The group checked that there were a sufficient number of contractors shortlisted and invited to tender.

- 1.7 It was felt that there was sufficient coverage for each to apply the following benchmarks to the Lots:

Lot	Benchmark
Lot 1 – Asset Management Services to all GBC owned buildings	87.3%
Lot 2 – Environmental & Street scene Services	82%
Lot 3 – Grounds Maintenance Services	83%
Lot 4 – Gas and Electrical (Council Properties)	85.6%

- 1.8 Contractors who submitted a completed PQQ and were not discounted as described in item 1.5 but did not achieve the threshold can be found in **Appendix 5**.
- 1.9 Contractors who submitted a completed PQQ and achieved the threshold can be found in **Appendix 6**.

2.0 Record keeping and confidentiality

- 2.1 All scoring sheets will be kept by echelon until completion of the process.
- 2.2 The returned PQQs will be stored by GBC but will be available to echelon to give feedback to contractors if requested. echelon also have electronic versions of each submission to enable feedback to be given.
- 2.3 The PQQ evaluation matrix will be forwarded initially to the senior team members of GBC only to enable confidentiality and to ensure the successful and non successful contractors are informed through the correct channels.
- 2.4 It was noted by all that the results of the PQQ evaluation will be kept strictly within the confines of the evaluation group.

3.0 Attendees

3.1 The following are the attendees of the PQQ evaluation workshop

Luke Driscoll*	Clair Moore / Mathew Baxter**
Elspeth White	Lesley Smith
Andy Woodcock	Sue Kendall
Emma Jacobs	Stephen Penfold
Sam Downing	Tim Hoskins
Stevyn Ricketts	Caroline Smith
Dave Stubington	Angela Benneworth
Sian Jones	Alan Wheeler
Jenny Leonard	Kat Martin
Richard Pym	Ian Marriott
Alan Gibson	Sam Voller
Maree Hall	Jayne Sharp

*LD from echelon attended both days

** CM & MB from echelon attended one day each

4.0 Appendix 1 - Evaluation Groups.

4.1 Where possible the groups were mixed with a member who had some knowledge of asset management or the evaluation process with someone less experienced.

Group	Member 1	Member 2
A	Alan Gibson	Andy Woodcock
B	Maree Hall	Jenny Leonard
C	Lesley Smith	Dave Stubington
D	Stevyn Ricketts	Jayne Sharp
E	Angela Benneworth	Caroline Smith
F	Elspeth White	Sam Voller
G	Emma Jacobs	Kat Martin
H	Richard Pym	Stephen Penfold
I	Sue Kendall	Alan Wheeler
J	Sam Downing	Sian Jones
K	Ian Marriott	Tim Hoskins

5.0 Appendix 2 - Evaluation sheet.

PQQ EVALUATION SHEET

Gosport PQQ evaluation score sheet

Group & Members:

Applicant's details

B1 Applicant: insert applicants name

Section

C1 Not scored - record for completeness only

C1.1 -

C1.21 Applicant's organisation details

Are the details provided?

Yes

No

C1.17 Parent Company Guarantee / alternative proposal provided

Will group guarantee work

Yes

No

QUANTITATIVE SCORES 50% WEIGHTING (58 Marks)

Quantitative Scores

D1 Name of Director and person responsible for H and S

<i>Good</i>	2	<i>senior person responsible for H and S</i>
<i>Satisfactory</i>	1	<i>if information provided</i>
<i>Unsatisfactory</i>	0	<i>if information not provided</i>

D2 & D3 Competent Person

<i>Good</i>	2	<i>named person has relevant qualifications</i>
<i>Satisfactory</i>	1	<i>if person named and details provided</i>
<i>Unsatisfactory</i>	0	<i>if answer no and /or no data provided</i>

D4 & D5 Health & Safety Policy and communication to workforce

<i>Good</i>	2	<i>policy provided and is conveyed to workforce</i>
<i>Satisfactory</i>	1	<i>policy provided and response is satisfactory</i>
<i>Unsatisfactory</i>	0	<i>Information not provided</i>

D6 Communicating Health and Safety to Staff

Good	2	yes
Unsatisfactory	0	no

D7 Health and Safety Induction

Good	2	if answer is yes and details enclosed show training / objectives
Satisfactory	1	if answer is yes and details enclosed
Unsatisfactory	0	if answer is no or if details are not provided

D8 - D14 Health and Safety Details

Good	2	if details enclosed, or if in policy, low rate of accidents
Satisfactory	1	if details enclosed, or if in policy
Unsatisfactory	0	if not provided and not in policy

D15 Health and Safety Performance

good	2	details enclosed and have no prosecutions or notices
satisfactory	1	details enclosed and satisfactory performance
unsatisfactory	0	details not provided or poor performance

D16 Asbestos Awareness

Good	2	details enclosed show a good awareness
Satisfactory	1	details enclosed and show basic awareness
Unsatisfactory	0	details not enclosed or are enclosed and poor

E1 Environmental Policy

Good	2	yes and details enclosed and are comprehensive
Satisfactory	1	yes and details enclosed and are reasonable
Unsatisfactory	0	details not enclosed or are enclosed and poor

E2 Environmental Notices Served

Good	2	no Notices Served
Satisfactory	1	no or notices served but are of a minor nature
Unsatisfactory	0	notices served and are of a major nature

E3 Additional Data

Good	2	main features and advantages provided / accreditation
Satisfactory	1	additional data provided and adds value
Unsatisfactory	0	no data provided or no value added

F1 Quality Assurance Policy

good	2	details enclosed and are comprehensive
yes	1	details enclosed but are not comprehensive
no	0	details not enclosed or are enclosed and poor

F2 QA additional data

Good	2	main features and advantages provided / accreditation
Yes	1	additional Data provided and adds value
No	0	no data provided or no value added

H1 Compliance with statutory obligations

Good	2	policy enclosed and clear explanation provided
Satisfactory	1	policy provided but explanation not clear or poor policy
Unsatisfactory	0	policy not provided

H2 Unlawful discrimination findings

good	2	no findings of unlawful discrimination
satisfactory	1	minor findings have been made against contractor
unsatisfactory	0	major findings have been made against the contractor

H3 & H4 Investigation by CEHR

satisfactory	2	no investigations
unsatisfactory	0	investigations have taken place

I1 Joint Training Initiatives

Good	2	yes do have initiatives and evidence provided is good
Satisfactory	1	yes, do have initiatives and evidence is satisfactory
Unsatisfactory	0	no, do not have initiatives

I2 Integrated Teams

Good	2	yes have integrated teams, evidence provided is good
Satisfactory	1	yes, do have integrated teams, evidence is
satisfactory		
Unsatisfactory	0	no, do not have initiatives

I3 CSR Policy

Good	2	yes do have a CSR policy and the evidence is good
Satisfactory	1	yes do have a CSR policy and evidence is satisfactory
Unsatisfactory	0	no, do not have CSR policy

I4 Business Cultures

Good	2	yes have assessed business culture and evidence provided is good
Satisfactory	1	yes have assessed business culture and evidence provided is satisfactory
Unsatisfactory	0	have not assessed business culture

J1 Number of Employees

Good	2	Number of employees demonstrates ample capacity to deliver work
Satisfactory	1	Number of employees demonstrates likely capacity to deliver work
Unsatisfactory	0	Number of employees does not demonstrate ability to deliver work

J2	<u>Skills/Qualifications</u>		
	Good	2	Qualifications and skills demonstrate good ability to deliver works
	Satisfactory	1	Qualifications and skills demonstrate average ability to deliver works
	Unsatisfactory	0	Including information not provided
J3 - J5	<u>Employment Monitoring</u>		
check	Good	2	good assessment of competence/monitoring/CRB
	Satisfactory	1	satisfactory assessment and accept CRB
	Unsatisfactory	0	were not provided and / or CRB not accepted
K2	<u>Outstanding Insurance Claims</u>		
	Good	2	If confirmed no claims outstanding
	Satisfactory	1	If confirmed claims are outstanding but are of a minor nature
	Unsatisfactory	0	If confirmed claims are outstanding but are major
L1	<u>References Available</u>		
	Yes	2	If answer is yes and references are provided
	No	0	If no references are provided
L2	<u>Relevant Contracts</u>		
	excellent	2	NEC /TPC / PPC contracts used
	satisfactory	1	if indicate partnering contract used
	unsatisfactory	0	if no partnering contract used
L3-L6	<u>Determination / Damages / Disputes</u>		
	Good	2	If answer is No
	Satisfactory	1	If answer is yes with satisfactory explanation
	Unsatisfactory	0	If answer is yes with unsatisfactory explanation
L7	<u>Contract withdraw</u>		
	Excellent	2	answer is no
	Satisfactory	1	answer is yes and details provided are satisfactory
	Unsatisfactory	0	no answer provided or answer is yes and details are unsatisfactory
L8	<u>Regulatory/Trade Bodies</u>		
	Good	2	good range of bodies provided with details enclosed
enclosed	Satisfactory	1	limited range of bodies provided or details not
	Unsatisfactory	0	no details provided

Qualitative Scores 50% Weighting (30 Marks)

COMMENTS

M References 5 *Excellent*
 4 *Good*
 3 *Satisfactory*
 2 *Weak*
 1 *Poor*

N1 Relevant Experience 5 *Excellent answer*
 4 *Good answer*
 3 *Satisfactory*
 2 *Weak answer*
 1 *Very weak or no answer*

N2 Mobilisation 5 *Excellent answer*
 4 *Good answer*
 3 *Satisfactory*
 2 *Weak answer*
 1 *Very weak or no answer*

N3 IT Systems 5 *Excellent answer*
 4 *Good answer*
 3 *Satisfactory*
 2 *Weak answer*
 1 *Very weak or no answer*

N4 Tenants 5 *Excellent answer*
 & Residents 4 *Good answer*
 3 *Satisfactory*
 2 *Weak answer*
 1 *Very weak or no answer*

N5 KPI Monitoring 5 *Excellent answer*
 & Validation 4 *Good answer*
 3 *Satisfactory*
 2 *Weak answer*
 1 *Very weak or no answer*

General Comment

COMPLETENESS CHECK

Has the applicant answered all the questions and provided all required documentation?

Checklist for required documentation

Y/N

Equal opportunities policy

☐

Audited Accounts (3 Years)

☐

Quality Assurance Documentation (if applicable)

☐

References provided

☐

Letter of authorisation to seek banker's reference

☐

Health and Safety Policy

☐

MINIMUM PREQUALIFICATION STANDARDS

			Criterion Met?
C2	Eligibility		
C2.1	Eligibility criteria	Pass <input type="checkbox"/>	Y/N
		Fail <input type="checkbox"/>	
C2.2	Schedule 1 Details	Pass <input type="checkbox"/>	Y/N
		Fail <input type="checkbox"/>	
Economic & Financial			
G8	Min Avg Turnover from similar contracts per contract area £250,000		Y/N
G8	Min Avg Turnover per contract area/ other evidence		Y/N
K1	Minimum level of professional indemnity insurance > £1m		Y/N
G	No concerns re financial ability to complete contract		Y/N
Technical & Professional			
L1	Evidence of similar service provision		Y/N
L2	Evidence of Partnering Contracts		Y/N
J1 & J2	Evidence of staff qualifications & experience		Y/N
K2, L4 & L6	Evidence of no significant concerns re service provision		Y/N
K2, L3 to L6	Evidence of lack of damages payments > £250k/appropriate responses		Y/N
E1 to E3	Evidence of environmentally sound measures		Y/N
F1 & F2	Evidence of appropriate quality control measures		Y/N
D1 to D16	Evidence of Health & Safety compliance		Y/N
H1 to H4	Evidence of Equal Opportunities Compliance		Y/N

6.0 Appendix 3 - Evaluation Log

Please see separate excel file.

7.0 Appendix 4 - Discounted Contractors

Please note that the group decided to continue to score the whole document in order to give fair and full feedback. The scores awarded were still not within the threshold for ITT stage and the score for each Discounted Contractor is given in brackets next to their name.

Contractor	Reason
Connaught Environmental (77.2%)	Failure L3-L6
Burley Ltd (72.7%)	Failure L2
Central Heating Systems (73.8%)	Failure L2

8.0 Appendix 5: Contractors who submitted PQQs who did not meet the threshold (by Lot)

Lot 1 – Asset Management Services CUT OFF POINT 87.3%

	Contractor	Score
1	Vinci	86.5%
2	Enterprise	84.9%
3	Mitie	77.9%
4	Richardson	63.5%

Lot 2 – Environmental & Streetscene Services CUT OFF 82%

	Contractor	Score
1	Mitie	77.9%
2	Connaught Environmental	77.2%

Lot 3 – Grounds Maintenance / Landscape Services CUT OFF 83%

	Contractor	Score
1	Quadron	79.8%
2	Mitie	77.9%
3	Connaught Environmental	77.2%
4	Ground Control	76.4%
5	Hi-Spec	74.6%
6	Burleys	72.7%

Lot 4 – Gas Servicing Installation & Electrical Works CUT OFF 85.6%

	Contractor	Score
1	Enterprise	84.9%
2	Robert Heath	84.1%
3	BTU Group	81.5%
4	Mitie	77.9%
5	Central Heating Services	73.8%
6	Richardson	63.5%

9.0 Appendix 6: Contractors who submitted PQQs who did meet the threshold by Lot

Lot 1 – Asset Management Services CUT OFF POINT 87.3%

	Contractor	Score
1	Morrison	98.3%
2	Mears	95.0%
3	ROK	93.3%
4	Lovell	93.2%
5	Mountjoy	93.2%
6	Kier	89%
7	Osbourne	89%
8	Comserve	87.4%

Lot 2 – Environmental & Street scene Services CUT OFF 82%

	Contractor	Score
1	Kier	89%
2	ISS Facility	86.5%
3	Veolia	85.6%
4	Enterprise	84.9%
5	Urbaser	83.1%
6	Verdant	82.3%

Lot 3 – Grounds Maintenance / Landscape Services CUT OFF 83%

	Contractor	Score
1	Mears	95.0%
2	The Landscape Group	93.3%
3	OCS Group	90.6%
4	Kier	89.0%
5	Continental Landscapes	86.6%
6	ISS Facility	86.5%
7	Veolia	85.6%
8	Enterprise	84.9%
9	Sodexo	83.1%

Lot 4 – Gas Servicing Installation & Electrical Works CUT OFF 85.6%

	Contractor	Score
1	Morrison	98.3%
2	TSG	97.5%
3	Mears	95%
4	Lovell	93.2%
5	Dodd Group	90.0%
6	PH Jones	90%
7	Kier	89%
8	eaga	86.6%
9	Kinetics	85.7%
10	B Bowden	85.7%

9.0 Appendix 7: ALL contractors Scores & Lot Indications

- ITT's issued to those highlighted in green.

	Contractor	Lot 1	Lot 2	Lot 3	Lot 4	Score
1	Morrison	✓			✓	98.3%
2	TSG				✓	97.5%
3	Mears	✓		✓	✓	95.0%
4	The Landscape Group			✓		93.3%
5	ROK	✓				93.3%
6	Lovell	✓			✓	93.2%
7	Mountjoy	✓				93.2%
8	OCS Group			✓		90.6%
9	Dodd Group				✓	90.0%
10	PH Jones				✓	90.0%
11	Kier	✓	✓	✓	✓	89.0%
12	Osbourne	✓				89.0%
13	Comserve	✓				87.4%
14	Eaga				✓	86.6%
15	Continental landscapes			✓		86.6%
16	Vinci	✓				86.5%
17	Iss Facility		✓	✓		86.5%
18	Kinetics				✓	85.7%
19	B Bowden				✓	85.7%
20	Veolia		✓	✓		85.6%
21	Enterprise	✓	✓	✓	✓	84.9%
22	Robert Heath				✓	84.1%
23	Sodexo			✓		83.1%
24	Urbaser		✓			83.1%
25	Verdant		✓			82.3%
26	BTU Group				✓	81.5%
27	Quadron			✓		79.8%
28	Mitie	✓	✓	✓	✓	77.9%
29	Connaught Environmental		✓	✓		77.2%
30	Ground Control			✓		76.4%
31	Hi – Spec			✓		74.6%
32	Central Heating Services				✓	73.8%
33	Burleys			✓		72.7%
34	Richardson	✓			✓	63.5%