

APPENDIX A

Tender Evaluation Report

Provision of a Special Educational Needs School in Bower
Lane, Bridgwater, Somerset
Ref: DN376213

Author: **Name: Natanya Nathan**
 Title: Service Manager
 Commercial & Procurement Team
 Date: 15/02/19

Management Summary

Bridgwater currently offers SEN school places through three separate sites placed in the south, west, and north of Bridgwater. These sites offer progression through distinct phases of education, but essentially provide Primary, Secondary and Post-16 SEN facilities.

A recent review of SEN provision in Somerset has demonstrated that the district of Sedgemoor is currently operating at capacity, and that students are being sent 'out of the county' for SEN education. This practice is inefficient, draining the County's resources and leading to disproportionately high costs.

To compound the issue, a number of influencing factors (such as the Hinkley Point C Power Station), look set to significantly increase the demand for school spaces running through till 2025 and beyond. In anticipation of the increased demand, Somerset County Council commissioned a feasibility study to establish the extent of required SEN expansion in the immediate future. The feasibility study produced demonstrated an urgent need for an all-through SEN School in Bridgwater.

Following a Key Decision approval dated 27/02/18 and further Cabinet/SLT approval on 12/11/18; the decision was taken to go out to tender following a competitive process under the Southern Construction Framework. Following the evaluation of the responses by stakeholders (listed in Appendix 2), this evaluation report proposes the award of the contract to the winning contractor.

Key Summary Points

1. Term

The contract term will be for pre-construction and construction of the school by July 2020.

2. Scope

The project scope of works is as follows:

- Construction of new 160 Place SEN School, including parking, associated ancillary facilities, and external works;
- Construction of school access road;
- Potential construction of additional section of spine road;
- Review of the existing design proposals and opportunity to propose VE;
- Contractor cost consultancy advice throughout the project and to agreement of final account. Client-side QS will be the subject of a separate appointment;
- Production of information required, in conjunction with appointed design team, to discharge planning conditions, if applicable;
- Preparation and submission of building control application;
- Co-ordination as required with statutory service providers to agree infrastructure requirements and installation;

- Design and co-ordination as required for any new service and supply connections;
- Compliance / delivery of BIM Level 2 as per SCC requirements
- The management / supervision of the installation of Client supplied IT and Loose FFE.

3. Procurement Process

a) Approach to Market

Procurement have worked closely with Property and Schools Commissioning to agree the approach, including having commissioners as part of the evaluation team, clear minimum criteria and weighting discussions.

A number of commissioning models and routes to market were discussed including the SCAPE framework which is a direct award arrangement, carrying out our own OJEU exercise, using the Futures 4 Somerset agreement or carrying out a competition under the Southern Construction framework.

The Infrastructure Board agreed that competition should take place whenever possible. As Scape and Futures 4 Somerset are both direct award agreements, this could only be achieved by carrying out our own OJEU exercise or under the Southern Construction Framework further competition route. In order to reduce the requirements on internal resources and timetable the Southern Construction Framework was agreed as the preferred route to market, because it meets OJEU requirements, has agreed rates, KPI's and all the available suppliers have a history of delivering school build projects.

As this is a bespoke special needs school, designers were engaged to prepare designs to an advanced stage to include within the tender documents. In addition, the suppliers were given a tight target budget to 'aim' for. The Southern Construction Framework pricing is evaluated on % profit, overheads and fees as per the framework rules and technical ability.

Southern Construction Framework

The framework has a pre-determined two stage process. Stage 1 seeks expressions of interest from all 10 of the suppliers on the framework and high-level confirmation that they have the ability to carry out the works.

On this occasion 5 suppliers submitted expressions of interest and were invited to stage 2 – tender process.

b) Market/stakeholder engagement

We provided all the framework suppliers with estimated timelines and a pipeline of work. All the suppliers on the framework have delivered Special Educational Needs school facilities.

We have also been in discussions with the Southern Construction Framework 'owners' Devon County Council to understand how best to use the framework and learn from other organisations that use the framework. This has enabled us to build a good relationship with the suppliers and Devon County Council.

c) Evaluation Methodology

Tenders were evaluated in accordance with the evaluation criteria set out the procurement documents, which was agreed between Commissioning, Property and Procurement as follows:

Sub-Criteria	Percentage of Overall Weighting (%)
Part D	
Technical Question 1	20%
Technical Question 2	10%
Technical Question 3	5%
Technical Question 4	5%
Technical Question 5	15%
Technical Question 6	15%
Total	70%

Tenders were evaluated on the basis of 70% quality and 30% price as agreed by members of SLT following a business case approval.

The scoring mechanism is contained in Appendix 3.

Each evaluation panel member (see Appendix 2) scored each tender submitted on an individual basis and prior to the moderation meeting held on the 15th February 2019.

Financial Evaluation

The following formula was used to evaluate price as submitted by Bidders:

$$\text{Score} = \frac{\text{Lowest Price received by SCC across all Tenders} \times 30}{\text{Your organisation's price submitted}}$$

This process essentially ranks the lowest to highest prices and allocates a score based on the difference between them.

This evaluation process has been overseen by the Commercial and Procurement Team.

d) Invitation to provide a Tender

5 potential providers expressed an interest in receiving an Invitation to Tender (ITT) through the e-Tendering System (ProContract). The Procurement Documents were issued on 15th January 2019.

Bid responses were received by the closing date of 12 noon on 1st February 2019, as follows:

- 4 Bidders responded
- All Bidders submitted a compliant Bid
- Bids were evaluated in accordance to the criteria set out in the Procurement Documents, which are available upon request.

The Bids were evaluated and moderated by a panel of SCC, AWW and Aecom staff (see Appendix 1).

Overall scores for the Bids (see Appendix 2). The name of the winning contractor and their tendered price is contained separately within confidential Appendix B.

5. Sourcing Recommendation

It is recommended to award a Contract to the winning contractor on the basis that they provided the Most Economically Advantageous Tender.

The Commercial and Procurement Team has checked all submitted tenders to ensure that all required documents were received.

Any risks identified can be incorporated in the discussions with the successful Bidder as part of the contract award process.

If SCC discovers errors or omissions in the Bid post award, the Bidder may be required to justify the price/item(s) concerned. SCC reserves the right not to accept any amendments to the initial Bid. If suitable justification is not supplied in relation to any errors or omissions, SCC reserves the right to approach the Bidder with the second highest score in order to award the Contract.

6. Contractual Position

The new Contract will be established between the winning contractor and SCC. The Contract will be under the NEC3 terms and conditions.

This is subject to approval of a Key Decision supported by this evaluation report.

7. Termination

There is a break clause within the Contract which allows termination at pre-construction stage, there is no commitment to continue to construction.

8. Programme

A detailed programme plan is submitted as part of the tender exercise and indicates delivery by July 2020. The major projects team in Property work with the provider to ensure the programme is kept up to date and delivered as agreed.

10. Risks

The main risks at this stage are to programme and costs. Mitigations have been suggested by the provider to ensure delivery on time and on budget. Surveys on the land have taken place and no additional risks have been discovered at this stage. Specific risks are addressed during the pre-construction phase, mitigation and ownership are also agreed during this phase.

11. Service Levels and Contract Management

Customer satisfaction and service levels will be monitored as part of Contract Management. The major projects team in Property will contract manage the agreement to ensure that the service meets expectations and to identify further opportunities for cost and service improvement.

12. Added Value

A key element of the Southern Construction Framework is to ensure social value is 'wrapped up' within the contractor's tender submissions. In particular apprenticeships and training opportunities.

The provider has also indicated that they will work with the local community and school to arrange legacy projects for pupils. Specific opportunities will be discussed during the pre-construction phase.

13. Next Steps

- a)** Key Decision to be signed off
- b)** Suppliers to be informed of the decision by Commercial and Procurement Team
- c)** The Contract is to be sealed once the standstill period is complete.

End of Report

Appendix 1

Evaluators

The quality evaluation team:

- Richard Morris Project Management Team Lead, SCC
- Malcolm Burt Architectural Design Advisor, SCC
- Phil Curd Access and Additional Learning Needs, SCC
- Jamie Furse Director, AWW

The Commercial/Financial Requirements evaluators: -

- Heather Neale Senior Quantity Surveyor, SCC
- Natanya Nathan Service Manager - Procurement, SCC
- Ben Garton Quantity Surveyor, Aecom

Appendix 2 – Breakdown of final Scores

	Weighting	Supplier A	Supplier B	Supplier C	Supplier D
Quality	70%	56.00%	48.00%	38.00%	60.00%
Price	30%	25.00%	19.81%	19.16%	30.00%
Total	100%	81.00%	67.81%	57.16%	90.00%

Appendix 3 – Scoring Methodologies:

Mini Competition Question	Unacceptable (0)	Poor (1)	Good (3)	Excellent (5)
Examples of Scoring Criteria				
Q1. Financial Control : (Mandatory Question)	<p>Answer not supplied</p>	<p>Limited commentary on how the scheme will be delivered to cost. No supporting information provided that demonstrates an ability to deliver to cost / at the proposed m2 rate. Poor or irrelevant risks presented. Inadequate mitigation provided for any relevant risks identified.</p>	<p>Robust commentary provided with good supporting information that demonstrates how the scheme will be delivered to cost. Risks are project specific and well considered with reasonable mitigation strategies proposed.</p>	<p>Very robust commentary provided with clear evidence of research, and scrutiny of the proposed cost plans to support any reassurance offered in the commentary provided. Risks are project specific and well considered with thorough practical mitigation strategies proposed.</p>
Q2. Quality Assurance & Performance :	<p>Answer not supplied</p>	<p>Unable to clearly demonstrate where the contractor have driven innovation or offered added value. Schemes generally delivered over budget or late or unable to clearly demonstrate expected challenges and/or how to overcome them to ensure innovation/added value and performance against programme and cost</p>	<p>Able to demonstrate where they have been able to offer some value or innovation previously when delivering SEN projects. Schemes generally delivered on budget and on programme. Or can evidence relevant challenges and examples to overcome them and demonstrates with minor weaknesses how to bring innovation and assurances against meeting programme and costs</p>	<p>Contractor has clearly demonstrated where they have driven innovation and added value in previous projects. All examples completing on programme and on budget. Or can evidence relevant challenges and examples to overcome them and demonstrates how to bring innovation and assurances against meeting programme and costs with no weaknesses</p>
Q3a. Social Responsibility : A completed ESP and method statement is	<p>Failure to provide ESP and</p>	<p>N/A</p>		<p>ESP and Method Statement</p>

Mini Competition Question	Unacceptable (0)	Poor (1)	Good (3)	Excellent (5)
	Examples of Scoring Criteria			
enclosed with this submission. (Yes 2.5%, No 0%)	Method Statement / failure to meet minimum requirements			provided and minimum requirements met
Q3b. Social Responsibility : The ESP meets the template minimum benchmark. (NOT SCORED)	N/A – Included in scoring above			
Q3c. Social Responsibility : Explain the reason for any negative variation to the SCF/CITB E & S Benchmark targets and set out the level of E & S outputs that can be achieved and describe how they will be delivered. (No variation scores 2.5%)	No Explanation Given for ESP Variations / No completed ESP and Method Statement Provided	Poor Reason Given for ESP Variations	Adequate Reason Given for ESP Variations	No Variation from ESP. Clear explanation as to how they will be delivered. With added benefit
Q4. Social Responsibility :	Answer not supplied / no socially responsible activities proposed	Very limited level of social responsibility activities. Poorly considered / not practical. Offer minimal benefit to the school / community.	Good level of social responsibility activities with some useful benefit to the school / community.	Excellent and extensive activities proposed that offer clear and significant benefit to the school / community.
Q5. Programmes of Work :	Answer not supplied / critical programme date not met	Critical programme date met and statement of reassurance provided but contains some weakness. Poor or irrelevant risks presented. Inadequate mitigation provided for any relevant risks identified.	Critical programme date met and sufficient statement of reassurance provided. Risks are project specific and well considered with reasonable mitigation strategies proposed.	Critical programme date met and statement of reassurance provided that instills extra confidence. Risks are project specific and well considered with thorough practical mitigation strategies proposed.
Q6. Design Management :	Answer not supplied	Limited information provided. Information not sufficiently detailed to enable internal technical review. Proposal not relevant to this project / proposal is something that will have significant detrimental impact on the programme.	Information provided and sufficiently detailed to enable internal technical review. Proposals are relevant and offer some benefit to the scheme, but with weakness e.g. slightly detrimental impact on the programme.	Excellent value engineering proposal that offers significant benefit to the scheme with no detrimental impact to programme. All information is clear and sufficiently detailed to enable internal technical review.

