

### Appendix 3 – Highways Award report – Cabinet (15 July 2019)

1. Selection Criteria (SQ) –First published on the portal on 6<sup>th</sup> February 2019 with a return deadline of 15<sup>th</sup> March 2019. Extensions were given at different times when required
2. On return of the SQ questionnaire, five contractors responded and were evaluated on the basis of the below criteria
3. The five contractors that responded to the SQ are:
  - Bidder A
  - Bidder B
  - Bidder C
  - Bidder D
  - Bidder E

**Table 1**

<b>section</b>	<b>criteria</b>	<b>weighting</b>
1	Supplier Information	N/A
2	Grounds for mandatory discretion (Reg.57(1) &(2)	Pass/Fail
3	Grounds for discretionary exclusion (Reg.57(8)	Pass/Fail
4	Economic and Financial Standing (Annual Turnover)	Pass/Fail
5	Accounts Details (For information)	N/A
6	Technical and Professional Ability- Relevant experience	Pass/Fail
7	Modern Slavery-	Yes/No
8	Insurance Levels	Yes/No
8.3a	Additional questions (response time)	Yes/No
8.3(b)	Quality Questions based on experience of delivery similar project in size and value	100%

4. Contractors who fail the pass/fail section could not proceed to the next stage (ITT)
5. Evaluation of the technical abilities of the contractors was based on the value and type of contract experience submitted and financial turnover of £6m pa was required. Failure to meet these requirement resulted in exclusion.
6. The SQ had one quality question (8.3b) and the below scoring criteria was used in the evaluation.

<b>Quality Question</b>	<b>Weighting</b>
Please provide your organisations past experience in delivering a	100%

highways works and service contract Your response must demonstrate and detail your experience of delivering all elements of a highways works and service contract preferably within a public sector. <b>Maximum of 3000 words</b>	
---	--

**Table 2**

<b>Score</b>	<b>Performance</b>
0	<b>Completely unsatisfactory/unacceptable response</b> No response to the question or serious deficiencies in being able to demonstrate past experience of delivering a highways works and service contract.
1	<b>Poor response</b> The response significantly fails to demonstrate the bidder's past experience of delivering all elements of a highways works and service contract.
2	<b>Partially Compliant response</b> The response partially demonstrates the bidder's past experience of delivering elements of a highways works and service contract but not all elements.
3	<b>Acceptable response</b> The response demonstrates the bidder's past experience of delivering all elements of a highways works and service contract. Any concerns are only of a minor nature.
4	<b>Good response</b> The response fully and clearly demonstrates the bidder's past experience of delivering all elements of a highways works and service contract to a high standard.

**SQ Selection Outcome –**

- After evaluation and moderation of the SQ submission, one contractor did not qualify to the next ITT stage because they failed both the financial turnover – Section 4 and section 6 technical ability (regardless of their score in the quality question). All other four bidders were invited to the ITT stage. Of the four that went through to the ITT stage, one had scored low on the quality question, but because of technicalities they could not be disqualified as they had passed all of the pass/fail sections.

**Table 3**

Name	SQ Quality question score	SQ Pass/fail	Outcome
Bidder A	50%	Fail	Could not go through to the next stage as they failed to meet the financial turn over that was required and experience was only as a sub-contractor with low value projects.
Bidder B	25%	Pass	Selected although with low score. Passed qualifying sections. Low score was because, their response was based largely on utilities contract, but with large contract value
Bidder C	75%	Pass	Selected through because they met the requirement
Bidder D	100%	Pass	Selected through because they met the requirement
Bidder E	75%	Pass	Selected through because they met the requirement

8. Invitation to Tender Stage (ITT) published on the 3<sup>rd</sup> April 2019 with a return deadline of 24<sup>th</sup> May 2019. Extensions were given at different times when required.
9. As bidder A failed the SQ, the ITT was sent to the successful bidders below:
  - Bidder B
  - Bidder C
  - Bidder D
  - Bidder E
10. To mitigate the risk of awarding to a contractor that could potentially submit a low quality bid we included a clause within the ITT. Therefore, for the contract to be awarded, the Bidders must score 25% and above out of the 40% available for quality.
11. Although four bidders were successful to the ITT stage, only three of those four submitted a bid. The three bidders that submitted a bid are the following from the SQ listed above:
  - Bidder C

- Bidder D
- Bidder E

12. The award criteria within the ITT was split at 60% price and 40%. Quality was assessed based on the below criteria:

**Table 4**

Number	Question	Weighting
1	Service Delivery (comprising of 21 elements in the specification)	20%
2	Contract management (comprising of 4 elements)	5%
3	Real time/Service Update	3%
4	Recycle	2%
5	Supply chain management	5%
6	Innovation	3%
7	Social Value	2%
<b>Total quality weighting</b>		<b>40%</b>

13. Question one had 21 elements and question 2 had 4 elements and evaluators were required to evaluate each element of every question using the below scoring criteria:

**Table 5**

Score	Performance
0	<b>Completely unsatisfactory/unacceptable response</b> No response to the question or serious deficiencies in meeting the required standards set out in the contract documents.
1	<b>Poor response</b> The response significantly fails to meet the required standards set out in the contract documents, contains significant shortcomings or is inconsistent with other proposals.
2	<b>Partially Compliant response</b> The response is partially compliant with some shortcomings in meeting the required standards set out in the contract documents.
3	<b>Acceptable response</b> The response is compliant and meets the basic contract standards set out in the contract documents. Any concerns are only of a minor nature.
4	<b>Good response</b> The response is fully compliant and clearly indicates a full understanding of the contract documents so as to consistently deliver the service in line with all the required standards.

Below is a breakdown of each bidders quality score:

**Quality Score Breakdown:**

**Table 6**

Question	Weighting	C	D	E
1	20%	18.8%	6.67%	5.71%
2	5%	4.38%	3.13%	3.44%
3	3%	2.25%	0.75%	2.25%
4	2%	2%	1%	1%
5	5%	5%	2.5%	2.5%
6	3%	3%	1.5%	1.5%
7	2%	1.97	1.57%	1.7%
<b>Total</b>	<b>40%</b>	<b>37%</b>	<b>17%</b>	<b>18%</b>

**Quality and Price score breakdown:**

**Table 7**

Bidder	Quality score	Price Score	Final score	Ranking
<b>C</b>	37%	53.76%	90.76%	1
<b>D</b>	17%	60%	77%	2
<b>E</b>	18%	47.97%	65.97%	3

14. As part of the ITT bidders were required to sign up to the Councils employability pathway. As part of the submission, bidders were required to commit to numbers for the duration of the contract. See below:

**Employability Pathway:**

15. It is a requirement of this contract that the successful contractor sign's up to the Council's employability pathway (see Appendix 1A).

Please indicate the number you can commit to as provided in Appendix 1A	
---	--

**Note:** The number of opportunities articulated is given as a guide only. It is LBM's expectation that the actual number of opportunities indicated will either exceed those articulated or represent a nominal reduction in the numbers articulated.

This page is intentionally left blank