

PT4 - Committee Procurement Report

This document is to be used to identify the Procurement Strategy and Purchasing Routes associated with a project and only considers the option recommended on the associated Gateway report.

Introduction

City Procurement Project Reference:	19/301/PS		
Project / Contract Title:	Baldwins Pond & Birch Hall Park Pond Dam Safety Improvements		
Project Lead & Contract Manager:	Mark Bailey	Lead Department:	Built Environment
Category Manager:	Jemma Borland	Other Contact:	n/a
Total Contract Value (excluding VAT and inc. extension options):	Baldwins Pond £880k Birch Hall Park Pond £150k	Contract Duration (inc. extension options):	
Budget approved Capital/Revenue:	Yes/No Capital/Revenue	Capital Project reference (if applicable):	n/a
Gateway Approval Process			
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Is this project subject to the Gateway process? Yes - If so, what was the last Gateway report, and date of approval, and what is the next Gateway report and scheduled date for recommendation for approval? <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Gateway 4 – October 2019 • Gateway 5 – June 2020 			
Opportunity for Inter-City Collaboration (is there another site/department that could benefit from this project)?			

Procurement Strategy Recommendation

City Procurement team recommended option
<p>Option 1: Tender projects separately. Tender Birch Hall Park Pond as an RFQ and Baldwins Pond as sub OJEU.</p> <p>For Baldwins Pond - Design and Build contract for Baldwins (using NEC4 Engineering & Construction Contract, Option A: Priced Contract with Activity Schedule, and including for Contractors Design)</p> <p>For Birch Hall Park Pond - This will be a traditional works-only NEC4 Engineering and Construction Contract (Option A: Priced Contract with Activity Schedule)</p>

Route to Market Recommendation

City Procurement team recommended option
Option 2: Tender projects separately. Tender Birch Hall Park Pond as an RFQ and Baldwins Pond as sub OJEU

Specification and Evaluation Overview

Summary of the main requirements:	
The design and implementation of proposed works to the impounding dams to two large ponds in Epping Forest in the interests of public safety, as recommended by the appointed Panel Engineer for dam safety.	
Technical and Pricing evaluation ratio 60% (Technical) / 40% (Price)	
Overview of the key Evaluation areas (if known at this stage): TBC	
Does contract delivery involve a higher than usual level of Health & Safety, Insurance, or Business risk to be allowed in the procurement strategy?	
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Enhanced level of health and safety because of works 	
Are there any accompanying documents with this report? e.g. PTO/outlined project plan identifying roles and responsibilities as appropriate If yes, please include information in the appendices section below.	Yes <input type="checkbox"/> No <input checked="" type="checkbox"/>
Will this project require the winning supplier(s) to process personal data on our behalf?	Yes <input type="checkbox"/> No <input checked="" type="checkbox"/>

If yes, please make sure you've defined roles and responsibilities within your project specification. For more information visit [Designing Specifications under GDPR](#). You may include your Privacy Impact Assessment or other relevant report as an appendix to this PT form when submitting to category board (for information).

Evaluation Panel – Please enter Names and Departments below (if known)

Mark Bailey – more to be confirmed

Built Environment

Procurement Strategy Options *This could include inter-departmental usage, external collaborative opportunities, existing contracts integrated once expired or adding it to an existing contract. Options for Make (In-house delivery) versus Buy (Outsource) decision to be considered; also indicate any discarded or radical options.*

Option 1: Tender Baldwins Pond & Birch Hall Park Pond Dam Safety Improvements separately.

Advantages to this Option:

- Baldwins pond is the biggest pond and will require more specialised work.
- Two separate suppliers can be appointed, so a supplier who is more qualified can be appointed to Baldwins Pond.

Disadvantages to this Option:

- Additional administration is required for both Lots.
- Multiple tender exercises are required.

Please highlight any possible risks associated with this option: Increased administration to deliver the projects

Option 2: Tender projects together

Advantages to this Option:

- Performance can be monitored at one source
- Less administration time.

Disadvantages to this Option:

- One contract is appointed so if the work is isn't up to standard on the Birch Hall Park pond there is a risk there could be issues on Baldwins Pond works as project is more specialised. This could result in delays, loss of money and retender.
- Combining the two projects may put off suppliers tendering due to Baldwins Pond being more specialised.

Please highlight any possible risks associated with this option:

- Supplier can be capable of carrying out the works for Birch Hall Park Pond but not Baldwins Pond.

Route to Market Options: *Route to market is the way in which the City will invite suppliers to bid for the procurement.*

Option 1: Open Sub OJEU for Baldwins Pond

Advantages to this Option:

- Opens up competition, brings opportunity to receive responses from the wider market

Disadvantages to this Option:

- Risk of having a high volume of bids.

Please highlight any possible risks associated with this option:

- No response to the tender.

Option 2: Tender Birch Hall Park pond as an open RFQ

Advantages to this Option:

- Opens up competition, brings opportunity to receive responses from the wider market.
- Quick turnaround time, contract will be put in place quickly.

Disadvantages to this Option:

- Risk of having a high volume of bids.

Please highlight any possible risks associated with this option:

Option 3: Intermediate Works

Advantages to this Option:

- Quick turnaround time.
- Trusted/pre-qualified suppliers

Disadvantages to this Option:

- Lack of specialism
- Risk of subcontracting which will increase price.

Please highlight any possible risks associated with this option:

- None of the suppliers are able to carry out the works

Price Mechanism

Option 1: Lump sum fixed price

Advantages to this Option:

<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • A contractual arrangement where the fee is capped, and the supplier accepts the risk. • Gives a clear cost, which aids reporting and budget management.
Disadvantages to this Option:
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Their price may contain added on cost due to the risk.
Please highlight benefits and possible risks associated with this option relative to the specifics of the project:
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Variation can alter the cost of a project quite considerably.
Option 2: Fixed price - schedule of rates/bill of quantities
Advantages to this Option:
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • A fixed fee for different requirements, allows us to better budget future works depending on the requirement.
Disadvantages to this Option:
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • There is no real incentive for contractors to treat work with urgency as there may not be LAD's in place.
Please highlight benefits and possible risks associated with this option relative to the specifics of the project:

Form of Contract

Option 1: CoL Standard amendments to JCT
Advantages to this Option:
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Commonly used form of contract with suppliers • Claims are dealt with retrospectively.
Disadvantages to this Option:
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • SME's may not have experience dealing with these terms. • Does not support collaborative working.
Please highlight benefits and possible risks associated with this option relative to the specifics of the project :
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • There is a lack of understanding of the terms that will cause delay and increased resources to solve issues.
Option 2: CoL Standard amendments to NEC3
Advantages to this Option:
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Pro-Active approach to delivery. • Using the spirit of mutual trust
Disadvantages to this Option:
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • SME's may not have experience dealing with these terms. • Terms favour the Supplier.
Please highlight benefits and possible risks associated with this option relative to the specifics of the project:
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • There is a lack of understanding of the terms that will cause delay and increased resources to solve issues.
Option 3: Other CC&S standard form
Advantages to this Option:
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • These are well known to the Contractors and we receive minimal objections to their usage. • The terms are designed for low value work, this is suited to the project and the delivery.
Disadvantages to this Option:
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • None seen at this time.
Please highlight benefits and possible risks associated with this option relative to the specifics of the project:
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • The Supplier may propose their own terms and conditions.

Outline of appendices

<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Please list appendices here or mark 'Not applicable' if there is none. • Items to consider appending: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ○ PTO (Project Plan with Roles and Responsibilities) ○ Data Protection Impact Assessment ○ risk matrix here
--

Report Sign-offs

Senior Category Manager Chamberlain's Department	Michael Harrington	Date	14/08/2019
Departmental Stakeholder Department		Date	Click here to enter a date.