

PT8 - Tender Award Report

This document is used to summarise the procurement process



| | |
|-----------------------|--|
| Report Title | Window Replacement and Internal & External Common Parts Redecorations - Dron House |
| Report Author | Louise Carroll |
| Report Date | 25/08/20 |
| Procurement Reference | |

| Key Area | Outcome |
|-------------------|-------------------------|
| Purpose of Report | Recommendation to award |
| Tender Process | Open non-OJEU |
| Proposed Provider | AD Construction |
| Cost (exc. VAT) | £1,499,468.00 |
| Potential Risks | |

Detailed Summary

1. Summary

Details of what needs to be approved and a list of key areas covered by the report

To recommend award of Window Replacement at Dron House to AD Construction for a fee of £1,499,468.00. The works are for the replacement of the windows to all three blocks, communal decoration and all other works include within the tender documentation.

2. Recommendations

Details of who the contract is to be awarded to, proposed contract term, extensions and other relevant details

To recommend award of Window Replacement at Dron House to AD Construction for a fee of £1,469,468.00. This will be under E2 terms. The proposed programme length is one year.

3. Current Service Provision

Details of current supplier, contract arrangements, expiry dates and potential exit issues.

N/A

4. Evaluation Summary

Overview of the tender process including SQ and ITT outcomes; evaluation criteria and weighting, evaluation outcomes including overview of the top 3 ranked suppliers.

The tender process was open non-OJEU. The evaluation criteria was split 60% quality and 40% technical. The gap between 1st and 2nd ranked supplier was 0.18 and therefore extensive evaluation and clarifications were carried out. The average quality score was 32/60 and the recommended contractor scored above this at 36/60.

1st- AD Construction 76/100

2nd- Diamond Building 75.49/100

3rd- Mulalley 71/100

5. Savings, efficiencies and benefits

Pricing overview, including cost type (fixed cost, schedule of rates etc) and cashable and non-cashable savings achieved.

The pricing documents included a collections page and priced works schedule.

The pricing ranged from £1.49m to £1.87m with the average price coming in at £1.71m. AD Constructions price was the lowest of the tenderers and is around 17% cheaper than the average.

The PTE of this project was circa £1m. AD Construction's tender price is therefore 40% above the PTE but the lowest submitted price.

6. Lessons Learnt

After reviewing the commercial submissions and having looked at the market we have established that our PTE may not be realistic.

COVID-19 is having an impact on pricing and tenderers bids are increasing to accommodate this.

7. Contract Management Plan

Details of persons managing the contract covering roles and responsibilities of individual staff.

Michael Sunnucks

8. Approval Sign Off

| | |
|--------------------------|---|
| Name of Approver | Michael Harrington |
| Position | Senior Category Manager |
| Date approved | 25/08/20 |
| Approver comments | The Closeness of the evaluation will require extensive feedback if the 2 nd place tenderer wishes to receive feedback. |

9. Appendices

Technical Evaluation

| Question | Weight | Evaluator | AD Construction | Axis Europe | Borras Construction | Chas Berger | Cuttle Construction | Diamond Build | Mulalley Co Ltd | Niblock Building | Symphony Windows |
|---|--------|------------------|-----------------|-------------|---------------------|-------------|---------------------|---------------|-----------------|------------------|------------------|
| Please provide 2 examples of a local authority housing scheme where you have acted as principle/main contractor to | 30 | Michael Sunnucks | 18 | 12 | 18 | 18 | 12 | 18 | 18 | 18 | 12 |
| | | Peter Smith | 18 | 12 | 18 | 18 | 12 | 18 | 24 | 18 | 12 |
| | | Evaluator 3 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| | | Jason Crawford | 18 | 12 | 18 | 18 | 12 | 18 | 18 | 18 | 12 |
| Please provide an indicative program, this must contain the following: 1. Lead in times for specialist | 10 | Michael Sunnucks | 6 | 4 | 4 | 6 | 4 | 8 | 8 | 6 | 4 |
| | | Peter Smith | 6 | 6 | 6 | 6 | 8 | 8 | 6 | 6 | 4 |
| | | Evaluator 3 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| | | Jason Crawford | 6 | 4 | 4 | 6 | 4 | 8 | 8 | 6 | 4 |
| You will be fully responsible for liaising with residents. Please detail how, as an organisation, you can achieve the following: Due to the nature of the project, it is envisaged that several elements will be required to be sub-contracted | 15 | Michael Sunnucks | 12 | 6 | 6 | 9 | 6 | 12 | 9 | 9 | 6 |
| | | Peter Smith | 9 | 9 | 9 | 9 | 9 | 15 | 9 | 6 | 6 |
| | | Evaluator 3 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| | | Jason Crawford | 9 | 6 | 6 | 9 | 6 | 12 | 9 | 6 | 6 |
| As an organisation, the City of London promotes social value within projects of this nature. Please provide 2 examples of | 15 | Michael Sunnucks | 9 | 3 | 6 | 9 | 6 | 12 | 9 | 6 | 6 |
| | | Peter Smith | 9 | 6 | 6 | 6 | 6 | 9 | 9 | 9 | 6 |
| | | Evaluator 3 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| | | Jason Crawford | 9 | 6 | 6 | 6 | 6 | 9 | 9 | 6 | 6 |
| As an organization, the City of London has residents needs and expectations at its heart. You shall therefore be required | 10 | Michael Sunnucks | 6 | 4 | 8 | 8 | 6 | 8 | 6 | 4 | 4 |
| | | Peter Smith | 6 | 6 | 6 | 6 | 6 | 8 | 6 | 4 | 4 |
| | | Evaluator 3 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| | | Jason Crawford | 6 | 4 | 6 | 6 | 6 | 8 | 6 | 4 | 4 |
| Please provide details of your practical completion process in relation the works and aftercare service. This should | 10 | Michael Sunnucks | 6 | 4 | 4 | 6 | 6 | 8 | 6 | 6 | 6 |
| | | Peter Smith | 6 | 6 | 4 | 6 | 6 | 8 | 6 | 6 | 6 |
| | | Evaluator 3 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| | | Jason Crawford | 6 | 4 | 4 | 6 | 6 | 8 | 6 | 6 | 6 |
| Weighted Total Must total 100 | 100 | | | | | | | | | | |
| Score from Quality split | | 36.00 | 25.20 | 28.80 | 34.20 | 27.60 | 41.40 | 38.40 | 30.00 | 26.40 | |
| Pricing Score | | 40.00 | 37.74 | 35.26 | 35.78 | 32.01 | 34.09 | 32.67 | 35.19 | 33.45 | |
| Total | | 76.00 | 62.94 | 64.06 | 69.98 | 59.61 | 75.49 | 71.07 | 65.19 | 59.85 | |
| Rank | | 1 | 7 | 6 | 4 | 9 | 2 | 3 | 5 | 8 | |