

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:	TBC		
Project / Contract Title:	Hampstead Heath Swimming Facilities - Safety, Access, and Security Improvements		
Project Lead & Contract Manager:	Edwin James Birch	Lead Department:	City Surveyors
Category Manager:	Kayleigh Rippe	Other Contact:	N/A
Total Contract Value (excluding VAT and inc. extension options):	£470,000	Contract Duration (inc. extension options):	5-7 months
Budget approved Capital/Revenue:	Capital	Capital Project reference (if applicable):	12265
Gateway Approval Process			
- 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? - Gateway 2			
Proposed Project Programme			
Gateway 3/4 (June 22), Tender (July 22), Gateway 5 (October 22), Practical Completion (May 23), Gateway 6 (September 23)			
Opportunity for Inter-City Collaboration (is there another site/department that could benefit from this project)?			
No.			

Procurement Strategy Recommendation

City Procurement team recommended option
Traditional – Without Quantities

Route to Market Recommendation

City Procurement team recommended option
Sub FTS ITT

Specification and Evaluation Overview

Summary of the main requirements:	
Due to the specialist nature of the works, including works very close to water, contractors that have worked on similar types of projects would be initially sought. Additionally, the team will be looking for contractors who are:	
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> a) Suitable for the type and scale of project b) Have the capacity and team to deliver it c) Will be willing to work pro-actively with the Client's project team 	
Technical and Pricing evaluation ratio	
TBC nearer the time but it is envisaged that the pricing evaluation will be higher than technical so potentially 60% pricing and Technical 40%.	
Overview of the key Evaluation areas (if known at this stage):	
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • 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"/>

Is there a requirement for a Performance Bond on this Project and if so, on what grounds?	
TBC	
Will the procurement process require a financial assessment? Yes <input type="checkbox"/> No <input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	
If yes, please indicate recommended assessment: Finance Check <input type="checkbox"/> Financial Appraisal <input type="checkbox"/>	
Please indicate reasons for this recommendation (please include in this section information on project being rated low/not low):	
A financial assessment has not been recommended for this project as the framework suppliers will have had to pre-qualified to sit on the framework.	
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)	
Edwin James Birch	City Surveyor's

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: Traditional – Without Quantities
Advantages to this Option:
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Fully Completed Design approach City has full control of the Design approach. Schedule of works to be used as the pricing document – This will be used to control cost more rigorously compared to the broader less detailed contract sum analysis that is used under design and build Greater level of engagement from contractors
Disadvantages to this Option:
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> If unsure of the design approach, would not be suitable as variations would be costly..
Please highlight any possible risks associated with this option: The Use of traditional could result in many different design changes across the different sites and cause programme issues.

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

Option 1: Sub FTS ITT
Advantages to this Option:
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Allows us to engage with the Market as a Whole Open Tender process allows for specialist tenderers to make an impact.
Disadvantages to this Option:
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Resources could be strained because of the large number of suppliers received. Longer tender period to cater for all suppliers.
Please highlight any possible risks associated with this option: An already strain team could delay the award and allocation of funds risks the delivery of the programme.
Option 2: Internal Framework
Advantages to this Option:
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> City Owns and manages this approach and documentation. We have established relationships with the suppliers which sit on it. The Framework has set Rates
Disadvantages to this Option:
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Does not fit the specialist works required
Please highlight any possible risks associated with this option: as above

Outline of appendices

o N/A

Report Sign-offs

Senior Category Manager Chamberlain's Department	Kayleigh Rippe	Date	30/03/2021
Departmental Stakeholder	Edwin James Birch	Date	30/05/2022

