

BIRMINGHAM CITY COUNCIL

CABINET MEMBER

WEDNESDAY, 03 JULY 2024 AT 00:00 HOURS
IN CABINET MEMBERS OFFICE, COUNCIL HOUSE, VICTORIA
SQUARE, BIRMINGHAM, B1 1BB

A G E N D A

3 - 22

- 1 **FULL BUSINESS CASE AND CONTRACT AWARD - NEW BUILD**
EXTENSION AT SELLY OAK TRUST SCHOOL

Report of Director for Children & Families

Birmingham City Council

Report to Cabinet Member



03 July 2024

Title: FULL BUSINESS CASE AND CONTRACT AWARD –
NEW BUILD EXTENSION AT SELLY OAK TRUST
SCHOOL

Lead Cabinet Portfolio: Councillor Mick Brown, Cabinet Member for Children,
Young People & Families

Relevant Overview and Scrutiny Committee: Councillor Kerry Jenkins, Education, Children & Young
People

Report Author: Zahid Mahmood, Interim Head of Service
Education Infrastructure
Phone Number 0121 464 9855
zahid.mahmood@birmingham.gov.uk

Authorised by: Dr Sue Harrison, Strategic Director of Children &
Families
Children and Families Directorate

Is this a Key Decision? No

**If this is a Key Decision,
is this decision listed on
the Forward Plan?** No

**Reason(s) why not
included on the Forward
Plan:** If yes, list reason(s). If no, insert 'Not Applicable'.
Not Applicable

Is this a Late Report? No
Reason(s) why Late: Not Applicable

**Is this decision eligible
for 'call in?'** Yes

If not eligible, please provide reason(s):

Not Applicable

Wards:

Bournville & Cotteridge

Does this report contain exempt or confidential information?

No

Has this decision been included on the Notification of Intention to consider Matters in Private?

No

Reasons why not included on the Notification:

Not Applicable

1 EXECUTIVE SUMMARY

- 1.1 To seek approval for the project costs for the design services for the capital scheme for the build of the extension to Selly Oak Trust School and to award the contract for the Pre-Construction Services Agreement (PCSA) period to commence. The project costs for this stage of the scheme are up to £737,850.

2 COMMISSIONERS' REVIEW

- 2.1 This report has been approved by Commissioners with no comments.

3 RECOMMENDATIONS

That the Cabinet Member for Children Young People and Families:

- 3.1 Approve the project costs for the design services to complete the PCSA stage for the extension at Selly Oak Trust School at a cost of up to £737,850.
- 3.2 Approves the Full Business Case appended to this report.
- 3.3 Approves the award of a contract to enter into a PCSA for the extension at Selly Oak Trust School to Morgan Sindall Construction & Infrastructure Ltd commencing in May 2024 for the estimated value of £397,644 plus an allowance of £40,000 for surveys and £10,000 for Planning and Building Regulations compliance.
- 3.4 Notes the award of the main works contract will be reported to Cabinet following successful completion of the PCSA services, subject to the cost, inclusive of fees, being within the approved value.
- 3.5 Authorises the Interim City Solicitor and Monitoring Officer to execute and complete all necessary legal documents to give effect to the above recommendation.

4 KEY INFORMATION

Context

- 4.1 The Local Authority has a statutory duty to ensure there are sufficient pupil places, secure diversity in the provision of schools and increase opportunities for parental choice through planning and securing additional provision (Section 14, Education Act 1996).
- 4.2 The Schools Capital Programme – School Condition Allocation & High Needs Allocation 2024-25 + Future Years report to Cabinet dated 19th March 2024 approved the procurement strategy of using the Constructing West Midlands 2 Framework Agreement for the Basic Need and Schools' Condition Allocation schemes above the procurement governance threshold of £0.250m (ex VAT) and delegated the award of contracts to the Cabinet Member for Children, Young People & Families in consultation with the Strategic Director for Children and Families.

- 4.3 The works comprise of the demolition and removal of existing modular teaching and changing room blocks which are no longer fit for purpose, and the construction of a new 2 storey extension to the existing school building with internal alterations. The extension will include general and specialist teaching space, pupil and staff changing facilities, toilets and ancillary, staff and administration space.
- 4.4 The PCSA period is where the detailed design for the works is completed. Following successful completion of the detailed design, it is programmed for the works to commence in January 2025. This is subject to recommendation 2.4, with the construction work to be carried out for a period of 60 weeks. To minimise disruption to the education of the pupils, some of the work will be carried out in the evenings, weekends and school shut down periods with a project completion programmed for March 2026.

Proposal and Reasons for Recommendations

- 4.5 The recommended option is for the project costs to be approved and the award of a contract for the PCSA period to commence to enable the school to ensure that children and young people have a suitable and safe space to learn, grow and develop.

Other Options Considered

- 4.6 There are no other options but to carry out the work as otherwise it would mean the City Council would fail to meet its statutory obligation to provide sufficient school places at Selly Oak Trust School.

5 RISK MANAGEMENT

- 5.1 Risks to design stage have been considered as part of the process. The risk of the PCSA not being completed in time will cause delays to the commencement of the overall project. A contingency sum of £40,000 for survey costs and £10,000 for Planning and Building Regulation compliance has been allocated to the project. This contingency sum has been included in the project costs for the design stage.
- 5.2 There are unknowns with the site and a requirement to obtain Planning and Building approval. Any risks from any issues arising will be mitigated by robust surveys being carried out during the PCSA period to inform the detailed design for the works required to be delivered.

6 CONSULTATION

- 6.1 The Head Teacher and governors of Selly Oak Trust School have been consulted and are fully supportive of the building extension scheme.

7 MEMBER ENGAGEMENT

Ward Councillor(s)

7.1 The Ward Members for Bournville & Cotteridge have been consulted in relation to the proposals via email and are supportive with the project progressing for decision.

Other

7.2 Not Applicable.

8 IMPACT AND IMPLICATIONS

Finance

8.1 The project costs totalling up to £737,850 will be funded from the High Needs Grant (HNG). This is inclusive of £268,715 for Acivico Ltd's professional fees and £21,491 of EDI capitalisation fees.

8.2 The cost for the PCSA period is £397,644 plus £50,000 for any planning and survey costs.

8.3 This report proposes the use of ringfenced DfE High Needs Allocation Grant and does not seek approval for the use of any corporate capital resources. Spend Control Board approval was granted on xx for the project costs of £737,850.

8.4 The Council has a good record of delivering these school capital projects within budget and to timescales.

Legal

8.5 This report facilitates the discharge of functions contained within section 22 of the School Standards and Framework Act 1998 whereby the local authority has a duty to maintain its schools; this includes expenses relating to premises.

8.6 The Local Authority has a statutory duty, by virtue of section 542 of the Education Act 1996 and the School Premises (England) Regulations 2012, to ensure that maintained school buildings are maintained to a standard such that, so far as is reasonably practicable, the health, safety and welfare of pupils are ensured.

8.7 Under Section 1 of the Localism Act 2011, the Council has the power to enter into the arrangements set out in this report, which are within the remit and limits of the general power of competence in Sections 2 and 4 of the Localism Act 2011. Any and all legal powers under the Council's Constitution and Procurement and Contract Governance Rules will be upheld when contracting with and or agreeing contracts with third parties.

Equalities

8.8 The Council must have regard to the need to advance equality of opportunity between persons who share a relevant protected characteristic and persons who do not share it and to foster good relations between persons who share a relevant protected characteristic and persons who do not share it. On review, no negative

impact on people with Protected Characteristics was identified. It was concluded that having the proposed safe, accessible building and classroom space at Selly Oak Trust School would support the Council's performance of its Equality Act duties.

Procurement

- 8.9 The procurement implications are for the award of a contract for a PCSA for the extension to Selly Oak Trust School following a further competition exercise using Acivico Ltd's Constructing West Midlands 2 Framework Agreement and are detailed in Appendix 2.

People Services

- 8.10 There are no staffing implications.

Corporate Parenting

- 8.11 There are no direct implications or opportunities in relation to the Corporate Parenting responsibility arising from the recommendations in this report.

Other

- 8.12 There are no other implications arising from the recommendations in this report.

9 APPENDICES

- 9.1 Appendix 1 – Selly Oak Trust School - Full Business Case
9.2 Appendix 2 – Selly Oak Trust School - Procurement Methodology

10 BACKGROUND PAPERS

- 10.1 [Schools' Capital Programme 2024/25 approved by Cabinet on 19th March 2024](#)

FULL BUSINESS CASE (FBC)

A. GENERAL INFORMATION

A1. General

| | | | |
|---|--|---|-----------------------|
| Project Title <i>(as per Voyager)</i> | SELLY OAK TRUST SCHOOL – NEW BUILD EXTENSION – FULL BUSINESS CASE | | |
| Oracle code | | | |
| Portfolio /Committee | Children Young People and Families | Directorate | Children and Families |
| Approved by Project Sponsor | Zahid Mahmood | Approved by Finance Business Partner | Paul Durrant |

A2. Outline Business Case approval *(Date and approving body)*

Schools Capital Programme – School Condition Allocation, High Needs Allocation, Basic Need Allocation 2024-25+ Future Years Cabinet Report.

A3. Project Description

These works are for the detailed design services to build an extension at Selly Oak Trust school for additional classroom space and to replace existing teaching accommodation that is no longer fit for purpose.

A4. Scope

This Business Case is to seek approval for the project costs for the design services for the capital scheme for the extension works at Selly Oak Trust School and to award the contract for the Pre-Construction Services Agreement (PCSA) period to commence.

A5. Scope exclusions

No works outside this scope will be undertaken

B. STRATEGIC CASE

This sets out the case for change and the project's fit to the Council Plan objectives

B1. Project objectives and outcomes

The case for change including the contribution to Council Plan objectives and outcomes

- A Bold Prosperous Birmingham
- A Bold Inclusive Birmingham
- A Bold Safe Birmingham
- A Bold Healthy Birmingham
- A Bold Green Birmingham

The extension works at Selly Oak Trust meets the Council Plan objectives by ensuring that children and young people have a suitable and safe space to learn, grow and develop in so their full potential can be achieved.

B2. Project Deliverables

These are the outputs from the project e.g. a new building with xm2 of internal space, xm of new road, etc

The scope of works includes the following:

- Design services for the capital extension scheme.
- Demolition and removal of existing modular buildings.
- Construction of new two-storey extension.

| B3. Project Benefits | |
|--|--|
| <i>These are the social benefits and outcomes from the project, e.g. additional school places or economic benefits.</i> | |
| Measure | Impact |
| <i>List at least one measure associated with each of the objectives and outcomes in B1 above</i> | <i>What the estimated impact of the project will be on the measure identified – please quantify where practicable (e.g. for economic and transportation benefits)</i> |
| To enable the additional uptake of pupils at Selly Oak Trust School. | Completing the extension works will provide suitable space for learning and development for additional pupils at Selly Oak Trust School and it enables the Council to meet its statutory obligations for to provide sufficient pupil places. |
| Support and enrich learning opportunities for children and young people. | On completion of the programme of works, pupils will have a fully functional safe, warm and dry environment before, during and after school hours. |
| B4. Benefits Realisation Plan | |
| <i>Set out here how you will ensure the planned benefits will be delivered</i> | |
| The extension works will ensure that Selly Oak Trust school will provide suitable space for learning and development to for additional pupils at Selly Oak Trust School and it enables the Council to meet its statutory obligations for to provide sufficient pupil places. | |
| B5. Stakeholders | |
| A stakeholder analysis is set out at G4 below. | |
| C. ECONOMIC CASE AND OPTIONS APPRAISAL | |
| <i>This sets out the options that have been considered to determine the best value for money in achieving the Council's priorities</i> | |
| C1. Summary of options reviewed at Outline Business Case | |
| <i>(including reasons for the preferred option which has been developed to FBC) If options have been further developed since the OBC, provide the updated Price quality matrix and recommended option with reasons.</i> | |
| <ul style="list-style-type: none"> The recommended option is for the project costs to be approved and the award of a contract to enable the school to ensure that children and young people have a suitable and safe space to learn, grow and develop. | |
| C2. Evaluation of key risks and issues | |
| <i>The full risks and issues register is included at the end of this FBC</i> | |
| <p>Approval to engage in a PCSA with the contractor will allow for early input into the design and will ensure we keep on track for overall programme for delivering the main works. Risks to design stage have been considered as part of the process. A contingency sum of £50,000 for planning and survey costs has been allocated to the project. This contingency sum has been included in the project costs for the design stage.</p> <p>There are unknowns with the site and a requirement to obtain Planning and Building approval. Any risks from any issues arising will be mitigated by robust surveys being carried out during the PCSA period to inform the detailed design for the works required to be delivered.</p> | |
| C3. Other impacts of the preferred option | |

| |
|--|
| <i>Describe other significant impacts, both positive and negative</i> |
| D. COMMERCIAL CASE |
| <i>This considers whether realistic and commercial arrangements for the project can be made</i> |
| D1. Partnership, Joint venture and accountable body working. |
| <i>Describe how the project will be controlled, managed and delivered if using these arrangements</i> |
| <p>Scheme will be delivered as follows:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Client for the project is Birmingham City Council. • Project Management services will be provided and carried out by Acivico Ltd. • The end user is Selly Oak Trust School. • Regular 2 – 4 weekly meetings will be held with the project team, including client and the end user. • Programme will be monitored and developed to ensure that required timescales are achieved. • Scheme costs are to be continually assessed, developed and monitored. |
| D2. Procurement implications and Contract Strategy: |
| <i>What is the proposed procurement contract strategy and route? Which Framework, or OJEU? This should generally discharge the requirement to approve a Contract Strategy (with a recommendation in the report).</i> |
| <p>The procurement route is to carry out a further competition exercise using the Constructing West Midlands 2 Capital Works Framework Agreement.</p> |
| D3. Staffing and TUPE implications: |
| <p>None</p> |

APPENDIX 1

| Capital Costs & Funding | Financial Year | Totals |
|---|-----------------|-----------------|
| | 2024/25 | |
| Expenditure | | |
| Selly Oak Trust School | | |
| Construction costs, incl. Surveys, Investigations, & Statutory Fees and contingency | £447,644 | £447,644 |
| Acivico Fees | £268,715 | £268,715 |
| EDI Capitalisation | £21,491 | £21,491 |
| Total Project Cost Excluding VAT | £737,850 | £737,850 |
| | | |
| Funding sources | | |
| High Needs Grant (HNG) | £737,850 | £737,850 |
| | | |
| Totals | £737,850 | £737,850 |
| | | |

| |
|--|
| E2. Evaluation and comment on financial implications: |
| The current costs for the project are based on the tender report dated 15 th April 2024 provided by Acivico Ltd QS. |
| E3. Approach to optimism bias and provision of contingency |
| An allowance of £40,000 for surveys and £10,000 for Planning and Building Regulations compliance. |
| E4. Taxation |
| <i>Describe any tax implications and how they will be managed, including VAT</i> |
| N/A |

| F. PROJECT MANAGEMENT CASE | |
|---|--|
| <i>This considers how project delivery plans are robust and realistic</i> | |
| F1. Key Project Milestones | Planned Delivery Dates |
| <i>The summary Project Plan and milestones is attached at G1 below</i> | |
| Cabinet Member Approval | May 2024 |
| Delegated Authority Approval to Award Phase 2 | Early July 2024 |
| Main Construction works | January 2025 – March 2026 |
| Practical completion | March 2026 |
| F2. Achievability | |
| <i>Describe how the project can be delivered given the organisational skills and capacity available</i> | |
| <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Scope of work identified as in the project description. • Extensive site investigation carried out. • Project programme and costs have been developed. • Funding is in place. • Contractor has considerable previous experience. • Similar projects have been delivered on budget and to time by the project team. | |
| F3. Dependencies on other projects or activities | |
| <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Landlord Approval has been granted for the project. | |
| F4. Officer support | |
| Project Manager: | Baljeet Uppal Interim Capital Programme Manager 07730 281 356 Baljeet.Uppal@birmingham.gov.uk |
| Project Accountant: | Jaspal Madahar Finance & Resources Manager 07766922478 jaspal.madahar@birmingham.gov.uk |
| Project Sponsor: | Zahid Mahmood Interim Head of Service, Education Infrastructure 07860906126 zahid.mahmood@birmingham.gov.uk |
| F5. Project Management | |
| <i>Describe how the project will be managed, including the responsible Project Board and who its members are</i> | |
| See D1 | |

G. SUPPORTING INFORMATION

(Please adapt or replace the formats as appropriate to the project)

| G1. PROJECT PLAN |
|---|
| <i>Detailed Project Plan supporting the key milestones in section F1 above</i> |
| <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. Cabinet Member Approval – May 2024 2. Completion of PCSA – December 2024 3. Delegated award of Phase 2 contract – early July 2024 4. Start on site – January 2025 5. Completion – March 2026 |

| G2. SUMMARY OF RISKS AND ISSUES REGISTER | | | |
|--|---|------------------------|--------------|
| <i>Risks should include Optimism Bias, and risks during the development to FBC</i> | | | |
| <i>Grading of severity and likelihood: High – Significant – Medium – Low</i> | | | |
| Risk or issue | Mitigation | Risk after mitigation: | |
| | | Severity | Likelihood |
| Condition of the site is not clear | Detailed surveys are to be carried out as part of the pre-construction to establish the site conditions. | High | Medium / low |
| Building costs escalate | A fixed priced contract programme will be provided by the contractor which will be closely managed and monitored by the Project Team. | Low | Medium |
| Building works fall behind | A detailed construction programme will be provided by the contractor which will be closely managed and monitored by the Project Team. | Medium | Medium |
| BCC faced with increasing revenue costs | Consequential revenue costs arising including additional staffing, utility costs and any on-going day to day repair and maintenance of the asset will be the responsibility of the school. Any increase in revenue costs will be offset by an increase in income through increased pupil numbers provided by the DfE. | Low | Low |

| G3. EXTERNAL FUNDING AND OTHER FINANCIAL DETAILS |
|--|
| <i>Description of external funding arrangements and conditions, and other financial details supporting the financial implications in section E1 above (if appropriate)</i> |
| N/A |

G4. STAKEHOLDER ANALYSIS

| Stakeholder | Stake in project | Potential impact on project | What does the project expect from stakeholder | Perceived attitudes and/or risks | Stakeholder management strategy | Responsibility |
|-------------------------------------|--|-----------------------------|---|---|--|--|
| Cabinet Members for ES&C and F&R | Strategic Overview of DGCF expenditure | High | Approval of Cabinet Member report and expenditure for project. | Strategy not approved | Early Consultation and Regular Briefing on all aspects of Basic Need | BCC / EDI |
| EDI's Consultant Partners (Acivico) | Design and Delivery | High | To support delivery and programme management. | Unable to design to budget Unable to deliver to timescales | Close working with other stakeholders Regular feedback | BCC/EDI /Acivico |
| School Leadership Team / Governors | Governing Body Agreement and End Users | High | Compliance with GBA Ongoing Revenue costs for R&M once works complete | N/A | Governing Body Agreement signed and regular project meetings | School Leadership Team/Academy Trust/ Governing Body EDI Project Officer |
| Pupils | End user | Low | Consultation | Nil | Through school's council | School Leadership Team |

G5. BENEFITS REGISTER

For major projects and programmes over £20m, this sets out in more detail the planned benefits. Benefits should be monetised where it is proportionate and possible to do so, to support the calculation of a BCR and NPSV (please adapt this template as appropriate)

| Measure | Annual value | Start date | Impact |
|---|--------------|------------|---|
| <i>List at least one measure associated with each of the outcomes in B1 above</i> | | | <i>What the estimated impact of the project will be on the measure identified</i> |
| (A) Monetised benefits: | £ | | |
| | | | |
| (B) Other quantified benefits: | | | |
| | | | |
| | | | |
| (C) Non-quantified benefits: | n/a | | |
| | | | |
| | | | |

| | |
|---|--|
| Other Attachments <i>provide as appropriate</i> | |
| • | |

PROCUREMENT METHODOLOGY

1 **Procurement Approach**

1.1 Procurement Options

- Tender for a Council only contract – this option was discounted on the basis that the CWM2 Framework Agreement is the Council's preferred route for construction works of this type and no additional benefit would be realised from carrying out a tender process advertised to the open market.
- Use a collaborative framework agreement - The Council's primary procurement route for capital works of this nature is to use Acivico DCFM Limited's Constructing West Midlands 2 Framework Agreement as approved in the Schools' Capital Programme – School Condition Allocation, High Needs Allocation, Basic Need Allocation 2024-25+ Future Years report to Cabinet dated 19th March 2024 either by undertaking a further competition exercise (this being the default route) or a direct award, subject to the complexities and timescales of each project in order to ensure that the Council's statutory duties are met.

This framework agreement is compliant with the Public Contracts Regulations 2015 (PCR15) and is suitable for use for a project of this nature therefore no other procurement route was considered.

1.2 Constructing West Midlands 2 Capital Works Framework Agreement

1.2.1 Award Mechanism

A further competition exercise was undertaken for this contract to demonstrate value for money to the Council using Lot 2 – projects above £5m.

1.2.2 Procurement Process

The first stage is competitive, with the successful tenderer being selected on the basis of their ability and understanding of the project for works, together with the pricing of those elements of the works which are normally under the control of the main contractor, e.g. preliminaries, overheads & profit, programme period, cost of rates for identifiable sections of work. This will be documented in a PCSA subject to approval of recommendation 2.3.

During the second stage, the Council's design team develops and completes the design in conjunction with the successful tenderer. The successful tenderer undertakes a compliant procurement process for the various work packages that are reviewed by the Council's technical cost control advisor to ensure that prices are reflective of current market conditions, are within budget and deliver Best

Value. Once the overall tender price is confirmed for the works, the Council will enter into the main works contract subject to authorisation.

1.3 Further Competition Assessment

1.2.1 The quality and price weightings below were established in line with the requirements of the framework agreement. The criteria used was 40% quality, 20% social value and 40% price.

1.2.2 The evaluation criteria used is as follows:

Initial Assessment (Pass / Fail)

| GENERAL INFORMATION | Scoring Assessment |
|--------------------------------|--------------------|
| Potential Supplier Information | Information only |
| Declaration | Pass / Fail |
| Payment by BACS | Information only |

Tenderers had to pass the above to proceed to the Quality Assessment.

Quality Assessment

| CRITERIA (40% WEIGHTING) | SUB-WEIGHTING |
|----------------------------|---------------|
| Methodology and Delivery | 40% |
| Programme Management | 40% |
| Organisation and Resources | 20% |
| TOTAL | 100% |

Social Value Assessment

| | Sub-Weighting | Sub-Criteria | Theme Sub-Weighting |
|----------------------|---------------|--|--------------------------------------|
| Qualitative | 5% | Local Employment | 30% |
| | | Buy Local | 10% |
| | | Partners in Communities | 25% |
| | | Good Employer | 15% |
| | | Green and Sustainable | 10% |
| | | Ethical Procurement | 10% |
| | | TOTAL | 100% |
| Quantitative | 15% | BBC4SR Action Plan sub-weighted as above | Total of financial proxies (£) score |
| | | | TOTAL 100% |
| Overall Social Value | 20% | | |

Price Assessment

The pricing assessment accounted for 40% of the overall weighting. Tenderers were asked to submit total costs for the works.

Combined Quality and Price Assessment

The Weighted Quality, Social Value and Price Score for each tenderer were added to produce an overall combined total score. The scores for each tenderer were compared and (subject to a final risk assessment) the potential suppliers with the highest score offering the most economically advantageous bid recommended for acceptance.

1.4 Invitation to Tender (ITT) Stage

1.4.1 Tender documentation was issued to the four framework providers; Galliford Try Construction Ltd, ISG Construction Ltd, Morgan Sindall Construction & Infrastructure Ltd and Willmott Dixon Construction Ltd on 17th October 2023 with a return deadline on 1st December 2023.

1.4.2 Questions were raised by tenderers during the tender period and these were addressed by issuing clarifications to all tenderers and requesting these were incorporated into their submission.

1.4.3 Three tender responses were received by the deadline; from Galliford Try Construction Ltd, Morgan Sindall Construction & Infrastructure Ltd and Willmott Dixon Construction Ltd.

1.5 Evaluation and Selection Summary

1.5.1 The evaluation was carried out in accordance with the details published in the tender documentation issued to all suppliers, and outlined that tenders received would be evaluated using a split of 40% quality, 20% social value and 40% price.

1.5.2 The evaluation of tenders was carried out by representatives from Education Infrastructure and Acivico Ltd, supported by Corporate Procurement Services.

1.5.3 All tenderers passed the General Information stage and proceeded to the next stage.

1.5.4 Quality Evaluation (40% Weighting)

The results of the quality evaluation are shown below:

| Company | Galliford | Morgan Sindall | Willmott Dixon |
|-------------------------|------------------|-----------------------|-----------------------|
| Quality Score (Max 100) | 80.00 | 64.80 | 72.80 |
| Weighted Score (Max 40) | 40.00 | 32.40 | 36.40 |
| Rank | 1 | 3 | 2 |

There were no issues arising with the quality evaluation.

1.5.5 Social Value Evaluation (20% Weighting)

The results of the social value evaluation are shown below:

| Company | Galliford | Morgan Sindall | Willmott Dixon |
|-----------------------------|------------------|-----------------------|-----------------------|
| Qualitative | | | |
| Score (Max 100) | 98.00 | 92.00 | 86.00 |
| Weighted Score (Max 5) | 5.00 | 4.69 | 4.39 |
| Quantitative | | | |
| Financial Proxy | £1,467,898.26 | £3,323,572.38 | £1,257,614.65 |
| Weighted Score (Max 15) | 6.62 | 15.00 | 5.68 |
| Overall Social Value | | | |
| Total (Max 20) | 11.62 | 19.69 | 10.07 |
| Rank | 2 | 1 | 3 |

A clarification was issued on the tenderers' proposed number of full time employees engaged on the contract for longer than 12 months. All tenderers responded with a satisfactory response in accordance with the requirement and the proxy figures are reflective of the final number after the clarification.

1.5.6 Price Evaluation (40% Weighting)

| Company | Morgan Sindall | Willmott Dixon |
|-------------------------|-----------------------|-----------------------|
| Price | £10,088,667 | £10,234,458 |
| Weighted Score (Max 40) | 40.00 | 39.43 |
| Rank | 1 | 2 |

It should be noted that Morgan Sindall Construction & Infrastructure Ltd submitted pricing for both a compliant and an alternative solution. The alternative solution was not evaluated as variant bids are not permitted as stated in the tender documentation.

After completion of the evaluation, Galliford Try Ltd advised there was an error in their pricing which was not sustainable and withdrew their tender offer.

The forecast net build cost of £7,820,000 has been estimated by Acivico and the basis of the pricing is that construction related preliminaries, overheads & profit and fee percentages are added by the tenderer(s) based on their framework rates to arrive the tender price and an indicative value for the purposes of evaluation. It should be noted the PCSA cost of £397,644 is contained within the above fee percentages.

1.5.7 Combined Quality / Social Value / Price Assessment

| Company | Morgan Sindall | Willmott Dixon |
|------------------------------|---------------------------|---------------------------|
| Quality | 32.40 | 36.40 |
| Social Value Qualitative | 4.69 | 4.39 |
| Social Value Quantitative | 15.00 | 5.68 |
| Price | 40.00 | 39.43 |
| TOTAL | 92.09 | 85.90 |
| Rank | 1 | 2 |

1.5.8 Recommendation

It is recommended that the contract be awarded to Morgan Sindall Construction & Infrastructure Ltd on the basis of being the first ranked tenderer after the quality / social value / price evaluation.

1.6 Service Delivery Management

1.6.1 Contract Management

The contract will be managed operationally by the Project Manager from Acivico Ltd reporting to the Principal Officer, Education Infrastructure – Capital Projects Team.

1.6.2 Performance Management

Formal contract management measures will be included as a requirement of the contract including key performance indicators around service levels.

