

## Tender Evaluation Summary

- 1 The main construction works were procured through the Highways and Infrastructure Works Framework Agreement following the protocol using Lot 4 for work above £500,000+, approved by the former Cabinet Member for Commissioning, Contracting and Improvement jointly with the Deputy Chief Executive on the 21<sup>st</sup> August 2014. The process to identify a preferred Contractor was as follows:
  - An Expression of Interest to Tender for SONR 1B letter was produced and issued, to the 6 Framework Contractors on 13<sup>th</sup> July 2016 and 5 Contractors were expressed the interest to tender for this scheme.
  - Tenders were invited from these 5 Contractors on 10<sup>th</sup> August 2016 and 2 Contractors withdrew during the tender period.
  - During the tender period mid tender interviews were held with the 3 Contractors to clarify the Councils requirements but also to answer any queries from tenderers. Responses to questions of a non-specific nature were shared with all other Contractors. Tenders were returned on 26<sup>th</sup> October 2016.
  - The tendered prices were higher than the pre tender estimate. Meetings were held with the 3 contractors to discuss the submitted tender and to explore possible value engineering options.
  - No practical value engineering options were identified and it was accepted additional funding would have to be found to address the increase in the works cost.
  - Additional funds have been identified as set out in the Executive Report.
  - A revised tender was issued on 21<sup>st</sup> February 2017. The revised tender reflected the latest programme and included certain clarifications raised in the meetings with the contractors.
  - Revised tenders were returned on 13<sup>th</sup> March 2017
- 2 The evaluation was completed against the price (60%) / quality (30%) / social value (10%) model.
- 3 **Quality** – in order to evaluate the capability of contractors for this work, tenderers were required to demonstrate their capability by providing information on the following:
  - Traffic Management (25% sub weighting);
  - Risk Management and Allocation (20% sub weighting);
  - Design (30% sub weighting);
  - Organisation and Resources (5% sub weighting);
  - Stakeholder Engagement (20% sub weighting)

The quality evaluation scores are shown in the table below:

TENDERER	A	B	C
Quality Score (Max 500)	185.00	310.00	337.50
Weighted Quality Score (Max 30)	16.44	27.56	30.00
<b>QUALITY RANKING</b>	3	2	1

- 1 **Social Value** - Tenderers were asked to provide action they propose for this project if they were awarded this contract in relation to the following areas as part of the Social Value assessment:

- Local Employment (60% sub weighting);
- Partners in Communities (15% sub weighting);
- Good Employer (15% sub weighting);
- Green and Sustainable (10% sub weighting)

The social value evaluation scores are shown in the table below:

<b>TENDERER</b>	<b>A</b>	<b>B</b>	<b>C</b>
SV Score (Max 500)	400.00	315.00	400.00
Weighted SV Score (Max 10)	10.00	7.88	10.00
<b>SV RANKING</b>	1	3	1

- 2 **Price** – the price was evaluated as below:

- Advanced Works & Design Elements (45% sub weighting);
- Construction Elements & Risk Allowance (45% sub weighting);
- Compensation Event (10% sub weighting)

The price evaluation scores are shown in the table below

<b>TENDERER</b>	<b>A</b>	<b>B</b>	<b>C</b>
Advanced Works & Design Elements	£610,022.02	£474,320.12	£268,474.50
Weighted Score (Max 45)	19.80	25.47	45.00
Construction Elements & Risk Allowance	£7,622,809.31	£5,891,847.44	£4,421,208.15
Weighted Score (Max 45)	26.10	33.77	45.00
Compensation Event	£20,915.00	£11,672.57	£20,104.45
Weighted Score (Max 10)	5.58	10.00	5.81
<b>Total Weighted Score</b>	51.49	69.21	95.81
<b>Total Adjusted Score (Max 60)</b>	30.89	41.54	57.48
<b>PRICE RANKING</b>	3	2	1

- 3 **Overall Evaluation**

The overall evaluation scores are shown in the table below:

<b>TENDERER</b>	<b>A</b>	<b>B</b>	<b>C</b>
Weighted Quality Score (Max 30)	16.44	27.56	30.00
Weighted Social Value Score (Max 10)	10.00	7.88	10.00
Weighted Price Score (Max 60)	30.89	41.54	57.48

Total Weighted Score (Max 100)	57.33	76.98	97.48
<b>OVERALL RANKING</b>	<b>3</b>	<b>2</b>	<b>1</b>

#### 4 Recommendations

It is recommended that the contract be awarded to Tenderer C on the basis of being the first ranked supplier after the price, quality and social value evaluation.

#### 5 The contract will be managed by a representative nominated by the Head of Infrastructure Projects, Birmingham City Council.