

## Appendix A – Bishopsford Bridge construction award

1. A Selection Questionnaire (SQ) was published on the London Tenders Portal on 24 June 2020 with a return deadline of 31 July. In addition to the standard questions about financial standing, insurances, etc., the SQ included a number of project-specific questions regarding bidders experience of managing similar projects.
2. Six potential providers submitted completed SQs and were evaluated on the basis of the below criteria.
3. The six contractors that responded to the SQ are:
  - Bidder A
  - Bidder B
  - Bidder C
  - Bidder D
  - Bidder E
  - Bidder F

The names of the six bidders are listed in Exempt Appendix B.

**Table 1 – Summary of the Selection Questionnaire**

section	criteria	weighting
1	Supplier Information	N/A
2	Grounds for mandatory exclusion (Reg.57(1) &(2)	Pass/Fail
3	Grounds for discretionary exclusion (Reg.57(8)	Pass/Fail
4	Economic and Financial Standing (Annual Turnover)	Pass/Fail
5	Accounts Details (For information)	N/A
6.1	Technical and Professional Ability – provide details of three relevant contract examples	N/A
6.2	Sub contractor and supply chain management	5%
7	Modern Slavery-	Yes/No
8.1	Insurance Levels	Yes/No
8.2	Construction experience (i) Relevant bridge projects (ii) Methodology, risk management, quality assurance. If applicable also approach to piling	(i) 15% (ii) 15%
8.3	Construction techniques (a) Temporary works (b) Environment Agency approvals / Flood Risk Activity Permit	(a) 20% (b) 20%

8.4	Health and safety in construction	10%
8.5	Commercial aspects (a) Managing client financial risk and contract cost variations (b) Approach to information management between on site and designers to manage risk	(a) 5% (b) 5%
8.6	Approach to post contract value engineering and collaborative working	5%

4. Contractors who fail the pass/fail section could not proceed to the next stage (ITT)
5. Evaluation of the technical abilities of the contractors was based on the value and type of contract experience submitted and financial turnover of £6m pa was required. Failure to meet these requirement resulted in exclusion.
6. The SQ quality questions and scoring criteria used in the evaluation are set out in Table 2 below.

**Table 2 – SQ quality questions and scoring criteria**

	<b>Technical and professional ability</b>	
6.2	Where you intend to sub-contract a proportion of the contract, please demonstrate how you have previously maintained healthy supply chains with your sub-contractor(s)	Total of 4 marks available (weighting 5%)
<b>8.2</b>	<b>Construction experience.</b>	
a.	i) Please provide details of relevant bridge projects over watercourses. Location, setting and project details to be provided. Non watercourse projects will be accepted but scored according to relevance and content. Please see part A 4.2 for description.	4 marks available for each project, total of 20 marks, 15% weighting
	Example 1	
	Example 2	
	Example 3	
	Example 4	
	Example 5	
	ii) Provide details of how you approached each project, your approach to methodology, risk management and quality assurance. If applicable, also include details of your approach to piling (sheet and CFA).	ii) 4 marks for each project, total of 20 marks, 15% weighting
	Example 1	
	Example 2	
	Example 3	

	Example 4	
	Example 5	
<b>8.3</b>	<b>Construction Techniques</b>	
a.	Temporary Works; provide details (no more than 400 words) of your organisation's recent experience in the last 3 years, in successfully designing, implementing and managing structural temporary works in/around an existing sensitive watercourse. Provide details of any issues encountered, and how you may have taken steps to manage risk within these works.	a total of 4 marks available (Weighting 20%)
b.	Environment Agency Approvals; provide details as to your organisation's recent experience (in the last 3 years) in of successfully applying for Environment Agency Flood Risk Activity Permits. Describe your approach to submissions, approvals, and outline any compliance issues you may have had in the last three years, and how these were resolved (if applicable).	- a total of 4 marks available (weighting 20%)
<b>8.4</b>	<b>Health and Safety</b>	
a.	Please provide details of your approach to ensure that you complied in full with all applicable health and safety requirements.	a total of 4 marks available (10% weighting)
<b>8.5</b>	<b>Approach to Commercial Aspects</b>	
a.	Please describe your experience of managing the Clients financial risk, and to managing contract cost variations.	- a total of 4 marks available (5% available)
b.	Please provide details of your historic approach to information management, including the use of IRS schedules, and collaboration between supply chain and design team so as to assist with mitigating unexpected issues on site.	a total of 4 marks available (5% available)
<b>8.6</b>		
a.	Please provide details of your company's previous approach towards post contract value engineering, and collaborative working arrangements. 500 words.	a total of 4 marks available (5% available)

**Table 3 - scoring**

<b>Score</b>	<b>Performance</b>
0	<b>Completely unsatisfactory/unacceptable response</b> No response to the question or serious deficiencies in being able to demonstrate past experience of delivering a highways works and service contract.
1	<b>Poor response</b> The response significantly fails to demonstrate the bidder's past experience of delivering all elements of a highways works and service contract.
2	<b>Partially Compliant response</b> The response partially demonstrates the bidder's past experience of delivering elements of a highways works and service contract but not all elements.
3	<b>Acceptable response</b> The response demonstrates the bidder's past experience of delivering all elements of a highways works and service contract. Any concerns are only of a minor nature.
4	<b>Good response</b> The response fully and clearly demonstrates the bidder's past experience of delivering all elements of a highways works and service contract to a high standard.

**SQ Selection Outcome –**

7. After evaluation and moderation of the SQ submission five of the six bidders passed to the ITT stage:
  - a. All six bidders passed all of the Pass / Fail questions
  - b. One bidder scored the lowest marks in the SQ quality criteria so did not pass to the ITT stage.

**Table 4 – summary of SQ selection outcome**

Name	SQ total weighted score	Progress to ITT stage	Outcome
Bidder A	81%	Yes	Selected to progress to ITT
Bidder B	71%	No	Scored lowest on the combined scores so did not pass to ITT
Bidder C	93%	Yes	Selected to progress to ITT
Bidder D	93%	Yes	Selected to progress to ITT
Bidder E	75%	Yes	Selected to progress to ITT
Bidder F	73%	Yes	Selected to progress to ITT

Invitation to Tender

8. The Invitation to Tender Stage (ITT) published on 28<sup>th</sup> August 2020 with a return deadline of 25<sup>th</sup> September 2020. Extensions were given until 8<sup>th</sup> October 2020
9. As Bidder B failed the SQ, the ITT was sent to the successful bidders A and C-F. All five bidders submitted a bid.
10. The award criteria within the ITT was split at 70% price and 30% quality. Weighting is set out in table 5 below and Table 6 contains the information on how criteria were evaluated.

**Table 5 – assessment of the ITT**

Criteria	Sub-criteria	Weighting	Sub-criteria weighting
<b>Technical and quality</b>		<b>30%</b>	
Methodology	Provide a detailed method statement, demonstrating how you will undertake the works sequence for this specific project safely, effectively, and with full regard to working around and over the watercourse, near trees, and around live services which are to be reintegrated in to the new structure. Specific reference should be made on ecology risk management and approach to FRAP processes. (1000 words).		50%
Programming	Provide a detailed GANTT programme, showing sequence of works and key milestones in the construction process. Alongside this, provide a narrative as to how		30%

	you will control programme and time risk (both client and contractor risks) and what processes you would put in place to do this. (500 words)		
Site management and controls	Provide details of your proposed site and contracts team, including relevant experience. Further, provide information as to how you will control flood risk and the issues raised in the appended WFD screening assessment and the Construction and Environmental management plan. (500 words)		15%
Social inclusion and engagement	The Council has identified opportunities for social value and engagement as part of this project, these being: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- Facilitation of public information sessions before and during the works.</li> <li>- Undertake a time lapse recording for educational purposes.</li> <li>- Facilitate a limited number of school pupil site visits as an educational opportunity around construction and the built environment.</li> <li>- Keep a regular site information board updated each week.</li> <li>- Sign up to the considerate contractors scheme.</li> </ul> Please provide a statement as to how you would implement these measures.		5%
<b>Price</b>		<b>70%</b>	
	Total price		100%

**Table 6 – evaluation of the ITT**

<b>Score</b>	<b>Performance</b>
0	<b>Completely unsatisfactory/unacceptable response</b> No response to the question or serious deficiencies in meeting the required standards set out in the contract documents.
1	<b>Poor response</b> The response significantly fails to meet the required standards set out in the contract documents, contains significant shortcomings or is inconsistent with other proposals.
2	<b>Partially Compliant response</b> The response is partially compliant with some shortcomings in meeting the required standards set out in the contract documents.

3	<p><b>Acceptable response</b></p> <p>The response is compliant and meets the basic contract standards set out in the contract documents. Any concerns are only of a minor nature.</p>
4	<p><b>Good response</b></p> <p>The response is fully compliant and clearly indicates a full understanding of the contract documents so as to consistently deliver the service in line with all the required standards.</p>

Below is a breakdown of each bidders quality and price score. Bidder B were not invited to tender as they were the lowest scoring bidder at the SQ stage.

**Table 7: Quality and Price score breakdown:**

	Technical and quality (total of 30%) – moderated scores	Price (70%)	TOTAL SCORE
	<b>Overall weighted quality score (Min 15%; max 30%)</b>	<b>Price: (sub-criteria weighting: 100%)</b>	
<b>Bidder A:</b>	19.1%	£1,509,891  Moderated price score of 56.9%	76%
<b>Bidder C:</b>	15.4%	£1,233,087  Moderated price score of 69.6%	85%
<b>Bidder D:</b>	30%	£1,530,879  Moderated price score of 56.1%	86.1%
<b>Bidder E:</b>	14.6% (fails to meet min 15% quality score)	£1,226,593  Moderated price score of 70%	0%
<b>Bidder F:</b>	23.6%	£1,497,170  Moderated price score of 57.3%	81%