



# Procurement Summary Report

## FURTHER COMPETITION UNDER EEM0067 FIRE & INTRUDER ALARMS AND FIRE PROTECTION EQUIPMENT FRAMEWORK SAFETY OF LIFE SYSTEMS SOUTH KESTEVEN DISTRICT COUNCIL

This report is commercially sensitive (under the Freedom of Information Act 2000 with 2012 updates) and is therefore intended for restricted circulation only. **The report should only be published with the consent of the Lead Council Officer, and after bidder's details and tender submission details (£) have been redacted;** due to the sensitive information it contains relating to the bidder's Tender submissions.

CONTRACT DETAILS	
<b>Lead Officer (Contracting Authority)</b>	Stewart Mason - Fire Compliance Officer
<b>Project ID</b>	DN734606
<b>FTS Reference</b>	N/A - Mini competition was used.
<b>Contract Dates</b>	<u>Start:</u> 01/11/2024 <u>End:</u> 31/10/2027 <u>Extension option:</u> 24 Months
<b>Length of Contract</b>	3 years with an option to extend for 2 years, making a total of 5 years.
<b>Procurement Value (£)</b>	The budget prior to going to market was in the region of £250,000 total.
<b>Type of Contract</b>	Services
<b>CPV Codes</b>	24950000-8 - Specialised chemical products 44482000-2 - Fire-protection devices

## Contents

- 1.0 [Introduction](#)
- 2.0 [The Project](#)
- 3.0 [Pre-procurement Process](#)
- 4.0 [Project Governance](#)
- 5.0 [The Public Procurement Process](#)
- 6.0 [Invitation to Tender](#)
- 7.0 [Review of the Selection Criteria](#)
- 8.0 [Evaluation of the Award Criteria](#)
- 9.0 [Bid Clarifications](#)
- 10.0 [Additional Tender Information](#)
- 11.0 [Results](#)
- 12.0 [External Financial Checks](#)
- 13.0 [Risk Implications](#)
- 14.0 [Recommendation](#)
- 15.0 [Next Steps](#)
- 16.0 [Governance](#)

## Appendices

- A. [Tender Award Questions](#)
- B. [List of Evaluators](#)
- C. [Final Scores](#)
- D. [Pricing Evaluation](#)

## **1.0 Introduction**

- 1.1 The purpose of this report is to ensure all the pertinent procedures followed for the selection of the Provider(s) to be awarded the Safety of Life Systems contract are recorded. This is for both the provision of an audit trail, and to enable the appropriate Officer to approve the recommendation as part of the Council's internal governance and accountability arrangements. This report also satisfies the reporting requirements under Regulation 84 of the Public Contract Regulations 2015.
- 1.2 This report is commercially sensitive (under the Freedom of Information Act 2000 with 2012 updates) and is therefore intended for restricted circulation only. **The report should only be published with the consent of the Lead Officer;** due to the sensitive information it contains relating to the bidder's Tender submissions.

## **2.0 The Project**

- 2.1 The Council wished to invite further competition responses for the supply of a single Service Provider for the service, repair, maintenance and installation of fire safety equipment, for South Kesteven District Council. All work must be designed, installed, tested/commissioned, or completed in accordance with the appropriate British Standard, BSEN or other appropriate Regulation.
- 2.2
- 2.3 The contract was not divided into Lots as this was a mini competition off the EEM0067 Fire and Intruder Alarms and Fire Protection Equipment Framework.

## **3.0 Pre-procurement Process**

- 3.1 The lead officer and Procurement Lead agreed that the process should follow a mini competition off the EEM0067 Fire and Intruder Alarms and Fire Protection Equipment Framework to access a comprehensive list of suppliers and ensure a smooth procurement process.

## **4.0 Project Governance**

### **4.1 Include details of Officer that approved the below, along with the relevant dates.**

- **PID – signed by Richard Wyles 19/01/2024**
- **Budget/spend - as above**
- **To make the Tender live – Charlotte Highcock 24/07/2024**
- **Accept any relevant abnormalities within the Tender – CH 28/08/2024**
- **Accept/Reject SQ submissions – CH 28/08/2024**
- **Accept pricing submitted – CH 28/08/2024**

### **4.2 Include details of the Key Officers:**

- **Procurement Lead (Welland) Charlotte Highcock**
- **Lead Officer (Contracting Authority) Stewart Mason**
- **Budget Holder Richard Wyles**

## 5.0 The Public Procurement Process

5.1 In accordance with the Public Contract Regulations 2015, this opportunity was not advertised, as it was a call off from a Framework (EEM0067). The Framework itself was advertised on the Find a Tender Service (FTS) (2022/S 000-032737).

5.2 On publication of the opportunity, organisations were asked to register their interest via the Council's "ProContract" e-Sourcing portal, where Tender documents were available. A total of 13 expressions of interest were received, resulting in 3 Tender submissions.

5.3

## 6.0 Invitation to Tender

6.1 The Tender was made up of two questionnaire sets: one questionnaire for the selection criteria questions, and one for award criteria questions.

6.2 The award questionnaire was constructed in sections to facilitate evaluation. Some sections carried a percentage weighting (%). For every weighted section, there was at least one question that carried an individual question sub weighting (%). The overall weighting (%) of questions within a section also totalled 100%.

## 6.3 Selection Criteria

There were some questions to which an adverse answer may have resulted in the elimination of a bidder. Questions that may have resulted in the elimination of a tender submission (marked as P/F (Pass/ Fail)) are detailed in the table below:

SELECTION CRITERIA QUESTIONS		
Section Title	P/F	Question Number
<b>Important: Please Read</b>	-	-
<b>Part 1: Potential Supplier Information</b>		
<b>Section 1 - Potential supplier information</b>	-	-
<b>Declaration</b>	-	-

## 6.4 Award Criteria

The award criteria questions considered the merit of the eligible Tenders to identify the most economically advantageous Tender.

The Council evaluated the award criteria as follows:

- A quality assessment worth 50%; the following criteria, weighting and methodology were applied:

Each bidder's response to each question was evaluated and marked a maximum of 5 marks as per the below scoring matrix:

In the evaluator's reasoned opinion, the response is an:	
<b>5</b>	<b>Excellent Response</b> The response is excellent in relation to the stated requirements of the question. The response provides an excellent level of detail and demonstrates that the bidder's expertise and approach significantly exceeds the Council's minimum requirements such as to provide added value.
<b>4</b>	<b>Strong Response</b> The response is strong in relation to the stated requirements of the question. The response provides a good level of detail and demonstrates that the bidder's expertise and approach exceeds the Council's minimum requirements.
<b>3</b>	<b>Satisfactory Response</b> The response is satisfactory in relation to the stated requirements of the question. The response provides a satisfactory level of detail and demonstrates that the bidder has the necessary expertise to meet the Council's minimum requirements and has a reasonable understanding of what those minimum requirements are.
<b>2</b>	<b>Weak Response</b> The response is weak in relation to the stated requirements of the question. The response provides a low level of detail and provides less than satisfactory evidence to demonstrate that the bidder has the expertise to satisfy the Council's minimum requirements and/or demonstrates some misunderstanding of those requirements.
<b>1</b>	<b>Poor Response</b> The response is poor in relation to the stated requirements of the question. The response provides a very low level of detail. There is a significant lack of evidence to demonstrate that the bidder has the expertise to satisfy the Council's minimum requirements or really understands what those requirements are.
<b>0</b>	<b>Unacceptable Response</b> The response is unacceptable in relation to the stated requirements of the question. The response provides no detail and fails to provide any evidence that the bidder can meet the requirements of the question. <b>OR</b> No answer has been given.

The award criteria questions were split into the following sections:

Section Title	Section Weighting (%)	Question Number	Question Sub Weighting (%)
Quality	50%	1	10%
		2	9%
		3	7%
		4	7%
		5	7%
		6	10%
Price	50%	-	100%

Bidders were advised that irrespective of the methodology described above, an agreed score for any of the quality questions of '0' or '1' would result in the elimination of their Tender, as the Council requires a minimum quality threshold.

- A price assessment worth 50%; the following criteria were applied:

Price scores were calculated based on the bidder with the lowest overall compliant price being awarded the full score of 50%. The remaining bids were scored in accordance with the following calculation:

$$= \left( \frac{\text{lowest submitted price}}{\text{potential supplier's submitted price}} \right) \times \text{price weighting}$$

6.5 Bidders were required to submit responses by no later than 28<sup>th</sup> August 2024.

## 7.0 Review of the Selection Criteria

7.1 The selection questionnaire responses were reviewed by Charlotte Highcock, Welland Procurement Unit.

## 8.0 Evaluation of the Award Criteria

8.1 An evaluation panel was constructed to ensure that individuals assigned to evaluate questions were the most suitable and relevant to the criteria being examined, based upon qualifications and experience. Each question was evaluated by at least two evaluators and their scores, and comments recorded (see appendix B for details).

8.2 Subjective evaluation was undertaken, and initial scores to a maximum of 5 marks were awarded using the scoring matrix above.

8.3 A process of moderation for each individual evaluator's scores was undertaken by Welland Procurement. The responses were discussed at a moderation meeting held on 9<sup>th</sup> September 2024 attended by all evaluators and chaired by the moderator.

The moderation meeting enabled the panel to review the scores awarded by each evaluator and agree a moderated score for each question. The meeting also ensured that scoring had been consistent and key points in each question had been accounted for. Average scoring was not used.

In all such cases, following discussion, the moderator concluded the most appropriate mark to be awarded.

## **9.0 Results**

9.1 The evaluation scoring process was devised based upon a maximum score of 100% being available to each bidder as stated in the Tender documentation and outlined above.

9.2 Following the completion of the evaluation and moderation process the scores awarded to the participants were as follows:

1st	ABCA Systems	82.07%
2nd	Bidder 2	75.20%
3rd	Bidder 3	58.54%

## **10.0 External Financial Checks**

10.1 Financial checks were carried out by the Council on the preferred Provider(s) on 24<sup>th</sup> September 2024. Please see below for details:

<b>Bidder</b>	<b>Risk Indicator</b>	<b>Description of Risk Indicator</b>
<b>ABCA Systems</b>	100	Very Low Risk - Ok to offer your best terms

## **11.0 Risk Implications**

11.1 The procurement process has been conducted in accordance with best practice and the Public Contract Regulations 2015, ensuring the principles of transparency, equity and fairness have been adhered to.

11.2 The Council will use a 10-day standstill period following the distribution of the notification letters (after approval has been granted).

11.3 As part of the tender, several risks were identified. The main risks include:

- **Lack of procurement experience by the client lead was identified early on therefore additional support was required to ensure this project got over the line.**
- **Delays to the start of the procurement timeline during preparations of the documentation shifted the key dates to aim for.**

## 12.0 Recommendation

12.1 Following the completion of the procurement process, it is recommended that ABCA Systems Limited is awarded the contract.

## 13.0 Next Steps

13.1 **The Lead Council Officer must ensure the internal governance/approval process is followed, prior to returning this summary report to Welland Procurement.**

13.2 This summary report does not supersede or replace any internal governance/approval process the Council may have.

13.3 Once the recommendation has been approved by the appropriate approvers, the preferred bidder and all unsuccessful bidders will be notified of the outcome simultaneously. Subject to the satisfactory return of due diligence, and no legal challenge being received, the Council intends to execute the Contract at the conclusion of the standstill period.

## 14.0 Governance



14.1 Signed (Procurement Lead) .....

Name: Charlotte Highcock

Job Title and Authority: Deputy Head of Welland Procurement Unit

Date: 24/09/2024

14.2 Signed (Lead Council Officer) .....

Name:

Job Title and Authority:

Date:

14.3 Signed (Chief Officer/Approver/Budget Holder) .....

Name:

Job Title and Authority:

Date:

## Appendix A – Tender Award Questions

Q No.	Question
1	<p>1. Communications</p> <p>Provide your proposed communication plan for SKDC and how it will be used to deliver an excellent service for this contract. What is your approach to the handling and management of complaints and how would you implement this on this contract? 10%</p> <p>Your answer must not exceed 500 words.</p>
2	<p>Contract Mobilisation and Delivery</p> <p>a) Please provide a mobilisation plan detailing key tasks and timescales to achieve commencement of all Services. Please identify personnel who will be responsible for mobilisation how they will work individually and collectively, and outline expectation of resources required from SKDC during mobilisation period.</p> <p>b) Provide details of your intended staffing structure, identifying those Key Personnel for delivery of this contract. Your response should include job titles/trades of team to deliver the Service; what their primary roles and functions are; office or site based with a maximum travel time to district; anticipated percentage amount of their time that will be allocated to contract; and details of their training, skills, knowledge, and experience. If you intend to rely on subcontractors, detail what role each sub-contractor will take and your procedures for selection, monitoring, and management of subcontractors to the ensure seamless delivery of the contract.</p> <p>c) Describe your organisational arrangements for ensuring that your direct and subcontract labour have appropriate training, skills, knowledge, and behaviours to safely and effectively carry out works to which they are assigned. 9%</p> <p>Your response should also reference and evidence your established Quality Assurance Systems and ongoing training. Response format: 1500-word limit, plus additional attachments: Mobilisation plan, structure chart, flow/process charts, CV's</p>
3	<p>Service Delivery Scenario 1</p> <p>The Service Provider receives a works order to attend a property to a fire alarm panel which appears to have failed with no indicator lamps illuminated. The fire alarm panel is obsolete. What procedures would the Contractor implement to resolve the situation? 7%</p> <p>Your answer must not exceed 500 words.</p>

4	<p>Service</p> <p>A vulnerable Tenant who lives in a sheltered housing scheme has reported to the scheme manager that they cannot hear the communal fire alarm system in their flat. The sheltered scheme is made up of communal areas and flats. The flats have a stay put policy with a LD1 alarm system, connected to the sheltered housing alarm system. The communal areas have an evacuate policy and are protected by an L3 system. What would your response be to the request for an addition sounder to be installed in the flat, to indicate if the communal alarm system is in fire? 7%</p> <p>Your answer must not exceed 500 words.</p>	Delivery
5	<p>Technology and Added Value</p> <p>Describe and evidence how you will use your company's established technology &amp; electronic systems to drive efficiency for SKDC. This should detail which systems you have available and successes you have had in relation to integration of customer and Contractor IT systems. Your response should also include evidence of the use of electronic documentation 7%</p> <p>Your answer must not exceed 500 words.</p>	
6	<p>Health and Safety</p> <p>Describe the safety systems and processes used to mitigate risk for the following scenarios:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Asbestos fibre release</li> <li>• Staff/sub-contractor accident investigation</li> <li>• RIDDOR</li> <li>• Compliance with CDM</li> </ul> <p>Please give details of any safety assurance processes and trades accreditation schemes. Your answer must not exceed 1000 words. 10%</p>	

## Appendix B – List of Evaluators

Name	Job Title	Authority
Stephen Sykes	Electrical contracts Manager	SKDC
Stewart Mason	Fire Compliance Officer	SKDC

CONFIDENTIAL