

Procurement Summary Report

SKDC-1232-FWK External Decoration

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	
Lead Officer (Contracting Authority)	Technical Services
Project ID	DN765860
Contract Dates	<u>Start:</u> 25/05/2025 <u>End:</u> 25/05/2032 <u>Extension option:</u> 48 Months
Length of Contract	3 years with an option to extend for 4 years, making a total of 7 years.
Procurement Value (£)	The budget prior to going to market was in the region of £3.500,000 per annum.
Type of Contract	Works
CPV Codes	45442100-8 - Painting work

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 SKDC-1232-FWK External Decoration 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 contract is for the provision of The Council wishes to invite further competition responses for the supply of works in respect of Carry out pre paint repairs to existing components (e.g. external doors, frames, fascia's, soffits etc...) on council owned dwellings, followed by external decoration works as part of the councils cyclical planned programme.
- 2.2 The contract was not divided into lots as this wasn't required as part of this process

3.0 Pre-procurement Process

- 3.1 Welland met with client to discuss the project brief agree the procurement route and all the project timescales along with the quality/price split and the quality questions and percentage weighting against them

4.0 Project Governance

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

- PID 19/02/2025 BE
- Budget/spend 19/02/2025 BE
- To make the Tender live 19/02/2025 BE
- Accept any relevant abnormalities within the Tender 19/02/2025 BE
- Accept/Reject SQ submissions 19/02/2025 BE
- Accept pricing submitted 19/02/2025 BE

4.2 Include details of the Key Officers:

- Procurement Lead (Welland)
- Lead Officer (South Kesteven District Council) Planned Works Manager
- South Kesteven District Council Budget Holder

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 EEM Cyclical Decoration, Decorating Materials & Tenant Options Vouchers Framework
- 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 4 expressions of interest were received, resulting in 3 Tender submissions.

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
Important: Please Read	-	-
Part 1: Potential Supplier Information		
Section 1 - Potential supplier information	-	-
Section 2 - Bidding model	-	-
Section 3 - Contact details and declaration	-	-
Part 2: Exclusion Grounds		
Section 2 - Grounds for mandatory exclusion	P/F	
Section 3 - Grounds for discretionary exclusion	P/F	
Part 3: Selection Questions		
Section 4 - Economic and Financial Standing	P/F	
Section 5 - Technical and Professional Ability	P/F	

Section 6 - Modern Slavery Act 2015	P/F	
Section 7 – Insurance	P/F	
Section 8 - Skills and Apprentices	-	-
Section 9 - Health and Safety Project Specific Questions	P/F	
Section 10 - Environment Project Specific Questions	P/F	
Section 11 - Equality Project Specific Questions	P/F	
Section 12 - Other Project Specific Questions	-	-
Section 13 - GDPR Questions	P/F	
Declaration	-	-

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 60%; 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:	
5	Excellent Response 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.
4	Strong Response 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.
3	Satisfactory Response 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.
2	Weak Response 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.
1	Poor Response 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.
0	Unacceptable Response 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. OR No answer has been given.

The award criteria questions were split into the following sections:

Section Title	Question Number	Question Sub Weighting (%)
Award Criteria – Quality	1	10
	2	15
	3	15
	4	10
	5	10

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 40% 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 4%. 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 12 noon 2nd April 2025

7.0 Review of the Selection Criteria

7.1 The selection questionnaire responses were reviewed by the Contract & Supply Specialist Welland Procurement Officer.

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 Friday 25th April 2025 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:

1 st	Bagnalls	91%
2 nd	Bidder 2	88.14%
3 rd	Bidder 3	79.48%

10.0 Risk Implications

10.1 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.

11.0 Recommendation

11.1 Following the completion of the procurement process, it is recommended that Bagnalls are awarded the contract.

12.0 Next Steps

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

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

12.3 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

13.0 Governance

13.1 Signed (Procurement Lead)
Name:
Job Title and Authority: Contract & Supply Specialist
Date: 28/04/2025

13.2 Signed (Lead Council Officer)
Name:
Job Title and Authority: Planned Works Manager
Date: 30th April 2025

13.3 Signed (Chief Officer/Approver/Budget Holder)
Name:
Job Title and Authority: Head of Technical Services
Date: 8th May 2025

Appendix A – Tender Award Questions

Q No.	Question
1	Please Provide evidence of previous contracts, minimum of 2 examples are required, where you have carried out external decoration (Inc pre-paint repair work) for similar organisations to SKDC.
2	How will you ensure that sufficient resources are provided to meet the requirements of this contract.
3	Please outline (giving examples) your ability to deliver the works.
4	Please provide your safeguarding policy or document how will you use our policy to report any concerns staff see.
5	As part of your response, please provide your approach to the following social value priorities:

Appendix B – List of Evaluators

Name	Job Title	Authority
Evaluator 1	Planned Works Manager	South Kesteven District Council
Evaluator 2	Project Officer	South Kesteven District Council

Appendix C – Final Scores

Question	Weight (%)	Bidder A	Bidder B	Bidder C
1	10%	8	8	8
2	15%	12	15	15
3	15%	15	12	12
4	10%	8	10	8
5	10%	8	10	8
Sub Total (out of 60%)		51%	55%	51%

Appendix D – Pricing Evaluation

Bidder	Total cost - XX years	% Score (out of 40%)
Bagnalls	£235,497	40
Bidder 2	£284,207	33.14
Bidder 3	£330,778	28.48