

Procurement Summary Report

Compliance Auditing – Gas & Electrical

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	EEM - DPS0010
FTS Reference	N/A
Contract Dates	<u>Start:</u> August 2025 - TBC <u>End:</u> August 2028 - TBC <u>Extension option:</u> 24 Months – 5 years total contract
Length of Contract	3 years with an option to extend for 1+1 years, making a total of 5 years.
Procurement Value (£)	The budget prior to going to market was in the region of £50,000 per annum.
Type of Contract	Consultancy Services
CPV Codes	

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 Compliance Auditing, Gas & Electrical 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 providing consultancy services to carry out both gas and electrical auditing following repair and installation works. The services will be carried out on council owned dwellings.
- 2.1 The contract was not divided into lots as this wasn't required as part of this process

3.0 Pre-procurement Process

- 3.1 The council met EEM independently to Welland Procurement. The project brief was agreed with EEM along with the procurement route. EEM assisted the council with 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 – agreed by SKDC Dec 2023 with no involvement of Welland
 - Budget/spend agreed with EEM 15th April 2025
 - To make the Tender live 30th April 2025
 - Accept any relevant abnormalities within the Tender 30th April 2025
 - Accept/Reject SQ submissions 30th April 2025
 - Accept pricing submitted 30th April 2025
- 4.2 Include details of the Key Officers:
- **Procurement Lead** - (South Kesteven District Council/Procurement Officer - EEM)
 - **Lead Officer** - (South Kesteven District Council) Technical Services
 - **Budget Holder** - Technical Services

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 mini competition from the EEM, Consultancy Services, DPS Framework

- 5.2 This Tender opportunity was not advertised on Contracts Finder.
- 5.3 On publication of the opportunity, organisations were asked to register their interest via the EEM e-Sourcing portal, where Tender documents were available. A total of 5 expressions of interest were received.

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:

EEM - Method Statement Scoring Guidance	
	Scoring Guidance
	<p>Void - Failed to address the question/issue or provide any answer. Score: 0</p> <p>Weak - Substantially poor submission Potential for some compliance but very major areas of weakness: Score: 1</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - limited response provided and/or - response is irrelevant/incomprehensible and/or - fails in all significant areas and/or - fails to provide detail of, or evidence to support, experience being tested. <p>Fair - One or more areas of major weakness: Score: 2</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - response is insufficient and/or - response is basic with limited detail and/or - insufficient evidence provided to support the response and demonstrate that the Applicant has the required experience and/or - some reservations as to the Applicant's understanding of the competence being tested. <p>Adequate - Substantial experience with no major concerns: Score: 3</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - response generally meets the requirements but lacks sufficient detail to award a higher mark. - overall the response meets the requirements outlined in the question and - is detailed and provides supporting evidence to demonstrate experience and - only minor reservations as to the Applicant's experience of and/or the extent of understanding of the competence being tested. <p>Good - A good response that meets the requirements: Score 4</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - fully meetings the requirements - sets out a robust response that fully addresses the requirements of the question and - provides full evidence and detail to demonstrate the Applicant's experience and - provides full confidence as to the Applicant's experience and understanding of the competence being tested. <p>Excellent - An excellent response with detailed supporting evidence and no weaknesses: Score 5</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - meets all requirements to score 4 as above and - provides or proposes additional value which exceeds the requirements in substance and outcomes in a manner acceptable and - the response and the evidence submitted in support not only provides full confidence as to the Applicant's experience but that the Applicant excels in the area.

The award criteria questions were split into the following sections:

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

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 40%. 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 21st May 2025

7.0 Review of the Selection Criteria

7.1 The selection questionnaire responses were reviewed by Rosamond Smith – Procurement Officer EEM.

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 9th May 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 Bid Clarifications

9.1 No clarifications were required.

10.0 Additional Tender Information

10.1 No additional information was required.

11.0 Results

11.1 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.

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

1 st	Morgan Lambert	94%
2 nd	Bidder 2	71.6%

12.0 Risk Implications

12.1 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.

13.0 Recommendation

13.1 Following the completion of the procurement process, it is recommended that Morgan Lambert are awarded the contract.

14.0 Next Steps

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

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

14.3 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.

15.0 Governance

15.1 Signed (Procurement Lead)
Name: Procurement
Job Title and Authority: SKDC
Date: 16th June 2025

15.2 Signed (Lead Council Officer)
Name: Planned Works Manager
Job Title and Authority: SKDC
Date: 16th June 2025

15.3 Signed (Chief Officer/Approver/Budget Holder)
Name: Head of Technical Services
Job Title and Authority: SKDC
Date: 16th June 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 gas and electrical auditing for similar organisations to SKDC.
2	<p>How will you ensure that sufficient resources are provided to meet the requirements of this contract.</p> <p>Your response should include as a minimum:</p> <p>How you will structure your team for the full range of required services. Please provide a structure chart(s) to show how this will fit within your existing organisational structure and provide an overview of key personnel along with their roles and responsibilities.</p> <p>Detail any succession planning you have in place to ensure the continuity of work throughout the length of the Contract and to mitigate risk.</p> <p>Please provide a typical process map of how you propose to manage the contract.</p> <p>If you are to bring in additional resources, how will you ensure their competences?</p> <p>Confirm the team that will be working on this project</p> <p>Confirm that your team will have the required levels of competence and qualifications required for this contract including examples of relevant experience and how the contractor will ensure this is met.</p>
3	<p>Please provide your safeguarding policy or document how will you use our policy to report any concerns staff see. (OUR SKDC POLICY IS ATTACHED)</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • How will your staff be made aware of their responsibilities to report safeguarding concerns through supervision / training / induction materials? • Is there a designated safeguarding individual to whom concerns are reported and who knows what action may or should be taken when concerns are raised? • Provide evidence that all members of staff hold a current DBS certificate.
4	<p>As part of your response, please provide your approach to the following social value priorities:</p> <p>Sustainability and Environment</p> <p>Local Workforce, including apprentices where possible</p> <p>Local Economy</p> <p>Bidders' responses should include:</p> <p>What is the bidder's approach and proposals to Social Value under this contract.</p> <p>The key steps required to deliver each of the Social Value measures to demonstrate that achievement of the targets set is reasonable.</p> <p>Timeframes for delivery of Social Value targets including key milestones to deliver each measure proposed.</p> <p>Clear explanation as to how the Social Value offered will apply directly to this contract and benefit the local communities.</p> <p>Resources required to ensure delivery of all the Social Value measures.</p> <p>Details as to how the delivery of all the Social Value commitments made will be monitored and measured throughout the contract term to provide clear and regular updates to the Council.</p> <p>Considerations to be made to the local authority's outputs and outcomes to be achieved as part of this project.</p>

Appendix B – List of Evaluators

Name	Job Title	Authority
Evaluator 1	Planned Works Manager	South Kesteven District Council
Evaluator 2	M&E contracts Manager	South Kesteven District Council

Appendix C – Final Scores

Question	Weight (%)	Morgan Lambert	Bidder 2		
QUALITY QUESTIONS	60%				
1	15%	12	9		
2	15%	12	9		
3	15%	15	12		
4	15%	15	9		
Sub Total (out of 60%)		54%	39%		
PRICE ASSESSMENT	40%				
Sub Total (out of 40%)		40%	32.6%		
TOTAL		94%	71.6%		

Appendix D – Pricing Evaluation

Bidder	Total cost – Per annum	% Score (out of 40%)
Morgan Lambert	£146,700	40%
Bidder 2	£180,000	32.6%