

## Procurement Summary Report

### Radon Remediation Works for 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>	Technical Services – South Kesteven District Council
<b>Project ID</b>	SKDC-1065
<b>FTS Reference</b>	Not applicable
<b>Contract Dates</b>	<u>Start:</u> 1st October 2025 <u>End:</u> 30th September 2027 <u>Extension option:</u> 24 Months
<b>Length of Contract</b>	2 years with an option to extend for 2 years (1 year + 1 year), making a total of 4 years.
<b>Procurement Value (£)</b>	The budget prior to going to market was in the region of £500,000 per annum.
<b>Type of Contract</b>	Goods/Services
<b>CPV Codes</b>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>71315210 - Building services consultancy services</li> </ul>



## **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 Radon Remediation Works 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 Radon Remediation Works and maintenance.
- 2.2 The contract has been split into lots due to it being a single requirement.

## 3.0 Pre-procurement Process

- 3.1 South Kesteven District Council (SKDC) officers in conjunction with Welland Procurement conducted market research into the procurement options and it was established that the National Housing Consortium (NHC) Residential Property Development and Asset Management Dynamic Purchasing System (DPS) under Category 1: Radon Gas (Testing, Remediation, Servicing) would be the most suitable for the requirements and it includes some suppliers that SKDC have worked with.
- 3.2 As this procurement is under a DPS it was established that NHC would manage the further competition process.
- 3.3 NHC conducted an initial Expression of Interest (EOI) and four suppliers expressed an interest in in the opportunity and two did not respond.

Supplier	Interested Y/N
BCS Property Projects Ltd	Y
Ductclean (UK) Ltd t/a DCUK FM	
Forza Facilities Management Ltd	Y
McHale Contracts and Plant Environmental LLP (MCP)	Y
Ridge and Partners LLP	Y
RSK Environmental Ltd	



All four suppliers were invited to submit a bid once the procurement was published.

## 4.0 Project Governance

### 4.1 Key Approvals:

- PID – Feb 2025
- Budget/spend – Technical Services
- To make the Tender live – NHC Procurement – 30/06/2025
- Accept any relevant abnormalities within the Tender – NHC Procurement – 30/06/2025
- Accept/Reject SQ submissions – NHC Procurement – 30/06/2025
- Accept pricing submitted - NHC Procurement – 30/06/2025

### 4.2 Key Officers:

- Procurement Lead (Welland)
- Lead Officer (Contracting Authority - SKDC)
- Technical Services Budget Holder
- Evaluator 1 -Evaluation Panel Member (Contracting Authority - SKDC)
- Evaluator 2 -Evaluation Panel Member (Contracting Authority - SKDC)

## 5.0 The Public Procurement Process

5.1 In accordance with the Public Contract Regulations 2015, this Tender opportunity was not advertised as it was a call off under the National Housing Consortium (NHC) Residential Property Development and Asset Management Dynamic Purchasing System (DPS) under Category 1: Radon Gas (Testing, Remediation, Servicing). The DPS itself was advertised on the Official Journal of the European Union (OJEU) ((2019/S 199-483872). The opportunity was also advertised on Contracts Finder.

5.2 On publication of the opportunity, organisations were asked to register their interest via the NHC “Delta” e-Sourcing portal, where Tender documents were available. Following the initial expression of interest all six suppliers were invited to tender, resulting in two Tender submissions.

### **Bids Received(2)**

- The Radon Consultants Ltd
- Bidder 2

## 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 **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:	
<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>	<p><b>Unacceptable Response</b></p> <p>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.</p> <p><b>OR</b></p> <p>No answer has been given.</p>
----------	--

The award criteria questions were split into the following sections:

Section Title	Section Weighting	Question Number	Question Sub Weighting (%)
<b>Award Criteria – Quality</b>	60%	1	10%
		2	15%
		3	15%
		4	10%
		5	10%
Price	40%		

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:

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

6.4 Bidders were required to submit responses by no later than 12 noon, on 30<sup>th</sup> June 2025.

## 7.0 Review of the Selection Criteria

7.1 The selection questionnaire responses were reviewed by NHC Procurement.

## 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 8<sup>th</sup> July 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.

- 8.4 Following the moderation meeting, the evaluators were issued with the bidders submitted Pricing Schedules for review.
- 8.5 The evaluators confirmed that clarification on the Pricing Schedule submissions was required from both bidders.

## 9.0 Bid Clarifications

- 9.1 Tenders were clarified as part of the evaluation/moderation process and both bidders were issued post tender clarification questions on 9<sup>th</sup> July 2025.
- 9.2 Both bidders were asked the following questions:

1. *Please provide a full break down of your costs for item Nos. 2 to 8. The breakdown should include details of the products that you propose to use and confirm it includes all elements of the required task description.*
2. *Please specify if the costs for item Nos. 2 to 8 are inclusive of post 90 day monitoring.*

## 10.0 Additional Tender Information

- 10.1 The post tender submissions were reviewed by the evaluators and a second moderation meeting was held on Friday 18<sup>th</sup> August 2025.

10.2 The post tender responses did not change the original moderated score or price evaluation.

### 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 <sup>st</sup>	The Radon Consultants Ltd	81%
2 <sup>nd</sup>	Bidder 2	66.58%

### 12.0 External Financial Checks

12.1 Currently Welland Procurement are unable to provide any external financial checks through Experian. We therefore recommend that the Council conducts any further financial checks it sees fit to ensure satisfactory consideration has been made to financial risk.

### 13.0 Risk Implications

13.1 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.

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

13.3 As part of the tender, no risks were identified.

### 14.0 Recommendation

14.1 Following the completion of the procurement process, it is recommended that The Radon Consultants Ltd is awarded the contract.

14.2 All evaluators have completed and signed a conflict of interest form, where no conflicts of interest were identified

### 15.0 Next Steps



- 15.1 **The Lead Council Officer must ensure the internal governance/approval process is followed, prior to returning this summary report to Welland Procurement.**
- 15.2 This summary report does not supersede or replace any internal governance/approval process the Council may have.
- 15.3 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.
- 15.4 The Contracts Finder website must be updated to declare the contract award due to the contract value.
- 15.5 The Council Register for South Kesteven District Council must be updated to confirm the contract spend as per the Transparency Agenda requirements.

## 16.0 Governance

- 16.1 Signed (Procurement Lead)  
Name: Senior Contracts & Supply Specialist  
Job Title and Authority: Welland Procurement  
Date: 1<sup>st</sup> September 2025
- 16.2 Signed (Lead Council Officer)  
Name: Planned Works Manager  
Job Title and Authority: Technical Services - South Kesteven District Council  
Date: 1<sup>st</sup> September 2025
- 16.3 Signed (Chief Officer/Approver/Budget Holder)  
Name: Head of Service  
Job Title and Authority: Technical Services - South Kesteven District Council  
Date: 1<sup>st</sup> September 2025

## Appendix A – Tender Award Questions

Question No.	Question
1	<p><b>Previous contract examples (weighting 10%)</b> Please provide evidence of previous contracts, minimum of 2 examples are required, where you have carried out radon remedial works for similar organisations to South Kesteven District Council (SKDC).</p> <p>Your answer must not exceed 2 side of A4 (Arial 11pt). OR Your answer must not exceed 1200 words.</p>
2	<p><b>Contract management (weighting 15%)</b> 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> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• 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 for daily activities. (Bidders may include an attachment).</li> <li>• Detail any succession planning you have in place to ensure the continuity of work throughout the length of the Contract and to mitigate risk.</li> <li>• Please provide a typical process map of how you propose to manage the contract. (Bidders may include an attachment).</li> <li>• If you are to bring in additional resources, how will you ensure their competences?</li> <li>• Confirm the team that will be working on this project. 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. (Bidders may include an attachment).</li> </ul> <p>Your answer must not exceed 2 side of A4 (Arial 11pt). OR Your answer must not exceed 1200 words.</p>
3	<p><b>Works Delivery (weighting 15%)</b> Please outline (giving examples) your ability to deliver the works.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Details should ideally include timeframes from receipt of works instruction to attend site and carry out the works inspection/survey and provide initial/SOR quotation to SKDC. (Bidders may include a flowchart/ attachment)</li> <li>• Booking in of works once the contractor has been provided with an order, commencement of work through to completion.</li> <li>• How will you communicate any delays to the client?</li> </ul>

	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• How do you propose to communicate the completion of works to the client?</li> </ul> <p>Your answer must not exceed 2 side of A4 (Arial 11pt). OR Your answer must not exceed 1200 words.</p>
4	<p><b>Safeguarding (weighting 10%)</b> Please provide your safeguarding policy or document how will you use our policy to report any concerns staff see. (SKDC Policy – see Appendix O)</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• How will your staff be made aware of their responsibilities to report safeguarding concerns through supervision / training / induction materials?</li> <li>• A dedicated safeguarding contact is required. Please confirm you are able to provide a to whom concerns are reported and who knows what action may or should be taken when concerns are raised?</li> <li>• Please confirm that all members of staff hold a current DBS certificate. Evidence of these will be reviewed on an annual basis by SKDC.</li> </ul> <p>Your answer must not exceed 1 side of A4 (Arial 11pt). OR Your answer must not exceed 800 words.</p>
5	<p><b>Social Value (weighting 10%)</b> As part of your response, please provide your approach to the following social value priorities:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Sustainability and Environment</li> <li>• Local Workforce, including apprentices where possible</li> <li>• Local Economy</li> </ul> <p>Bidders' responses should include:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• The key steps required to deliver each of the Social Value measures to demonstrate that achievement of the targets set is reasonable.</li> <li>• Timeframes for delivery of Social Value targets including key milestones to deliver each measure proposed.</li> <li>• Clear explanation as to how the Social Value offered will apply directly to this contract and benefit the local communities.</li> <li>• Resources required to ensure delivery of all the Social Value measures.</li> <li>• 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.</li> </ul> <p>Considerations to be made to the local authority's outputs and outcomes to be achieved as part of this project. Your answer must not exceed 1 side of A4 (Arial 11pt). OR Your answer must not exceed 1000 words.</p>

## Appendix B – List of Evaluators



<b>Name</b>	<b>Job Title</b>	<b>Authority</b>
Evaluator 1	Technical Services	South Kesteven District Council (SKDC)
Evaluator 2	Health & Safety	South Kesteven District Council (SKDC)