



Welland Procurement: Procurement Planning and Delivery Toolkit

Contents

Section 1: Pre-Procurement Approvals (WP to complete with Client, then Client Manager to sign off).....	2
Section 2: Procurement Planning Phase (WP to complete)	5
Section 3: Approval To Publish This Procurement:	8
Section 4: Conflict of Interest Log With Mitigations:	9
Section 5: Procurement Recommendation Report and Award	10
Section 6: Contract Management:	15

Note: WP staff to capture the date the PPT was received to Wellandprocurement@melton.gov.uk or, if completing with the client the date of the meeting where this was done.

Date First Received by WP: 26/01/2026

Section 1: Pre-Procurement Approvals (WP to complete with Client, then Client Manager to sign off)

Authority Name	South Kesteven DC
Lead Officer:	Peter Withers
Phone Number:	
Lead Officer Email:	peter.withers@southkesteven.gov.uk
FTS Reference	2026/S 000-020784

Procurement Title:	Wharf Road Level 4 Car Park Resurfacing
WP Procurement Reference:	SKDC-1613
Date Supplier must begin work:	01/06/2026
Date work must be completed:	30/09/2026
Date Client can provide their procurement documents:	06/02/2026

Overview of the Procurement

In the box to the right please tell the story or **what you are buying and why**,

- the **aims and scope of the project**, who is the project sponsor or point of escalation?
- include any **relevant historical information** eg performance or issues in previous contracts.
- Are there any **known risks or special considerations** eg will staff transfer from current provider, is there sensitive information involved, what about intellectual property or copyright concerns? Is this something that needs local suppliers, SME's or The Voluntary, Charity or Social Enterprise sector?
- Are there **any deadlines** in terms of Funding deadlines or do we need to meet any special procurement rules?
- **Are there any key milestone dates for approvals or decisions?**
- Do you have **dedicated staff** available to create your documentation eg the Specification or **external consultants** involved

The works consist of asphaltting works to replace the asphalt surface on Level 4 of the Wharf Road car park as it has deteriorated, cracked and is in poor condition. The works are required to comply with the lease terms and to maintain the use of the car park for the residents and public using the car park.

Project Type: This is a new requirement that is a one time project

Please confirm the situation regarding funding for this procurement Funding has been approved

Is approval to procure required and has this been secured: No Sign Off Required Approval to Procure Secured

Has legal been engaged to provide a draft contract and legal advice. Legal Engaged, External Support on Contract Required

Other Resources (if not the Lead officer)	Name	Contact (email & Phone)
Person responsible for the Contract	Peter Withers	peter.withers@southkesteven.gov.uk;
Person(s) Responsible for the Specification	Adrian Baker	adrianbaker@pickeverard.co.uk;
Person responsible for the Pricing Doc	Adrian Baker	adrianbaker@pickeverard.co.uk;

Procurement Details:

Date First Received by WP: 26/01/2026

A. Will this require Soft Market Engagement/Supplier input to define the specification etc before the tender is published? Or have any suppliers already been contacted recently about this project, including your incumbent? If yes provide details below.	No
Click or tap here to enter text.	
B. Are any staff (internally or externally) currently carrying out work relating to this procurement who may need to be transferred to any new supplier? If yes provide details below including weblink to any internal policy (TUPE)	No
Click or tap here to enter text.	
C. Are there any Equality and Diversity issues in the proposed work- eg women in construction, accessibility concerns, ethnicity or religious considerations? If yes provide details below including weblink to any internal policy	No
Click or tap here to enter text.	
D. Will data identifying individuals be collected or transferred as part of information shared in the delivery of this procurement? This will need GDPR policy advice from your internal representative.	No
Click or tap here to enter text.	
E. Are you looking to include Social Value, sustainability, or environmental impact outcomes as part of the proposed work? If yes provide details below including weblink to any internal policy and any staff engaged in social value within your authority	Yes
Use of apprentices within supplier company, reduction in waste, energy conservation	
Project Type: This is a new requirement that is a one time project	
If this is not a onetime project how many years would the contract need to cover? Please provide a single figure, or if you would prefer a shorter contract which allows extensions, provide the initial term and extensions instead eg 3+1+1, 4+1 or 3+2, 2+2+1 are all variations on a 5 year contract	4 Months
Total Contract Value (the anticipated cost for the project/Contract Length, including extensions, based on current rates paid or agreed budgets)	£300,000
What is the main Commodity Type covered by the procurement (by value)	Works

Date First Received by WP: 26/01/2026

Approval to Start

<p>Signature: Peter Withers Role: Interim Projects Officer</p> <p>Signature: peter withers</p>	<p>The relevant officer has liaised with Democratic Services and understands the decision-making implications and confirms approval to procure has been granted and has financial approval to proceed.</p> <p>Form was Signed Electronically (see left)</p>
--	---

Link to return to Section 5: Procurement Recommendation Report and Award (after checking details in section 1): click [Here](#)

Section 2: Procurement Planning Phase (WP to complete)

1. Use Of Early Market Engagement

Early Market Engagement to be used (tick all that apply)		
<input type="checkbox"/> Questionnaire asking for supplier input	<input type="checkbox"/> Event to outline proposal and get supplier feedback	<input type="checkbox"/> Workshop to help design tender process
<input type="checkbox"/> Other (provide details)		

2. Use of a Framework

Using Existing Framework/ DPS/Dynamic Market options explored (Include details below): No - Not Deemed Appropriate	
Click or tap here to enter text.	
Framework Provider and Reference (if used) Click or tap here to enter text.	FTS ref for Framework (If available) Click or tap here to enter text.
Creating New Framework/Dynamic Market (tick whichever applies)	
<input type="checkbox"/> A new framework is required to be set up	<input type="checkbox"/> A new Dynamic Market is required to be set up
Reasoning:	

3. Use of Lots

Lotting Arrangements: Is there an opportunity to break the work down into lots? – this makes it more accessible to SME’s and Local suppliers. Either provide the lot breakdown or reasons why lots are not used (below)
N/A

4. Award Criteria - MAT (most advantageous tender)

Criteria	Assigned weighting	Breakdown
Commercial	[60%]	Click or tap here to enter text.
Technical/Quality	[40%]	Click or tap here to enter text.

The Following Pass/Fail criteria were also established:

1. member Contractor of the Mastic Asphalt Council

5. Use of the competitive flexible process (or stages in under-threshold procurements)

Competitive Flexible Options: Phases identified as being useful:

Date First Received by WP: 26/01/2026

a) Market Engagement Event <input type="checkbox"/>	f) Audits and Checks <input type="checkbox"/>	k) Preferred Supplier Stage <input type="checkbox"/>
b) Participation Stage <input type="checkbox"/>	g) Negotiation <input type="checkbox"/>	l) Final Tender <input type="checkbox"/>
c) Site Visits <input type="checkbox"/>	h) Dialogue <input type="checkbox"/>	m) Supplier Funding <input type="checkbox"/>
d) Supplier Presentations <input type="checkbox"/>	i) Award Without Negotiation/Dialogue <input type="checkbox"/>	n) Prototype development <input type="checkbox"/>
e) Product Demonstrations <input type="checkbox"/>	j) Intermediate Assessment to reduce field <input type="checkbox"/>	o) Variant Tenders <input type="checkbox"/>
p) Other stages (please identify below):		

6. Procurement Risks /Issues (Identified from either conversations with Client or Section 1)

Risk/Issue Description	Officer Assigned	Date Added	Severity (1-5)	Likelihood (1-5)	Score	Mitigation	Last Reviewed

Click [here](#) to return to the stage 4 report: risk implications

7. Any Other Considerations or adjustments to original scope.

8. Recommended Route to Market

Procurement Route: Open Tender (Below Threshold)	Reason: No appropriate framework, previous similar procurement was run as an open tender and generated a good level of interest and bids.
--	---

How long should the tender remain valid for from date of final tender submission? Ensure you include time for any sign off processes	90 Days
--	---------

Date First Received by WP: 26/01/2026

9. Procurement Timeline

Activity	Proposed Date(s)	Delivered Dates	If delivered late include reason
Procurement Start Date	06/02/2026	06/02/2026	
Progress Check in	Updates at agreed periods		
Specification Complete	06/02/2026	06/02/2026	
Draft Contract Provided to WP	06/02/2026	06/02/2026	
Pricing Document Complete	06/02/2026	06/02/2026	
Quality Questions Complete	10/02/2026	10/02/2026	
Tender Instructions etc Complete	12/02/2026	04/03/2026	
Approval To Publish Competition	02/03/2026	06/03/2026	
Advertised on eTender System	02/03/2026	09/03/2026	
Tender Notice (UK4)	02/02/2026	09/03/2026	
Clarifications Managed	(Every 2-3 days)		
Clarifications Close	23/03/2026	30/03/2026	
Tender Submission Date	30/03/2026	07/04/2026	
Evaluation Starts	30/03/2026	07/04/2026	
Moderation Session	13/04/2026	17/04/2026	
Recommendation Report	15/04/2026	17/04/2026	
Approval to Award	17/04/2026	Click or tap to enter a date.	
Contract Details Notice (UK7)	04/05/2026	Click or tap to enter a date.	
Contract Register Completed	11/05/2026	Click or tap to enter a date.	
Agreed Contract Start Date	01/06/2026	Click or tap to enter a date.	

[Link to return to Section 5: Procurement Recommendation Report and Award \(after checking details in section 2\): click Here](#)

Date First Received by WP: 26/01/2026

Section 3: Approval To Publish This Procurement:

Prior to publishing any tender, the WP lead must provide the tender pack and this document to the lead officer for it to be signed off as ready to publish to suppliers.

Sign off should be from the Head of Department as a minimum.

Welland Procurement can only publish this tender once this has been signed off.

Specification Checked <input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	Pricing Document Checked <input checked="" type="checkbox"/>
Quality Questions signed off <input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	Draft Contract signed off <input checked="" type="checkbox"/>
Having reviewed: <ul style="list-style-type: none">• the information in section 2 of this document,• the documentation to be published to suppliers, and• having completed the above checklist, I confirm permission to publish this procurement has been granted by:	
Name:	Peter Withers
Signature	peter withers
Position in Authority:	Projects Officer

[Link to return to Section 5: Procurement Recommendation Report and Award \(after checking details in section 3\): click Here](#)

Date First Received by WP: 26/01/2026

Section 4: Conflict of Interest Log with Mitigations:

Name	Role in Procurement	COI identified	Date COI Identified	Mitigation used (if required)
Gareth Dawkins	Council Lead	N/A		
Adrian Baker	Evaluator (External Consultant)	N/A		

- Where multiple COI are identified for a single person list each on a separate line
- Roles may include evaluators, those who have designed the specification or those with influence upon the award/contract decision.

Link to return to Section 5: Procurement Recommendation Report and Award (after checking details in section 2): click [Here](#)

Date First Received by WP: 26/01/2026

Section 5: Procurement Recommendation Report and Award

This report is to provide comfort that all stages of this procurement have followed UK and Authority Regulations.

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 is commercially sensitive (under the Freedom of Information) 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.

Instructions: as this is a single document covering the whole of the procurement from inception to completion this award report will guide you to relevant information for you to review using hyperlinks – at the end of any section to be reviewed there will be another link to return you back to the Recommendation report.

Procurement Summary information

<p>Please see Section 1 for: Procurement Overview, Lead Contact information Contract Length Approval to Procure/Sign off by clicking here</p>	<p>Please see section 2 for: Early Market Engagement details Framework Details (if used), Lot Details (if applicable), The Award Criteria (Financial Vs Technical/Quality vs Social Value etc) Procurement Stages Risks & Mitigations Agreed Timeline (plus delays) Route To market used by clicking here</p>	<p>Please See section 3 for: Approval to publish the tender by clicking here</p> <p>Please See Section 4 for: Conflicts of Interest Log by clicking here</p>	<p>Actual Contract Value (from winning bid: £298,948.12</p>
---	---	--	---

The Public Procurement Process

In accordance with the Procurement Act 2023, the following option shown below was used: Option A

Option A: this Tender opportunity was advertised on the Find a Tender Service (FTS) under the reference given in section 1 and advised bidders that award of the contract would follow the route to market set in section 2.8
--

Option B: this opportunity was not advertised, as it was a call off from a Framework The Framework references are in section 2.2
--

On publication of the opportunity, organisations were asked to register their interest via the Council's e-Sourcing portal, where Tender documents were publicly available. A total of 43 expressions of interest were received, resulting in 1 Tender submissions.

The procurement process has been conducted in accordance with best practice and the relevant UK procurement regulations, ensuring the principles of transparency, equity and fairness have been adhered to.

Evaluation of the Award Criteria

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 three evaluators and their scores, and comments recorded

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

A process of moderation for each individual evaluator's scores was undertaken by Welland Procurement. The responses were discussed at a moderation meeting (See procurement timetable in section 2.9 for date), attended by all evaluators and chaired by the moderator and a final agreed score awarded. The meeting 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.

Technical/Quality Assessment Scoring matrix

In the evaluator’s reasoned opinion, the response is a:					
Score of 0	Score of 1	Score of 2	Score of 3	Score of 4	Score of 5
Unacceptable Response	Poor Response	Weak Response	Satisfactory Response	Strong Response	Excellent 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 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.	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.	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.	demonstrates that the bidder’s expertise and approach, exceed the Council’s minimum requirements.	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 exceed the Council’s minimum requirements such as to provide added value.

Bidders were advised that irrespective of the methodology described above:
1. A score below XX% for the quality assessment would result in the elimination of their Tender, as the Council requires a minimum quality threshold. <input type="checkbox"/>
2. 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. <input checked="" type="checkbox"/>

Commercial Assessment

The bidder with the lowest overall compliant price being awarded the full score available, the remaining bids were scored in accordance with the following calculation:

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

Results

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

Place	1 st
Name	Rio Asphalt
Score	94.2%

Recommendation

Option 1: Following the completion of the procurement process, it is recommended that the following supplier(s) is/are awarded the contract.
Rio Asphalt

Option 2: If it is recommended that an award is not made following this process, for the following reason(s)

Subcontractors

Option 1: Please note the share of the contract which the successful tenderer intends to subcontract to third parties is approximately XX%.
The main supplier's nominated subcontractors are as follows:

Option 2: No subcontractors will be used for this contract.

Next Steps

The Lead Council Officer must ensure the internal governance/approval process is followed, prior to returning this summary report to Welland Procurement. This summary report does not supersede or replace any internal governance/approval process the Council may have.

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 any standstill period.

Sign Off

Procurement lead	Lead Council Officer	Chief Officer/Approver/Budget Holder
------------------	----------------------	--------------------------------------

Date First Received by WP: 26/01/2026

Name: Tom Paling	Name:	Name:
Role: Contract & Supply Specialist	Role:	Role:
Signature	Signature	Signature
Date: 17/04/26	Date	Date

Section 6: Contract Management:

This section covers information and actions required after the signing of the contract for the authority assigned Contract Manager

Contract Mobilisation

Role	Name	Contact
Contract Manager (authority)		
Contract manager (supplier) Foster Property		
Contract manager (supplier) Gratton Construction		

Contract Meetings	
Has the authority contract manager set up a contract review meeting:	
At what frequency are the meetings?	

Contract Award Notice

It is a legal requirement to publish a UK7 Contract Details Notice **within 30 days** of the signature of any contract valued over £20,000. Contracts **over £5m** must also have a **redacted version of the contract** attached.

Please confirm you have passed the **contract start date, contract length, final contract total** and a **redacted contract if required** to Wellandprocurement@melton.gov.uk to enable them to publish this on your behalf.

Date of email:

Sender details:

KPI's

The KPI's for this Contract are as follows:

KPI Ref	Title	Method of calculating	Required KPI level
1			
2			
3			

Other Legal Requirements for the Contract Manager

During the contract lifetime the following notices are required:

- Where a contract needs to be varied in terms of costs (outside of annual indexation) or scope (excluding material changes) the contract manager must arrange for the UK10 Contract Change notice to be placed on the Find a Tender System
- Where a contract needs to be extended (either via an agreed extension or otherwise) the contract manager must arrange for the UK10 Contract Change notice to be placed on the Find a Tender System
- When a contract terminates – for any reason including naturally reaching the contract end date the contract manager must arrange for the UK11 Contract Termination notice to be placed on the Find a Tender System
- Where your contract is over £5m, the contract manager must arrange for the UK9 Contract Performance Notice to be placed on the Find a Tender System at least annually (and not less than 30 days after in response to missed KPI's or a breach of contract)
- Where your contract has payments of over £30k in any quarter, the contract manager must arrange for the UK8 Contract Payment Notice to be placed on the Find a Tender System in that quarter