

CONTRACT SCRUTINY PANEL AGENDA



Monday 10TH October 2005

at 11:00 am

in Committee Room 'A'

MEMBERS: CONTRACT SCRUTINY PANEL:

Councillors Cambridge, Rayner, Shaw, D Waller and M Waller

- 1. APOLOGIES FOR ABSENCE**
- 2. TO RECEIVE ANY DECLARATIONS OF INTEREST BY MEMBERS**
- 3. MINUTES**
 - 3.1 To confirm the minutes of the meeting held on 12th and 26th September, 2005 (attached)
- 4. ITEMS FOR INFORMATION**
 - 4.1 Supply of Fitness Room Equipment for the Borough Buildings Sports Hall –
Acting Director of Adult and Community Services
- 5. ITEMS FOR DECISION**
 - 5.1 None
- 6. ANY OTHER ITEMS WHICH THE CHAIRMAN CONSIDERS ARE URGENT**
- 7. LOCAL GOVERNMENT (ACCESS TO INFORMATION) ACT 1985**

EXEMPT ITEMS

Under Section 100(A)(4) of the Local Government Act 1972, the press and public be excluded from the meeting for the following items of business on the grounds that it involves the likely disclosure of exempt information as defined in the paragraphs referred to below of Part 1 of Schedule 12A of the Local Government Act 1972 as amended by the Local Government (Access to Information) Act 1985

8. ITEMS FOR INFORMATION

8.1 None

9. ANY OTHER CONFIDENTIAL ITEMS WHICH THE CHAIRMAN CONSIDERS ARE URGENT

CONTRACT SCRUTINY PANEL

MINUTES AND DECISION RECORD

12th September 2005

PRESENT: Councillors John Cambridge, Jane Shaw, Denis Waller and Maureen Waller

OFFICERS: David Wilson, Principal Engineer (Construction)
Pat Watson, Democratic Services Officer
Jo Wilson, Democratic Services Officer

39. APPOINTMENT OF CHAIR

In the absence of the chair Councillor Cambridge was appointed as chair for this meeting only.

40. APOLOGIES FOR ABSENCE

Apologies were received from Councillor Pat Rayner.

In accordance with Paragraph 4.2(ii) of the Council's Procedure Rules Councillor Frances London attended as substitute for Councillor Pat Rayner

41. DECLARATIONS OF INTEREST

None

42. DEMOLITION OF FRIARAGE SPORTS HALL, FRIARAGE YOUTH CENTRE, FRIARAGE HORSE HUT AND FRIARAGE CANTEEN, HARTLEPOOL – *Acting Head of Technical Services*

Purpose of Report

To inform the Contract Scrutiny Panel on the acceptance of this tender.

Background

Tenders were opened on 1st August 2005 submitted by

G O'Brien's and Son's Ltd
H Smith Demolition
J Hellen's
MGL Demolition

The Tender prices submitted were:

£77,129.94
£81,921.33
£91,585.17
£149,700.00

Financial implications

Hartlepool Borough Council accepted the lowest tender from 'G O'Brien's and Son's Ltd' for the sum of £77,129.94 on the basis of best price. The work will be funded in proportion to the ownership's by Hartlepool Borough Council, SRB and the Henry Smith's Trust.

Discussions then took place between members on demolition costs in general

Decision

- I. That the report be noted
- II. That a request be made for Officers to prepare a full report on demolition costs generally for a future meeting of this panel.

43. LOCAL GOVERNMENT (ACCESS TO INFORMATION) ACT 1985

Under Section 100(A)(4) of the Local Government Act 1972, the press and public be excluded from the meeting for the following items of business on the grounds that it involves the likely disclosure of exempt information as defined in the paragraphs referred to below of Part 1 of Schedule 12A of the Local Government Act 1972 as amended by the Local Government (Access to Information) Act 1985

Minute 44 - Tenders in respect of Hartlepool Transport Interchange – Subway Infill Works (para 9) exempt information under 12A Local Government Act 1972 namely terms proposed or to be proposed by or to the Authority in the course of negotiations for a contract for the acquisition or disposal of property or the supply of goods or services – *Acting Head of Technical Services*

**44. TENDERS IN RESPECT OF HARTLEPOOL TRANSPORT
INTERCHANGE – SUBWAY INFILL WORKS (para 9) – *Acting Head
of Technical Services***

Members were informed that tenders had been invited in respect of the above contract.

J CAMBRIDGE

CHAIRMAN

CONTRACT SCRUTINY PANEL

MINUTES AND DECISION RECORD

26th September 2005

PRESENT: Councillor Pat Rayner (Chair)
Councillors John Cambridge, Jane Shaw,

OFFICERS: Colin Bolton, Principal Mechanical and Electrical Engineer
Pat Usher, Sport and Recreation Manager
Paul Jamieson, Assistant Landscape Architect
Allison Eskelly, Landscape Architect
Alison King, Principal Legal Executive (Conveyancing)
Jan Bentley, Democratic Services Officer
Leanne Lupton, Clerical Assistant

45. APOLOGIES FOR ABSENCE

Apologies were received from Councillors D Waller and M Waller.

In accordance with Paragraph 4.2(ii) of the Council's Procedure Rules
Councillor Sheila Griffin attended as substitute for Councillor Dennis Waller

46. DECLARATIONS OF INTEREST

None

47. CONFIRMATION OF MINUTES OF THE MEETING HELD ON 30TH AUGUST, 2005

The minutes were confirmed.

48. DEMOLITIONS, ALTERATIONS AND AN ACCOMMODATION BLOCK EXTENSION TO CARLTON OUTDOOR EDUCATION CENTRE – *Head of Procurement and Property Services*

PURPOSE OF REPORT

To advise members on the outcome of the selection of a contractor for this project

BACKGROUND

The Children's Services Portfolio Holder had previously agreed to this project being procured using a partnering approach.

Four contractors had been invited to attend for interview on 18th August 2005.
The contractors were: -

MMP Construction (NE), Bishop Auckland
Hall Construction Services Ltd., Rushyford.
Gus Robinson Developments Ltd., Hartlepool.
Thomas Armstrong (Construction) Ltd., Catterick.

The contractors had been informed that the following scoring system would operate:-

Quality: Price ratio 60: 40

References, Presentations and Interviews would account for 60% of the total score

Price would account for 40% of the total score.

The contractors had been required to confirm that the project could be built for the budget cost, and to submit their costs for Preliminaries, Overheads and Profit.

Following presentations and interviews, the scoring matrix was completed and the results were as follows: -

Constructor	A	B	C	D
References	19.92	18.65	20.00	18.88
Presentation and Interview	40.00	38.25	34.85	28.65
Price	40.00	31.55	26.28	0.00*
Total	99.92	88.45	81.13	47.53

* Contractor D had submitted an invalid tender at interview and his price was not considered.

Contract Procedure Rule 10(vii) states that the contractor with the highest Partnering Score would be accepted.

Contractor A, Gus Robinson Developments Ltd., would be appointed for this project.

FINANCIAL IMPLICATIONS

The overall budget for this project is £ 886,858.00. The Contractor had confirmed that the project could be built within the available budget and to the timescale required

DECISION

That the Panel agreed to receive this report for information.

49. LOCAL GOVERNMENT (ACCESS TO INFORMATION) ACT 1985

Under Section 100(A)(4) of the Local Government Act 1972, the press and public be excluded from the meeting for the following items of business on the grounds that it involves the likely disclosure of exempt information as defined in the paragraphs referred to below of Part 1 of Schedule 12A of the Local Government Act 1972 as amended by the Local Government (Access to Information) Act 1985

Minute 50 - Conservation Works to War Memorial at Victory Square and Winged Victory at the Headland (para 9) exempt information under 12A Local Government Act 1972 namely terms proposed or to be proposed by or to the Authority in the course of negotiations for a contract for the acquisition or disposal of property or the supply of goods or services – *Head of Procurement and Property Services*

Minute 51 - Tenders in respect of Burn Valley Gardens Phase II Environmental Works (para 9) exempt information under 12A Local Government Act 1972 namely terms proposed or to be proposed by or to the Authority in the course of negotiations for a contract for the acquisition or disposal of property or the supply of goods or services – *Head of Procurement and Property Services*

Minute 52 - Tenders in respect of the Supply of Fitness Room Equipment for the Borough Buildings Sports Hall (para 9) exempt information under 12A Local Government Act 1972 namely terms proposed or to be proposed by or to the Authority in the course of negotiations for a contract for the acquisition or disposal of property or the supply of goods or services – *Acting Director of Adult and Community Services*

**50. CONSERVATION WORKS TO WAR MEMORIAL AT VICTORY SQUARE AND WINGED VICTORY AT THE HEADLAND – (para 9) –
*Head of Procurement and Property Services***

Members were requested to approve a Select List of Contractors for conservation work in respect of the above.

**51. TENDERS IN RESPECT OF BURN VALLEY GARDENS PHASE II ENVIRONMENTALS WORKS – (para 9) –
*Head of Procurement and Property Services***

Members were informed that tenders had been invited in respect of the above contract.

**52. TENDERS IN RESPECT OF THE SUPPLY OF FITNESS ROOM
EQUIPMENT FOR THE BOROUGH BUILDINGS SPORTS HALL –
(para 9) – *Head of Procurement and Property Services***

Members were informed that tenders had been invited in respect of the above contract.

P RAYNER

CHAIRMAN

<p style="text-align: center;">CONTRACT SCRUTINY PANEL</p> <p style="text-align: center;">10th October, 2005</p>
--



Report of: Acting Director of Adult and Community Services

Subject: SUPPLY OF FITNESS ROOM EQUIPMENT FOR THE
BOROUGH BUILDINGS SPORTS HALL

1. PURPOSE OF REPORT

- 1.1 To advise Members on the outcome of the selection of contractors for the supply of fitness room equipment for the Borough Buildings Sports Hall.

2. BACKGROUND

- 2.1 On 26th September, 2005 this Panel received and opened submissions from four companies tendering for the supply of fitness room equipment only (**Form A**) and the supply of the same equipment supported by an IT based fitness and retention management package (**Form B**) for the Borough Buildings Sports Hall. The following companies submitted tenders:-

- * Precor Products Ltd, Berkshire
- * Technogym UK Ltd, Berkshire
- * Life Fitness (UK) Ltd, Cambridgeshire
- * Pulse Fitness, Cheshire

- 2.2 As members will be aware from this meeting, the Borough Buildings Sports Hall is an externally funded project supported by a variety of funding partners. At the time of advertising the fitness tender (which was dictated by available timescales), the preferred choice was for the provision of equipment with an IT package. However, Officers were awaiting for clarification on the availability of funding for this, which again, as Members will be aware, has since been made. Since funding is available, Officers therefore have only evaluated those tenders submitted on tender **Form B**.

- 2.3 Hereafter and in no particular order, the submissions made by the companies in paragraph 2.1 are referred to by letters A to D.

- 2.4 The evaluation of these tenders comprised of an assessment of the submissions based on price/quality through an agreed marking mechanism under procedures as set out in Paragraph 13 of the General provisions relating to Contract Procedure rules. Potential suppliers were informed in

advance that this assessment would be made on the basis of 50% price and 50% quality.

3. EVALUATION

3.1 As there is a vast range of equipment available on the market with considerable differences in the functionality, features and quality of each individual piece of kit, very detailed information specifying equipment requirements was made available in advance.

3.2 Companies were then asked to tender information on the basis of whether they were able to meet these standards or not. Tenders were then evaluated in this way, taking mainly the following factors into consideration:-

- * A company's ability to supply cardio vascular and resistance equipment to the required specification. For example, leading users through work programmes, allowing them to view progress, whether the equipment was IFI (Inclusive Fitness Initiative) accredited, whether unauthorised use of equipment could be prevented and whether wireless integration with the IT fitness management package for maximum flexibility was possible.
- * A company's ability to supply an IT based fitness management package to the required specification. For example, whether all equipment was compatible with the system, whether the system operated the equipment through a pre-programmed reading device (smartcard or key reader) for safety and ease of use, whether the system could "lock out" equipment to prevent unauthorised access, whether the system captured 100% of usage data and whether an Internet based facility could be provided for users to log non fitness room based activities.
- * Evidence of usage data provided being able to support health care initiatives such as GP Referral tracking.
- * A company's ability to provide a comprehensive call-out and service contract for all of the equipment. For example, guaranteed response times and 24 hours 7 days a week on-line fault logging via the Internet.
- * A company's ability to provide an ongoing training and support package for staff, extending to after the new facility is opened.
- * A company's ability to deliver and install equipment by the end of December, 2005.
- * A proven track record in the fitness industry.

3.3 **Appendix 1** sets out the price and quality scores for tenders A to D, with the higher scores indicating lower price, higher quality or a combination of both. As can be seen, Company B scored the highest.

- 3.4 Company B are Technogym UK Ltd. The evaluation process highlighted the technologically advanced equipment provided by the company that will provide an improved experience for all users, whether a GP Referral client or someone who more regularly exercises. They also proved to be the only company who could provide resistance equipment to the required specification.
- 3.5 More importantly, the evaluation team were impressed with the existing working relationship that Technogym have already developed with the Health sector. This has involved a joined up approach working directly with them in developing their IT based fitness and retention management package, "Wellness". As a consequence, it is believed that the data available from this system will be of significant interest to our own PCT in the future.

4. RECOMMENDATIONS

Panel are invited to note the award of the Contract for the supply of fitness room equipment and an IT fitness and retention management package for the Borough Buildings Sports Hall to Technogym UK Ltd.

CONTACT OFFICER: John Mennear, Acting Assistant Director (Cultural Services)

Background Papers

Contract Scrutiny Panel 26th September, 2005.

FITNESS EQUIPMENT – BOROUGH BUILDINGS SPORTS HALL
SCORING OF SUBMISSIONS

Company	Quality Mark	Price Mark	Total Score
A	29.75	50	79.75
B	47.5	35	82.5
C	29	39	68
D	29.5	44	73.5