

CONTRACT SCRUTINY PANEL AGENDA



Monday 10th July 2006

at 10:00 am

in Committee Room 'A'

MEMBERS: CONTRACT SCRUTINY PANEL:

Councillors Brash, S Cook, Henery, Lilley and Sutheran

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 22nd June 2006 (*attached*)
- 3.2 To confirm the minutes of the meeting held on 26th June 2006 (*attached*)

4. ITEMS FOR INFORMATION

- 4.1 Major Improvements to the Public Reception Facilities at the Civic Centre to form a new Contact Centre – *Head of Procurement and Property Services*

5. ITEMS FOR DECISION

No items

6. ANY OTHER ITEMS WHICH THE CHAIRMAN CONSIDERS ARE URGENT

CONTRACT SCRUTINY PANEL

MINUTES AND DECISION RECORD

22nd June 2006

PRESENT: Councillor Geoff Lilley (in the Chair)
Councillors Jonathan Brash, Shaun Cook and Gordon Henery

OFFICERS: Mike Ward, Chief Financial Officer
Paul Hamilton, Insurance Officer/Risk Manager
Pauline Newton, Principal Legal Executive
Jo Wilson, Democratic Services Officer

7. APOLOGIES FOR ABSENCE

Apologies were received from Councillor Lilian Sutheran

8. DECLARATIONS OF INTEREST

None

9. 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) (Variation) Order 2006).

Minute 10 - Insurance Tenders for all classes of business (para 3) – exempt information under 12A Local Government Act 1972 namely information relating to the financial or business affairs of any particular person (including the authority holding that information – *Chief Financial Officer*

10. INSURANCE TENDERS FOR ALL CLASSES OF BUSINESS – (para 3) – *Chief Financial Officer*

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

G LILLEY
CHAIR

CONTRACT SCRUTINY PANEL

MINUTES AND DECISION RECORD

26th June 2006

PRESENT: Councillor Geoff Lilley (in the Chair)
Councillors Jonathan Brash, Gordon Henery and Lilian Sutheran

OFFICERS: John Lewer, Public Transport Co-ordinator
Dave Wilson, Principal Engineer (Engineering Consultancy)
Pauline Newton, Principal Legal Executive
Jo Wilson, Democratic Services Officer

11. APOLOGIES FOR ABSENCE

Apologies were received from Councillor Shaun Cook

12. DECLARATIONS OF INTEREST

None

13. CONFIRMATION OF MINUTES OF THE MEETING HELD ON 12th JUNE 2006

The minutes were confirmed

14. 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) (Variation) Order 2006).

Minute 15 - Hartlepool/Stockton Countryside Bus (para 3) – exempt information under 12A Local Government Act 1972 namely information relating to the financial or business affairs of any particular person (including the authority holding that information – *Public Transport Coordinator*)

Minute 16 - Middleton Grange Multi-Storey Car Park – Waterproofing Works – Phase 1 (para 3) – exempt information under 12A Local Government Act 1972 namely information relating to the financial or business affairs of any particular person (including the authority holding that information – *Principal Engineer (Structural)*)

15. HARTLEPOOL/STOCKTON COUNTRYSIDE BUS – (para 3) – *Public Transport Coordinator*

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

**16. MIDDLETON GRANGE MULTI-STOREY CAR PARK –
WATERPROOFING WORKS – PHASE 1 – (para 3) - *Principal Engineer (Structural)***

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

G LILLEY

CHAIR

CONTRACT SCRUTINY PANEL

10th July 2006



Report of: Head of Procurement and Property Services

Subject: MAJOR IMPROVEMENTS TO THE PUBLIC
RECEPTION FACILITIES AT THE CIVIC CENTRE
TO FORM A NEW CONTACT CENTRE.

1. PURPOSE OF REPORT

- 1.1 To advise members of the outcome of the selection of a contractor for this project.

2. BACKGROUND

- 2.1 The Performance Management Portfolio Holder agreed that this project should be procured using a partnering approach.

Six contractors were invited to attend for interview on 9th June 2006.

The contractors were informed that the following scoring system would operate :

Quality : Price ratio 60:40

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

- 2.2 The Finance and Performance Management Portfolio Holder approved the procurement strategy for this project at the meeting on 9th January 2006. This included the procurement of the Contact Centre works using a partnering approach.
- 2.3 Expressions of interest were received and six contractors were invited to attend for interview on 9th June 2006, following prequalification checks.
- 2.4 The Contractors were:-

Walter Thompson, Northallerton

Lotus Construction Ltd, Otley
 Paragon Interiors Group plc, Nottingham
 Gus Robinson Developments Ltd, Hartlepool
 Banner Holdings, Chesterfield
 Mitie Property Services Ltd, Cramlington

Lotus Construction Ltd sent their apologies for not being able to attend for interview or quote at this time due to workload.

- 2.5 The Contractors were informed of the evaluation process which was based on the following scoring system:-
 Quality : Price ratio 60:40

- 2.6 Quality evaluation included:-
- | | | |
|--------------|---|--------------------|
| Presentation |) | |
| Interview |) | 60% of total score |
| References |) | |

Presentation and Interview

Each member of the panel scored each question out of a total of 10. The score for each Contractor was calculated. The Contractor with the highest score was awarded 100%. The other scores were calculated as a percentage of the highest score. The resultant scores were entered into a matrix to allow a best value score to be calculated. The presentation and interview score accounted for 40% of the total score.

References

References were obtained from previous Clients. The Contractor with the highest score was awarded 100%. The other scores were calculated as a percentage of the highest score. The resultant scores were entered into a matrix to allow a best value score to be calculated. The references accounted for 20% of the total score.

- 2.7 Price evaluation included:-
- | | | |
|---------------|---|--------------------|
| Preliminaries |) | |
| Overheads |) | 40% of total score |
| Profits |) | |

Pricing

Each contractor was asked to indicate this percentage overheads and profit on the works to be carried out. These were then entered into a scoring matrix to produce a theoretical price for the works. The Contractor who provided the lowest costs was awarded 100%. The other scores were calculated as a percentage of the highest score. The resultant scores were entered into a matrix to allow a best value score to be calculated. The pricing score accounted for 40% of the total score.

- 2.8 The Contractors were required to confirm that the project could be built for

the budget cost and within the required timescale.

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

Constructor	A	B	C	D	E
References	20.00	18.53	19.94	19.19	0.00
Presentation & Interview	40.00	35.74	27.01	32.29	37.21
Price	38.12	36.10	40.00	33.91	36.50
Total	98.12	90.37	86.95	85.39	73.71

- 2.10 Contract Procedure Rule 10 (vii) states that the contractor with the highest Partnering Score will usually be awarded the Contract.

Constructor A, Gus Robinson Developments Ltd, fulfils all requirements and will be appointed for this project.

3. **FINANCIAL IMPLICATIONS**

- 3.1 The overall construction budget for this project is £768,444.00. The Contractor has confirmed that the project can be built within the available budget and to the timescale required.

4. **RECOMMENDATIONS**

- 4.1 That the Panel receives this report for information.