



APPENDIX B

Tender Evaluation Matrix for the appointment of the Main Contractor to undertake the Maylands Urban Realm Improvements

Cabinet October 2015

Appendix B: Tender Evaluation Matrix for the appointment of the Main Contractor to undertake the Maylands Urban Realm Improvements

Maylands Urban Realm Works															
				T. LOUGHMAN & Co.				MURRILL CONSTRUCTION				BLAKEDOWN CONSTRUCTION Ltd.			
Evaluation Criteria	Sub-criteria	Overall Score (%)		Pass/Fail	Notes			Pass/Fail	Notes			Pass/Fail	Notes		
		Sub Headings Weighting													
Financial Appraisal	Financial assessment on Main Contractor	Pass/Fail													
Previous Experience	Company experience in carrying out contracts similar to the Maylands Urban Realm Works	Pass/Fail		Pass	Good selection of projects, but mostly under £1m (apart from Haringey and Marlowes Bus Station). T/O £2.8-4.8m			Pass	Good relevant experience. T/O £9-14m.			Pass	Good range of projects but with landscape emphasis. T/O £9-10m.		
	Contracts or commissions terminated early	Pass/Fail			None.				None.				None.		
Technical Capability	Details of project team management structure, key people and sub-contractors / suppliers	15%	100 marks	3	9.00%	Good project team proposed. SuperColour and street lighting sub-contractors named. No proposed Resource Schedule. No reference to Aecom as novated design consultants.		3	9.00%	Good management structure, cross referenced to Project Team (4.10).		3	9.00%	Good Organogram of Project Team.	
	Confirmation of licence to work on the Highway – Hertfordshire County Council	Pass/Fail		Pass	Licence NA. All insurances in place.			Pass	Licence NA. All insurances in place.				Licence NA. All insurances in place.		
Quality	Method Statements of how works will be carried out (approach)	20%	40 marks	3	4.80%	Objectives established. Well-considered TM. Logical phasing proposed. Comprehensive list of work tasks. No reference to key logistical issues. Risk management assessed under 4.9.		4	6.40%	Works sequence well considered. Comprehensive summary of work tasks. Specific (detailed) and generic Method Statements given. TM proposals limited. No reference to key logistical issues. Main risk as inclement weather. Risk management assessed under 4.9.		3	4.80%	General good approach but lacking in detail. No Method Statements submitted. No reference to key logistical issues. Risk management assessed under 4.9.	
	Health & Safety and Risk Management		30 marks	3	3.60%	Policy Statement good, but generic, and general approach thorough. No Key Risks identified.		4	4.80%	H&S Management well covered in general terms. Key risk identified as buried services. General measures given for dealing with risk, including 'designing-out'.		4	4.80%	Good H&S management procedures and specific Risk Register provided.	
	Method Statements on Management		30 marks	3	3.60%	Strong Management and Site Teams with relevant experience. No detail given on liaison with Project Team and Client. Monitoring of site performance/quality included in Method Statement.		4	4.80%	Proposed Integrated Management Structure given in 4.10. Good approach to Site Management, including how proposed team structure will align with the existing Project Team and Client Organisation. List of Employers Agents Meeting attendees seems unrealistic. Sub-contractors identified.		4	4.80%	Generally good approach to Site Management, and including co-ordination arrangements with Project/Client Team.	
Programme	Design, Procurement and Construction Programme of works including sequence and timing of the principal parts	15%	100 marks	4	12.00%	Detailed Works Programme submitted, but no provision for design or site investigation. Requested to re-consider specific programme requirements. Comprehensive response on Programme issues following clarification request.		3	9.00%	Detailed Programmes submitted. Start date needs to be adjusted. Timing of construction design not informed by SI data. Requested to re-consider specific programme requirements. Revised Programme not submitted in response to clarification request.		1	3.00%	Detailed Programme not provided. Reference to Schedule 14 inadequate. Requested to re-consider specific programme requirements. No further Programme details submitted in response to clarification request.	
Price	Value Engineering and Value Management	50%	10 marks	3	3.00%	Value Management covered in general terms. Value Engineering identified 5 possible measures, but no costs given.		4	4.00%	6 opportunities for Value Engineering identified and costed.		2	2.00%	Some potential Value Engineering savings considered but not costed.	
	Total Costs for the Project		90 marks	90	45.00%	£1,138,881.03. Clarifications requested on rates given for Site Clearance, SuperColour and luminaires. No Exclusions or Assumptions. In response to clarification request, will stand by tender rates.		76	38.00%	£1,289,981.93. Clarifications/understanding requested for various Assumptions & Exclusions. In response to clarification request, additional £22,632.79 for lamp columns. Possible addition for electric connection if private supply. Will otherwise stand by tender rates.		72	36.00%	£1,432,618.75. Clarification requested on rate given for street light columns. In response to clarification request, will stand by tender rates.	
SUMMARY															
Pass / Fail				Pass				Pass				Pass			
Quality				33.00%				34.00%				26.40%			
Cost				48.00%				42.00%				38.00%			
TOTAL				81.00%				76.00%				64.40%			