

Appendix 2: Award Report

Carlton & Granville Design Team

Following the EOI 3 suppliers were invited to a mini-competition under the GLA ADUP framework.

Evaluation Team

Name	Position	Organisation
Emma Sweeney	Senior Project Manager – Evaluator	Brent Council
Richard Barrett	Head of Estates Regeneration – Evaluator	Brent Council
Pooja Agrawal	Regeneration - Evaluator	GLA
Lesley Benson	Key Stakeholders	Granville Plus Nursery School
Mark Allan	Key Stakeholders	South Kilburn Trust
Breda Hillman	Procurement - Moderator	Brent Council

The submissions were evaluated based on the following:

Quality / Technical	Area weighting	Overall weighting
Design Approach and Vision	25%	60%
Confirmed Deign Team	20%	
Produce a Consultation Strategy	15%	
Social Value	Area weighting	Overall weighting
Social Value Offer	5%	10%
Social Value Delivery	5%	
Combined Quality and Social Value Threshold – 42% out of the available 70%		
Commercial - Cost		Overall weighting
Cost submission		30%
Total		100%

The Scoring method used was as follows:

Score	Description
0	The information required is either omitted or fundamentally fails to meet the relevant submission requirements or to address the Authority's requirements. Insufficient evidence to support the proposal to allow the Authority to evaluate. Unacceptable.
1	The information submitted has insufficient evidence to demonstrate that the relevant submission requirements or the 'Authority's requirements can be met. Significant omissions, serious and/or many concerns. Poor.
2	The information submitted has some minor omissions in respect of the relevant submission requirements or the Authority's requirements. The tender satisfies the basic requirements in some respects but is unsatisfactory in other respects and raises some concerns. Fair.
3	The information submitted provides some good evidence to meet the relevant submission requirements or the Authority's requirements and is satisfactory in most respects and there are no major concerns. Good.

Score	Description
4	The information submitted provides good evidence that all the submission requirements or the Authority's requirements can be met. Full and robust response, any concerns are addressed so that the proposal gives confidence. Very Good .
5	The information submitted provides strong evidence that all the submission requirements or the Authority's requirements can be met and the proposal exceeds expectation i.e. exemplary in the industry provides full confidence and no concerns. Outstanding

Below is a summary of the quality evaluation.

Quality/Technical Evaluation	Weighting	Supplier 1		Supplier 2		Supplier 3	
		Score	Result	Score	Result	Score	Result
Design Approach and Vision	25%	4	20.00%	2	10.00%	2	10.00%
Confirmed Design Team	20%	4	16.00%	3	12.00%	3	12.00%
Produce a Consultation Strategy	15%	4	12.00%	2	6.00%	2	6.00%
Quality Total	60%		48.00%		28.00%		28.00%

Submissions overall were good, however, the evaluation showed a clear divide between the winning bidder and the other two suppliers. The highest scoring supplier showed a very strong vision with good design concept that incorporated housing. They also had a very good understanding of the locality and they gave a very detailed approach to consultation.

Social Value	Weighting	Supplier 1		Supplier 2		Supplier 3	
		Score	Result	Score	Result	Score	Result
Offer	5%	4	4.00%	4	4.00%	4	4.00%
Delivery	5%	4	4.00%	4	4.00%	2	2.00%
Total Social Value	10%		8.00%		8.00%		6.00%

The highest scoring supplier gave social value commitments that included a £10k community contribution to projects, 6 work placements, 4 lecturers and talks in schools and aim to work with Brent job centres to offer job opportunities/apprenticeships.

The financial evaluation was worth 30%.

The scoring was based on: Best (lowest) price receives the maximum score available in this section; the remaining bids receive a score pro rata to the best price using the following calculation.

Bids were evaluated on the basis of a fixed price lump sum for the delivery of the Masterplan/Design scheme to RIBA Stage 3. The following is the scores from the Financial Evaluation

Commercial	Weighting	Supplier 1	Supplier 2	Supplier 3
Costs submission		£ 531,713.00	£ 619,106.00	£ 628,854.00
Total Commercial	30%	30.00%	25.77%	25.37%

Supplier 1 had the lowest price and therefore received maximum prices. The resources allocated by all bidders were similar but with different rates.

Bidders were also asked to provide an additional optional fixed price for RIBA Stage 4. This was stated that it may or may not be taken up by the council. The value for RIBA Stage 4 for bidder 1 is £295,666 which was cheaper than the other bidders.

These was further additional costs identified which did not form part of the evaluation but may be taken up by the council if required. This included surveys and assessment that may be required. The total additional costs identified were £81,730.

Overall Summary

The following is the result from the Quality/Social Value and Financial evaluation.

Overall Summary	Weighting	Supplier 1	Supplier 2	Supplier 3
Quality/Technical	60%	48.00%	28.00%	28.00%
Social Value	10%	8.00%	8.00%	6.00%
Commercial	30%	30.00%	25.77%	25.37%
Total	100%	86.00%	61.77%	59.37%

Recommendations

The recommendation is to award the contract to supplier 1 to commence as soon as possible. Supplier 1 is a well know Architectural Company that has many projects throughout London and the UK.