

	<p style="text-align: center;">Executive 27th May 2008</p> <p style="text-align: center;">Report from the Director of Environment and Culture</p>
<p style="text-align: right;">Wards Affected: All</p>	
<p>Approval of the Award of Contracts for Highway Maintenance Works</p>	

Forward Plan Ref: E&C-07/08-047

Appendices 5 and 6 to this report are not for publication.

1.0 Summary

- 1.1 This report requests authority to award contracts as required by Contract Standing Order No 88. This report summarises the process undertaken in tendering these contracts and, following the completion of the evaluation of the tenders, recommends which suppliers should be appointed.

2.0 Recommendations

- 2.1 The Executive to approve the appointment of the contractors listed in **Appendix 1** to the Highways Maintenance framework agreements, from 1st August 2008 for 3 years with the option of a one-year extension.

3.0 Detail

- 3.1 The highway contracts are used to complete highway responsive maintenance works, planned maintenance works such as footway upgrades and carriageway resurfacing and deliver the majority of highway improvement schemes including traffic calming schemes, bus priority schemes, controlled parking zones, cycle network schemes, and town centre improvements. The contracts are also used to deliver improvements for other council services including Housing and Parks on an internal trading account basis. The planned maintenance works are typically funded by the Council's capital and revenue budgets and the principal road and other various highway improvement schemes by the Transport for London (TfL) allocation or Section 106 funding. Officers in Transportation manage these projects using the services of the

Executive
27th May 2008

Version 11.1
8th May 2008

various contractors for the different elements of the work which minimises lead in times and also improves flexibility to changes in design following public consultation.

- 3.2 The 8th October 2007 Executive granted the Director of Environment & Culture the authority to invite tenders adopting the European Public Procurement restricted 'two stage' process. It was agreed that the Council's overall requirements would be split into six lots, each tendered as a separate framework agreement. The names of the lots are shown in **Appendix 1**.
- 3.3 The essence of a framework agreement is that at contract commencement, the exact requirements of the Council are not known. As a result the contract pricing is based on a schedule of rates (Pricing Schedule). When tendering, each contractor inserts a rate against each item in the schedule of rates. This enables staff within the Transportation Service Unit to cost each of the different schemes during the term of the contract. When the scheme is ready to go ahead, an order (or "specific contract" under EU terminology) is placed using the tendered prices. This type of contract is typically used for services when the demand for each and every item, over a year or longer, is impossible to predict.

Invitation to Tender – Key Issues

- 3.4 In October 2007 a contract notice was placed in the Official Journal of the European Union and adverts placed in the Wembley Observer, the New Civil Engineer and The Surveyor. These invited expressions for a two-stage tender process for all 6 lots. There was no indication at this stage whether any lot would be on the basis of a single-party appointment or a multi-party appointment – where more than one contractor is appointed to a framework, the EU rules require that a minimum of three are appointed.
- 3.5 The Council indicated in its adverts that the Transfer of Undertakings (Protection of Employment) legislation (TUPE) could apply to some of the lots. Detailed correspondence with the current contractors took place, leading to advice from the Council's solicitors that TUPE potentially applied to lots 2, 3 and 6.
For these lots, it was decided that tenderers were required to submit two pricing schedules, one on the basis of TUPE applying to transfer all the staff identified by the current contractors, and one on the basis that no staff would transfer.
- 3.6 In relation to the submission of the pricing schedules, tenderers were advised that models jobs would be used to evaluate these. For each of the six lots, the evaluation panel produced a series of model or typical jobs. The prices for every item forming part of a model job would then be used to reach a priced model job or jobs for each tender. The totals for each model job were then multiplied by a factor to arrive at the estimated annual value for that job. Further detail of the methodology for evaluating price is set out in **Appendix 2**.

Evaluation of Pre-Qualification Questionnaires

- 3.7 In response to the adverts referred to in paragraph 3.4, a total of 39 enquiries were received and firms were sent a draft 'specification of requirements' and a pre-qualification questionnaire to complete and return by 26th November 2007. A total of 26 completed select list questionnaires were received. Shortlisting was carried out by an Evaluation Panel comprised of representatives from:
- Transportation Unit (3)
 - Procurement Unit (2)
 - Legal Services
 - Financial Services
 - Management Services

In addition, the health and safety and the sustainability sections of the questionnaire were separately assessed by officers specialising in these areas. The Evaluation Panel assessed the contractors' financial viability, technical ability, quality assurance and their approach to health & safety and environment & sustainability. The technical ability questions were quite detailed in asking for information about resources such as depots and about supply arrangements for materials. This exercise resulted in the following number of contractors being shortlisted for each of the six contract lots and invited to formally submit tenders:

Lot	Lot Description	Number of contractors invited to tender	Number of contractors submitted tender
1	Machine Surfacing	10	9
2	Hand Surfacing	9	6
3	Footway Relay	7	6
4	Anti Skid Surfacing	6	4
5	Street Furniture Painting & Incidental Repairs/Replacement	6	5
6	Line Markings	8	6

Tender Evaluation

- 3.8 Contractors were sent tender packs including tendering instructions, contract conditions and specifications.
- 3.9 Tenderers had an opportunity to indicate any discounts that would apply should they be successful in being awarded a contract for more than one lot.
- 3.10 Tenderers were advised that the contracts would be awarded on the basis of the tenders which are most economically advantageous to the Council.
- 3.11 To determine which tenders are the most economically advantageous tenderers were advised that the Evaluation Panel would use the criteria and weightings listed below (the split of 70% price and 30% quality was agreed by the Executive in October 2007) :

Executive 27 th May 2008	Version 11.1 8 th May 2008
--	--

Evaluation Criteria	Weighting
Price	70%
Proven ability to meet the requirements of the Works Specification	12%
Approach to the delivery of the Works	7%
Approach to ensuring that standards are achieved	6%
Development of a working relationship with the Council	5%

- 3.12 Tenderers were required to submit a series of method statements, around four or five method statements for each of the four quality criteria listed in the table above.
- 3.13 Tenders for each lot had to be submitted to the Democratic Services Manager as set out in the tender document. All tenders were received in various days within March 2008 (different days for the different lots) and they were opened by two council officers at the Town Hall.
- 3.14 The Panel member from Financial Services inserted the submitted prices/rates into the models described in paragraph 3.6.
- 3.15 The Method statements for assessing quality were initially evaluated by four individual officers from the Evaluation Panel. Each method statement was given a score of between 0 and 3 by each individual. These four officers met with the Chair of the Evaluation Panel throughout the first three weeks of April 2008 to discuss the method statements submitted and agree a combined score for each quality criterion. Evaluation sheets were used throughout to record the score and note down comments on how well each of the award criteria was addressed.

Recommendation

- 3.16 Following the separate price and quality evaluations referred to above, the Evaluation Panel met to collate all the different scores. The Panel's agreed recommendations for contract award are as set out in **Appendix 1**. For each contract, three suppliers are to be appointed as this is the minimum requirement for a multi-framework agreement under EU legislation. The Acting Head of Highways considers that the Council will need to ensure that adequate resources are available to deliver highways works, and single-supplier frameworks do not guarantee this, even for the lower value lots. Also it is considered that multi-framework agreements would mitigate the risk of schemes not being completed on time which could result in a loss of external funding.
- 3.17 In making the recommendation to the Executive, there is a clear focus on price because of the agreed weighting of 70%. This was agreed by the evaluation panel in consideration of value for money and maximising the impact of the budgets available to improve the highway network. However, although the qualitative issues were only weighted at 30%, the successful tenderers all scored satisfactorily and are particularly strong on their experience in service delivery in similar contracts. Officers in Transportation will monitor the

performance of suppliers and compliance to the conditions of contract through their quality management systems.

- 3.18 The new Highway Maintenance contracts will be let for an initial period of three (3) years, with the option to renew for a further one (1) year, subject to satisfactory performance.
- 3.19 The overall evaluation methodology and a summary of results are outlined in **Appendix 2 (Overall scores for quality and price), Appendix 3 (quality scores), Appendix 5 (detailed pricing scores – not for publication). The identities of all tenders is as shown in Appendix 6** (not for publication).

Next Steps

- 3.20 To ensure any TUPE arrangements are in place before the new contracts start (see section 7 below), the current Highway Maintenance contracts have been extended by one month under the Director of Environment and Culture's delegated powers and will now expire on 31st July 2008.
- 3.21 As already indicated, the successful contractors are being appointed to framework agreements. Three suppliers are appointed to each framework agreement. They have no guarantee of work under the contract. However tenderers were advised that the cheapest supplier would be given preference. The cheapest supplier has been identified for each lot and preference will be given to this supplier in the allocation of works orders, with other suppliers in the framework being allocated work as additional resources are required. The schedule of rates within each contract document include the various items required to carry out highways work. If any future schemes include work or materials not covered under the term contract, a 'mini-competition' procedure will be utilised whereby all the suppliers in the framework will be invited to provide a quotation.

4.0 Financial Implications

- 4.1. The Council's Contract Standing Orders state that contracts for services exceeding £500k shall be referred to the Executive for approval of the award of the contracts.
- 4.2. The estimated value of this contract is in excess of £30 million over an initial period of three (3) years, rising to £40 million if the option to extend is taken up. This expenditure will be met from the annual Capital and Revenue budgets and TfL funding during the four years.
- 4.3 The estimated annual value of work if each contractor carried out the current budgeted level of work can be found in **Appendix 4**. It should be noted that this level of work at £7.7M is lower than the estimated total contract sum in 4.2 as it does not take account of additional monies that may become available during the year from section 106 / traffic management schemes etc. which will be charged at the new rates from August 2008.

4.4 The final cost for each lot will depend on the volume of work awarded to each contractor in line with the framework agreement and it is therefore not possible to provide a definitive answer on the impact these tendered prices will have on current budgets. However it is possible to assess the best case scenario, based on the number one ranked contractor carrying out all work and the worst case scenario, based on an even split of work between all contractors. The Appendix shows that based on these assumptions the best case is an annual saving of £337K (4.38%) while the worst case is an annual increase of £529K (6.88%). The actual variation is likely to lie somewhere between these two extremes, however a number of other factors need to be considered in the likely final impact.

- (i) The new prices will not apply until August 2008 so the variance in the first year will only be a proportion of the above figures depending on the value of work completed at current prices.
- (ii) There is a significant saving on costs for Lot 1 (machine laid road resurfacing) of some £448K to £808K per annum but an increase in the costs for all other lots of £472K to £977K per annum. The extent that savings on Lot 1 can be vired to partly offset the increases on the other lots is limited to the schemes funded by Brent which only form 50% of the total. The remaining 50% comes largely from Transport for London and can not be vired. However it may be possible, if the Council can get the TfL resurfacing work completed early enough and at a saving, to apply to use this saving for other new schemes.
- (iii) The current year's capital programme approved by the Executive of 18th March 2008 made some allowance for the estimated increase in prices from July 2008. Officers will rework the costs of these approved schemes in the light of this contract award and will make any necessary virements to keep within the overall budget.

5.0 Legal Implications

5.1 Section 41 of the Highways Act 1980 imposes a duty on the Council to maintain

those highways for which it is the highway authority. This includes all the highways in the Borough except the North Circular Road.

5.2 The estimated value of these contracts over their lifetime is higher than the EU threshold for Works and the award of the contracts therefore is governed by the EU Public Procurement legislation. The award is subject to the Council's own Standing Orders in respect of High Value contracts and Financial Regulations.

5.3 The Council must observe the EU Regulations relating to the observation of a mandatory minimum 10 calendar day standstill period **before** the contract can be awarded. Therefore once the Executive has determined which tenderers should be appointed, all tenderers will be issued with written notification of the contract award decision. A minimum 10 calendar day standstill period will then be observed before the contract is concluded – this period will begin the day after all tenderers are sent notification of the award decision – and additional

debrief information will be provided to unsuccessful tenderers in accordance with the regulations. As soon as possible after the standstill period ends, the successful tenderers will be issued with a letter of acceptance and the contracts can commence on 1st August 2008.

- 5.4 In considering the recommendation to this report, Members must be satisfied that the recommended appointments represent the most economically advantageous tenders and that they will ensure best value for the Council.

6.0 Diversity Implications

- 6.1 The proposals in this report have been subject to screening and officers believe that there are no diversity implications for Brent staff.
- 6.2 For each contract, tenderers have outlined the steps and procedures they will take to minimise disruption and inconvenience to pedestrians. Their approach will be monitored by the Transportation Unit, particularly in regard to the safety and any hindrance of people with a disability.
- 6.3 Tenderers had a good approach to general diversity issues, for instance: “We are able to communicate in a variety of media and at frequencies to suit the various stakeholders” and from another tenderer, “in planning the works, we will identify stakeholders who require extra consideration associated with their business(deliveries) or personal circumstances (person with a disability)”.

7.0 Staffing/Accommodation Implications

- 7.1 Staff in the Transportation Service Unit manage the Highway Maintenance Works Contracts.
- 7.2 External contractors currently provide these services, and it is not proposed to bring any of these services ‘in-house’. In this event, there are no implications for Council staff arising from the award of the contracts.
- 7.3 As indicated above, TUPE may apply to transfer some staff from the current contractors for lots 2, 3 and 6. However for both lots 2 and 3 the current contractors who indicated that they may have staff to whom TUPE could apply have been appointed to the new frameworks for these lots and also for other lots. For lot 6, the current contractor has put forward two staff to whom TUPE may apply, but they have since left the company and a sub-contractor is performing their role. It is therefore possible that TUPE will not operate to transfer any staff. Ultimately the obligations under TUPE are imposed on the outgoing and incoming contractors but the Council seeks a smooth implementation of the new contracts and will facilitate the statutory consultation process if required. With this in mind, the current contracts will be extended by a month in order to allow a reasonable period for the necessary consultation should any staff transfer.

Background Papers

- Contract files 2002 - 2007

- Code of Practice for Highway Management
- Invitation to Tender 2008

Contact Officer

Sandor Fazekas, Acting Head of Highway Engineering, Transportation Services
Unit, Brent House, 349 High Road, Wembley, Middx HA9 6BZ
Tel: 020 8937 5113 E-mail: Sandor.Fazekas@brent.gov.uk

Richard Saunders
Director of Environment & Culture

APPROVAL OF THE AWARD OF CONTRACTS FOR HIGHWAYS MAINTENANCE WORKS.

1. Recommendations of the Evaluation Panel

Lot	Description	Recommended to be awarded to:		Rank
		Contractor	ID No.	
1.	Machine Surfacing	London Surfacing Company Ltd	8	1
		Aggregate Industries UK Ltd trading as Bardon Contracting	7	2
		Ringway Infrastructure Services Ltd	2	3
2.	Hand Surfacing	FM Conway Ltd	13	1
		Aggregate Industries UK Ltd trading as Bardon Contracting	15	2
		O'Hara Bros	12	3
3.	Footway Relay	J & B Construction Co. Ltd	19	1
		John Crowley (Maidstone) Ltd	16	2
		Aggregate Industries UK Ltd trading as Bardon Contracting	21	3
4.	Anti Skid Surfacing	John Crowley (Maidstone) Ltd	22	1
		J.Browne Construction Company Ltd	23	2
		FM Conway Ltd	24	3
5.	Street Furniture Painting & Incidental Repairs/Replacement	John Crowley (Maidstone) Ltd	26	1
		J & B Construction Co. Ltd	29	2
		J. Browne Construction Company Ltd	28	3
6.	Line Markings	Wilson & Scott (Highways) Ltd	37	1
		John Crowley (Maidstone) Ltd	32	2
		FM Conway Ltd	36	3

Overall Scores for Price and Quality

Identification Number	Lot 1			
	Quality (Max30)	Price (Max70)	Total (%)	Rank
1	25.16	35.85	61.01	4
2	26.51	35.34	61.85	3
3	16.31	42.71	59.02	5
4	14.18	34.59	48.77	8
5	25.84	30.70	56.54	7
6	20.85	15.11	35.96	9
7	27.87	40.00	67.87	2
8	20.85	50.99	71.84	1
9	28.83	29.73	58.56	6

Identification Number	Lot 2			
	Quality (Max30)	Price (Max70)	Total (%)	Rank
10	25.15	37.93	63.08	4
11	24.41	35.43	59.84	5
12	15.93	51.29	67.22	3
13	24.84	51.37	76.21	1
14	19.49	0.00*	19.49	6
15	27.68	45.75	73.43	2

Identification Number	Lot 3			
	Quality (Max30)	Price (Max70)	Total (%)	Rank
16	24.71	48.38	73.09	2
17	19.52	10.36	29.88	6
18	18.50	25.27	43.77	5
19	23.67	52.60	76.27	1
20	23.20	33.70	56.90	4
21	27.37	39.69	67.06	3

Identification Number	Lot 4			
	Quality (Max30)	Price (Max70)	Total (%)	Rank
22	24.18	45.19	69.37	1
23	19.03	44.35	63.38	2
24	24.85	33.96	58.81	3
25	26.80	16.50	43.30	4

Identification Number	Lot 5			
	Quality (Max30)	Price (Max70)	Total (%)	Rank
26	25.21	64.42	89.63	1
27	19.52	0.00*	19.52	6
28	20.45	46.62	67.07	3
29	20.13	56.82	76.95	2
30	21.65	30.34	51.99	4
31	24.00	13.55	37.55	5

Identification Number	Lot 6			
	Quality (Max30)	Price (Max70)	Total (%)	Rank
32	23.98	44.64	68.62	2
33	20.56	31.43	51.99	4
34	19.03	28.42	47.45	5
35	12.12	12.66	24.78	6
36	25.26	40.66	65.92	3
37	17.73	52.20	69.93	1

*Any negative scores have been converted to 0.00.

Note that Tenderers were asked to provide discounts for award of multiple lots. During the evaluation the only discount that came into play was that provided by Aggregate Industries trading as Bardon (1% for the award of Lots 1,2 & 3)

Methodology for scoring price

The totals for each model job were multiplied by a factor to arrive at the estimated annual value for that category of work.

These values were then totalled along with an assessment of the value of items not included in the model jobs and potential discounts to arrive at an estimated annual value for each lot. This estimated annual value was then converted to a score by giving the mean of all bids a score of 50 and then giving one mark up or down for each percentage point that the bidder's price varied from the mean. For example if a bidder's price was 10% below the mean it would score 60 out of 100 while a price 10% above would score 40 out of 100. This total out of 100 was then multiplied by 0.7 to reflect the 70% weighting for price in the overall evaluation.

Quality Scores

Methodology for Scoring Quality

Quality

Tenderers were required to provide a number of method statements under the following headings:

- Proven ability to meet the requirements of the Works Specification
- Approach to the delivery of the Works
- Approach to ensuring that standards are achieved
- Development of a working relationship with the Council

The response to each question in the tenderers method statement was discussed and evaluated by the Evaluation Panel and a score agreed using the following scoring key:

Score	Standard of Response
0	unacceptable or no information given or an
1	meets some of the requirements
2	meets the minimum requirements
3	meets the minimum requirements and adds value

Pre-determined weightings were applied to each question and the scores obtained multiplied by this weighting to arrive at a total.

The weightings for each of the four main criteria were then applied so as to arrive at a total “quality” score for each tender in line with the 30% weighting for “quality” in the overall evaluation.

Lot 1 Highway Maintenance - Quality Scores Machine Surfacing

<i>Tenderer Identification</i>	<i>Quality 30% Weighting</i>									
	<i>Section A</i>		<i>Section B</i>		<i>Section C</i>		<i>Section D</i>		<i>Sub Total</i>	
	<i>Points</i>	<i>12%</i>	<i>Points</i>	<i>5%</i>	<i>Points</i>	<i>7%</i>	<i>Points</i>	<i>6%</i>	<i>Points</i>	<i>Score</i>
3	37.50	7.50	15.00	2.50	35.00	4.08	20.00	2.22	107.50	16.31
5	55.00	11.00	30.00	5.00	41.50	4.84	45.00	5.00	171.50	25.84
6	36.00	7.20	22.50	3.75	41.50	4.84	45.50	5.06	145.50	20.85
7	53.50	10.70	30.00	5.00	60.00	7.00	46.50	5.17	190.00	27.87
1	50.00	10.00	30.00	5.00	48.50	5.66	40.50	4.50	169.00	25.16
8	42.50	8.50	20.00	3.33	43.00	5.02	36.00	4.00	141.50	20.85
2	51.00	10.20	30.00	5.00	45.50	5.31	54.00	6.00	180.50	26.51
9	55.00	11.00	30.00	5.00	60.00	7.00	52.50	5.83	197.50	28.83
4	31.50	6.30	15.00	2.50	19.00	2.22	28.50	3.17	94.00	14.18

- (a) Proven ability to meet requirements of the specification (12%)**
- (b) Development of working relationship with Council (5%)**
- (c) Approach to the delivery of works (7%)**
- (d) Approach to ensuring standards are met (6%)**

Lot 2 Highway Maintenance - Quality Scores Hand Laid Surfacing

<i>Tenderer Identification</i>	<i>Quality 30% Weighting</i>									
	<i>Section A</i>		<i>Section B</i>		<i>Section C</i>		<i>Section D</i>		<i>Sub Total</i>	
	<i>Points</i>	<i>12%</i>	<i>Points</i>	<i>5%</i>	<i>Points</i>	<i>7%</i>	<i>Points</i>	<i>6%</i>	<i>Points</i>	<i>Score</i>
11	40.50	8.10	30.00	5.00	45.50	5.31	54.00	6.00	170.00	24.41
14	31.50	6.30	22.50	3.75	40.00	4.67	43.00	4.78	137.00	19.49
13	50.00	10.00	30.00	5.00	41.50	4.84	45.00	5.00	166.50	24.84
15	54.00	10.80	30.00	5.00	57.50	6.71	46.50	5.17	188.00	27.68
10	48.50	9.70	30.00	5.00	51.00	5.95	40.50	4.50	170.00	25.15
12	36.50	7.30	15.00	2.50	33.50	3.91	20.00	2.22	105.00	15.93

- (a) Proven ability to meet requirements of the specification (12%)**
- (b) Development of working relationship with Council (5%)**
- (c) Approach to the delivery of works (7%)**
- (d) Approach to ensuring standards are met (6%)**

Lot 3 Highways Maintenance - Quality Scores Footway Relay

Tenderer Identification	Quality 30% Weighting									
	Section A		Section B		Section C		Section D		Sub Total	
	Points	12%	Points	5%	Points	7%	Points	6%	Points	Score
21	51.00	10.20	30.00	5.00	60.00	7.00	46.50	5.17	187.50	27.37
16	48.50	9.70	30.00	5.00	47.25	5.51	40.50	4.50	166.25	24.71
20	45.25	9.05	30.00	5.00	37.50	4.38	43.00	4.78	155.75	23.20
19	52.50	10.50	25.00	4.17	45.25	5.28	33.50	3.72	156.25	23.67
18	35.00	7.00	20.00	3.33	40.50	4.73	31.00	3.44	126.50	18.50
17	27.50	5.50	30.00	5.00	33.50	3.91	46.00	5.11	137.00	19.52

- (a) *Proven ability to meet requirements of the specification (12%)*
- (b) *Development of working relationship with Council (5%)*
- (c) *Approach to the delivery of works (7%)*
- (d) *Approach to ensuring standards are met (6%)*

Lot 4 Highway Maintenance - Quality Scores Anti Skid

<i>Tenderer Identification</i>	<i>Quality 30% Weighting</i>										
	<i>Section A</i>		<i>Section B</i>		<i>Section C</i>		<i>Section D</i>		<i>Sub Total</i>		
	<i>Points</i>	<i>12%</i>	<i>Points</i>	<i>5%</i>	<i>Points</i>	<i>7%</i>	<i>Points</i>	<i>6%</i>	<i>Points</i>	<i>Max. Points Posble</i>	<i>Score</i>
25	47.00	9.40	30.00	5.00	56.25	6.56	52.50	5.83	185.75	204.00	26.80
24	53.50	10.70	30.00	5.00	37.50	4.38	43.00	4.78	164.00	204.00	24.85
22	50.00	10.00	27.50	4.58	47.50	5.54	36.50	4.06	161.50	204.00	24.18
23	38.50	7.70	20.00	3.33	39.00	4.55	31.00	3.44	128.50	204.00	19.03

- (a) Proven ability to meet requirements of the specification (12%)**
- (b) Development of working relationship with Council (5%)**
- (c) Approach to the delivery of works (7%)**
- (d) Approach to ensuring standards are met (6%)**

Lot 5 Highway Maintenance - Quality Scores Street Furniture and Painting

<i>Tenderer Identification</i>	<i>Quality 30% Weighting</i>										
	<i>Section A</i>		<i>Section B</i>		<i>Section C</i>		<i>Section D</i>		<i>Sub Total</i>		
	<i>Points</i>	<i>12%</i>	<i>Points</i>	<i>5%</i>	<i>Points</i>	<i>7%</i>	<i>Points</i>	<i>6%</i>	<i>Points</i>	<i>Max. Points Posble</i>	<i>Score</i>
26	51.00	10.20	30.00	5.00	47.25	5.51	40.50	4.50	168.75	204.00	25.21
31	49.00	9.80	30.00	5.00	36.00	4.20	45.00	5.00	160.00	204.00	24.00
30	45.50	9.10	21.25	3.54	41.50	4.84	37.50	4.17	145.75	204.00	21.65
28	44.00	8.80	20.00	3.33	41.75	4.87	31.00	3.44	136.75	204.00	20.45
29	42.00	8.40	21.25	3.54	39.75	4.64	32.00	3.56	135.00	204.00	20.13
27	27.50	5.50	30.00	5.00	33.50	3.91	46.00	5.11	137.00	204.00	19.52

- (a) Proven ability to meet requirements of the specification (12%)**
- (b) Development of working relationship with Council (5%)**
- (c) Approach to the delivery of works (7%)**
- (d) Approach to ensuring standards are met (6%)**

Lot 6 Highway Maintenance - Quality Scores Line Marking

<i>Tenderer Identification</i>	<i>Quality 30% Weighting</i>										
	<i>Section A</i>		<i>Section B</i>		<i>Section C</i>		<i>Section D</i>		<i>Sub Total</i>		
	<i>Points</i>	<i>12%</i>	<i>Points</i>	<i>5%</i>	<i>Points</i>	<i>7%</i>	<i>Points</i>	<i>6%</i>	<i>Points</i>	<i>Max. Points Posble</i>	<i>Score</i>
36	51.50	10.30	30.00	5.00	42.50	4.96	45.00	5.00	169.00	204.00	25.26
32	49.00	9.80	27.50	4.58	47.50	5.54	36.50	4.06	160.50	204.00	23.98
33	42.00	8.40	22.50	3.75	38.75	4.52	35.00	3.89	138.25	204.00	20.56
34	38.50	7.70	20.00	3.33	39.00	4.55	31.00	3.44	128.50	204.00	19.03
37	36.50	7.30	11.25	1.88	39.00	4.55	36.00	4.00	122.75	204.00	17.73
35	20.50	4.10	15.00	2.50	23.00	2.68	25.50	2.83	84.00	204.00	12.12

- (a) Proven ability to meet requirements of the specification (12%)**
- (b) Development of working relationship with Council (5%)**
- (c) Approach to the delivery of works (7%)**
- (d) Approach to ensuring standards are met (6%)**

Estimated Values of Recommended Award and Comparison with Current Budget

Appendix 4

Lot1			Lot2			Lot3			Lot4			Lot5			Lot 6			TOTALS
ID	Est. Value	Rank	ID	Est. Value	Rank	ID	Est. Value	Rank	ID	Est. Value	Rank	ID	Est. Value	Rank	ID	Est. Value	Rank	Est. Value
2	2,829,284	3				16	4,040,681	2	22	209,242	1	26	104,387	1	32	307,453	2	4,661,763
									23	212,178	2	28	150,157	3				2,829,284
						19	3,739,893	1				29	123,909	2				362,335
			12	836,469	3													3,863,802
			13	835,321	1				24	248,497	3				36	327,714	3	836,469
															37	268,946	1	1,411,532
7	2,639,987	2	15	922,826	2	21	4,660,921	3										268,946
8	2,193,670	1																8,223,733
																		2,193,670

Budget 3,002,000 805,000 3,360,000 208,000 100,000 213,000 7,688,000

Best Case

All work to Rank 1 2,193,670 835,321 3,739,893 209,242 104,387 268,946 7,351,458
 Variance (£) -808,330 30,321 379,893 1,242 4,387 55,946 -336,542
 Variance (%) -26.93% 3.77% 11.31% 0.60% 4.39% 26.27% -4.38%

Worse Case

Even split of work 2,554,314 864,872 4,147,165 223,305 126,151 301,371 8,217,178
 Variance (£) -447,686 59,872 787,165 15,305 26,151 88,371 529,178
 Variance (%) -14.91% 7.44% 23.43% 7.36% 26.15% 41.49% 6.88%

Executive
27th May 2008

Version 11.1
8th May 2008