


SEATON JURASSIC VISITOR CENTRE

INTERPRETATION CONTRACTOR

Tender Report

January 2015

**SEATON
JURASSIC**

Author	Jeremy Dunn Senior Associate Director	Signed 
Approved	Andrew Gilbert Director	Signed A. Gilbert

Job No.	14-2562PM
Date	21/01/2015
Issue No.	1
Revision	2

CONTENTS:

- 1.0 INTRODUCTION
 - 2.0 ANALYSIS OF TENDER
 - 3.0 COMPARISON TO BUDGET
 - 4.0 CONCLUSIONS & RECOMMENDATIONS
-
- APPENDIX A - TENDER DOCUMENTS & BRIEF
 - APPENDIX B - TENDER CLARIFICATIONS
 - APPENDIX C - TENDER REGISTER, MONITORING FORM AND FORMS OF TENDER
 - APPENDIX D - PART 1, TENDER REVIEW SHEETS AND SUMMARY
 - APPENDIX E - PART 2, GUIDANCE NOTES, TENDER REVIEW SHEETS AND SUMMARY
 - APPENDIX F - STANDARD INTERVIEW QUESTIONS
 - APPENDIX G - POST INTERVIEW EVALUATION SPREADSHEET

1.0 INTRODUCTION

1.1 General

1.1.1 This report deals with the tender issued in respect of the Interpretation Contractor for the Seaton Jurassic Visitor Centre project. This commission will complete the final design of the Interpretation fit out element of the project and carry out its construction for the Seaton Jurassic Visitor Centre.

1.1.2 The brief and Stage D Detailed Design for the works was agreed by both East Devon District Council (EDDC) and Devon Wildlife Trust (DWT) and included within the tender documents.

1.1.3 The tender documents were reviewed by EDDC and the process and documents were approved as meeting EDDC Standing Orders. The proposed appointment document for the commission was agreed by EDDC and was issued as part of tender documentation.

1.1.4 The evaluation of the tenders included financial and non-financial factors and included the following:

- Professional and business standing.
- Economic and financial standing.
- Bidder's technical capacity and capability – an assessment of:
 - The bidder's technical and professional capability to deliver the works.
 - The experience and resources available to the bidder.
 - The bidder's track record in delivering similar works.

1.1.5 Part 1, Sections A to E was marked on a pass or fail criteria. The remaining sections of the tenders were evaluated on a most economically advantageous tender basis with a 70% weighting on quality and 30% on price.

1.1.6 Part 2, Section F the quality questions, was judged using the percentage scores detailed in red against the three questions identified in the tender documents.

1.1.7 Part 3, Section G the commercial offer, was judged by taking the average price of all the tender returns. This was judged to equal 50% of the available marks. Individual tenders were then awarded points above and below the average percentage relative to their tender price.

1.2 Interpretation Tender

- 1.2.1 Tender documents for the works were prepared by WWA and uploaded to the EDDC website on the 12th November 2014. Advertisements detailing the opportunity were placed in the Western Morning News (paper and website) and the Museums Association website. The stated tender return date was 8th December 2014.
- 1.2.2 Thirteen Contractors registered an interest and downloaded the tender information from the EDDC website. A full list of those who registered is available in Appendix C and they are summarised below;
- Ecological Construction Solutions (Lloyd Turner Ltd)
 - Paragon Creative
 - Beck Interiors
 - Scena
 - Acoustiguide Limited / Espro Acoustiguide Group
 - MET Studio Design
 - Leach Colour
 - LCI Productions Ltd
 - SYSCO
 - The Hub
 - Hartnell Creative Communication Limited
 - Greendale Construction Limited
 - Museums & Heritage Consultant
- 1.2.3 One week before the original tender return date, four of the registered Contractors had confirmed that they would be returning a full tender provided that an extension of time could be granted. These were; Ecological Construction Solutions, [REDACTED], [REDACTED] and [REDACTED]. At their request and to ensure that tenders had sufficient time to complete the tender documentation the tender return date was extended by five days and then subsequently by the following weekend.
- 1.2.4 On the 9th December [REDACTED] confirmed that they were withdrawing from the tender process and on the 11th December [REDACTED] confirmed their withdrawal.
- 1.2.5 Of the other registered contractors, the reasons for not submitting a tender were;
- Current workload
 - Number of project currently being tendered and timescales involved
 - Capacity to be able to undertake the project
- 1.2.6 Within the tender period four clarifications were issued by WWA – these are documented within Appendix B. After considered requests from the tendering Contractors, the date for return of tenders was first extended to 17:00 on 12th December 2014 and subsequently to 17:00 on 15th December 2014.
- 1.2.7 By the stated time two bona fide tenders were received from; Ecological Construction Solutions (Lloyd Turner Ltd) and [REDACTED].
- 1.2.8 The tenders were opened on 15th December 2014 at 6pm and the tender figures and contract periods recorded on the Tender Monitoring Form (see Appendix C). Appendix C also includes the returned Forms of Tender.

1.2.9 Due to the reduced number of tender returns WWA contacted both EDDC and HLF to ensure that the tender process would be considered valid. WWA informed them on 11th December that only two tenders were likely to be received. On the 15th December on behalf of the HLF, Roy Steel and Tom Brewer confirmed that they accepted that the tender was valid subject to receiving a full tender report.

1.2.10 The following tenders were received for the works:

Tenderer	Pre-Construction Stage		Construction Stage		
	Fee	Nr of days	Prelims	Overheads & Profit	Nr of days
Pre-tender estimate	£ 40,000.00	40 days	£100,000.00	-	35 weeks
Ecological Construction Solutions	£4,200.00	15 days	£102,105.00	1.8%	37 weeks
██████████	£66,497.20	45 days	£196,284.00	10.0 %	50 weeks

1.2.11 As part of the tender evaluation, Contractors were requested to attend an interview where they were asked to give a presentation on their tender and overall approach to the project. These took place on 18th December 2014.

2.0 ANALYSIS OF TENDERS

- 2.1 Both tenderers returned bona-fide tenders by the appointed time. These were opened by Jeremy Dunn and Andrew Gilbert (both WWA). Both submission had included accompanying letters and had accepted the terms and conditions of the tender and appointment.
- 2.2 Part 1, Sections A to E were marked on a pass or fail basis by Jeremy Dunn (17th December 2014) and checked by Tom Bates. The record of the marking by tender review sheet is detailed in appendix D.
- 2.3 Before the tender process Helen Shackleton had declared a personal connection with Ecological Construction Solutions. Due to this she was not included in the tender marking process other than to provide a single marking review of the Section F of the [REDACTED] return. This marking session was carried out on the morning of the interviews and no contact with Ecological Construction Solutions was made ahead of their interview.
- 2.4 Part 2, Section F of the tender was judged using the percentage scores detailed in red with each question. The marking was carried out individually by; Harry Barton (DWT) and Jeremy Dunn (WWA) on 17th December 2014. Alison Hayward (EDDC) did not individually mark the tender returns but was present for the tender interviews and the post interview evaluation.
- 2.5 Once the individual marking had occurred a review session which moderated and agreed the overall scores was held and the results recorded on the summary spreadsheet. The individual marking sheets, guidance notes and summary spreadsheet are detailed in appendix E.
- 2.6 Part 3, Section G, the commercial offer. The tendered costs were entered in to the evaluation spreadsheet. From the tender return the following breakdown of the costs and time by stage was identified;

Tenderer	Pre-Construction Stage		Construction Stage		
	Fee	Nr of days	Prelims	Overheads & Profit	Nr of days
Pre-tender estimate	£ 40,000.00	40 days	£100,000.00	-	35 weeks
Ecological Construction Solutions	£4,200.00	15 days	£102,105.00	1.8%	37 weeks
[REDACTED]	£66,497.20	45 days	£196,284.00	10.0 %	50 weeks

- 2.7 The tenders were examined arithmetically and no errors were found within.
- 2.8 No post tender clarifications were required.
- 2.9 Ecological Construction Solutions (Lloyd Turner Ltd) and [REDACTED] were invited to attend an interview on 18th December 2014. The interviews were structured to give 20 minutes for the Contractor to introduce their team and summarise their tender responses. 40 minutes was allowed for questions following the presentation. The interviews were carried out by Alison Hayward (EDDC), Harry Barton (DWT) and Jeremy Dunn (WWA). A standard list of questions was identified which is detailed in appendix F.

- 2.10 Following the interviews the evaluation spreadsheet was reviewed. Only the marking criteria detailed in the tender were used to make any adjustments to the post tender review. The final evaluation sheet is detailed in appendix G.
- 2.11 The pertinent points summarised from the evaluation are;

Ecological Construction Solutions (Lloyd Turner Ltd)

Part 1 issues;

- Turnover, £226k in 2013, consideration and credit check should be carried out to ensure that they financially can undertake the project.
- Check workload commitments due to size of project.
- PI insurance, quote provided for the correct cover, if successful should be in place before the first payment under the pre-construction agreement.
- Limited number of personnel, check ability to manage the works and backup procedures.
- Basic QA, Environmental and Equality Statements, these should be updated during the project.

Part 2 issues;

- Good C.V.'s and project experience.
- Projects of lower value than this commission.
- Risk analysis acceptable
- Detailed programme of works

Interview notes;

- Strong team which has worked together before and supply chain in place.
- Future workload issue confirmed as not an issue as all other projects will be completed by March 15.
- Confirmed that the cost plan is acceptable and the project can be delivered within the budget.
- Confirmed programme is acceptable.
- Back up management needs further clarification.
- Financial checks required.
- "Ability to drive the project and ensure decisions are made" needs further clarification.
- Draft preliminaries to be reviewed to ensure value for money and exact requirements.

Part 1 issues;

- Credit check required due to Parent Company structure.
- Check if Parent Company Guarantee (PCG) would be available.
- At interview check H&S procedures following accident and prosecution.

Part 2 issues;

- Good C.V.'s and project experience.
- Projects of higher value than this commission, some foreign examples.
- Risk analysis did not consider mitigation measures.
- Detailed programme of works.

Interview notes;

- Strong team with good background, supply chain in house.
- Good management structure but will need 4 weeks to familiarise themselves with the project.

- Confirmed PCG would not be made available.
- Confirmed changes to H&S and management structures, good response.
- Confirmed committed to design principles.
- Provided updated cost plan at interview with additional £200k costs, not able to provide solutions to this issue.
- Confirmed programme is acceptable, and with adaption could meet the key delivery dates.
- Draft preliminaries to be reviewed to ensure value for money and exact requirements.

3.0 COMPARISON TO APPROVED BUDGET

- 3.1 The pre contract budget for the works was identified as £40,000. Ecological Construction Solutions (Lloyd Turner Ltd) tendered fee was £4,200, however, we would expect that works they have budgeted in the off-site construction works will be required during this phase. We would recommend that EDDC allow for an approval of £40,000.
- 3.2 [REDACTED] pre contract fee was £66,497.20, £26,497.20 over the current budget.
- 3.3 Ecological Construction Solutions (Lloyd Turner Ltd) confirmed that the current budget for the construction works was acceptable and could be delivered on budget.
- 3.4 [REDACTED] confirmed that they currently would require an additional £200k to deliver the construction works.
- 3.5 WWA have carried out a limited financial check as part of the tender review, however, the clients should satisfy themselves in this regard and carry out any further checks prior to the award of the contract.

4.0 CONCLUSIONS & RECOMMENDATIONS

- 4.1 One of the two tenders submitted is within the pre-construction fee budget of £40,000.
- 4.2 All tenders have been assessed on a 'level playing field'.
- 4.3 No arithmetical errors were identified.
- 4.4 The tender process has been checked with the HLF and EDDC and they have confirmed that the process is acceptable and considered valid.
- 4.5 ██████████ would require additional funds to deliver the pre-construction and construction phases of the works. Although their tender return form indicated that they could not meet the programme they have since confirmed that it could be achieved.
- 4.6 Ecological Construction Solutions (Lloyd Turner Ltd) tender is within the pre-construction budget. With a review of the Prelims requirements they have confirmed that the project can be delivered within the construction budget. They have confirmed that the project can be delivered to the programme.
- 4.7 Ecological Construction Solutions (Lloyd Turner Ltd) offered a competitive price with good experience and a style that matched DWT's ambitions for the design. We therefore recommend that Ecological Construction Solutions (Lloyd Turner Ltd) are awarded the contract.
- 4.8 We recommend that prior to the award of the contract;
- That the Clients satisfy themselves with regard to the financial stability of the Contractor.
 - That the Clients satisfy themselves with regard to the management backup available to the Contractor.
 - That the Clients satisfy themselves with regard to ability of the Contractor to ensure that decisions are made in a timely manner and that they can drive the project.
 - That final approval from HLF is obtained to award the contract.
- 4.9 We recommend, subject to the items identified in 4.8, that the tender of Ecological Construction Solutions (Lloyd Turner Ltd) be accepted and a Contract be entered into.
- 4.10 The clients should also note that;
- Before the first payment to Ecological Construction Solutions (Lloyd Turner Ltd) under the pre-construction agreement a copy of the full PI Insurance certificate should be sought.
 - During the project Ecological Construction Solutions (Lloyd Turner Ltd) should be encouraged to develop more detailed QA, Environmental and Equality Statements.