# TO: THE EXECUTIVE 11 MARCH 2014

#### AWARD OF PUBLIC REALM CONTRACTS

#### Annex 1: Evaluation Criteria

#### 1 EVALUATION RESULTS

- 1.1 The quality criteria and weightings used for evaluation are shown in Tables 1, 2 and 3. Each quality criteria had several elements relating to it and evidence had to be provided to back up any statements made. Both elements were scored.
- 1.2 The evaluation results are shown in confidential annexes in Tables 4, 5 and 6.
- 1.3 Each lot was evaluated separately and a winning bidder identified for each lot separately as shown in Tables 4 to 6.
- 1.4 Contractors bidding for more than one lot were asked to identify any financial efficiencies driven by the combination of services and also how these were derived in order that the Council could assure itself that the quality of services offered would not deteriorate. Any combination "discount" is not accounted for in Tables 4 to 6 but is detailed in the commentary.
- 1.5 The financial appraisal for Lot 1 was based on a "basket of services" which was derived by assessing spending patterns and quantities in recent years. This "price" is driven by a schedule of rates numbering 910 individual lines, a significantly less number than previously. There are also fixed priced elements of which the major sums relate to street lighting and gulley cleansing. Members should note the appraisal is for financial assessment only and does not reflect the actual cost of the service, this being determined by the Council's' capital and revenue provision and other sources of funding such as grant awards and developer contributions.
- 1.6 All potential contractors for Landscape Services obviously met or exceeded the minimum financial saving set for them of £50,000 per annum otherwise their bid would have been pointless. However, the assessment process required that contractors must first pass a quality threshold which was set at 80% before any reference would be made to the financial basis of the contract. In the event, the recommended contractor for Lot 3 offered the highest quality bid and the lowest price.

#### Unrestricted

#### NON- CONFIDENTIAL ANNEXE

## Table 1 – Evaluation Criteria for Lot 1 Highways Maintenance and Works

Total Cost 60%

Quality Criteria 40%	<u>Weighting</u>
Quality Statements	
Client Satisfaction – Product	5
Client Satisfaction – Service	13
Right First Time	9
Cost	10
Time	3
Health and Safety	5
Key People Submission	10
Schedule of Resources	5
Register of Risks	5
Method Statements	
Winter Service	4
Street Lighting	5
Emergency Service	4
Gully Cleansing	5
Town Centre and Ascot	3
ICT	3
Asset Management Data	4
Customer Services option	3
Percentages and rates	4
	100

#### NON- CONFIDENTIAL ANNEXE

## Table 2 – Evaluation Criteria for Lot 2 Street Cleansing

Total Cost 60%

Quality Criteria 40%	Weighting
General Management of the Contract	10
Service Delivery	20
Cleansing of Bracknell Town Centre	10
Public Toilets	5
Effective Working with Other	5
Contractors	
Key Performance Indicators	6
Recycling	6
Neighbourhood Retail Areas	6
Customer Service (Option)	5
Fly Tipping, Hazardous Waste, Drugs and Sharps	5
Bins	5
Traffic Management	6
SME's, Community Support, Special	5
Events	
Control of Weeds and Vegetation	6
	100

# NON- CONFIDENTIAL ANNEXE

## Table 3 – Evaluation Criteria for Lot 3 Grounds Maintenance

## <u>Total Cost:</u> Must reduce in-house cost by a <u>minimum</u> £50,000

Quality Criteria : 80% threshold	Weighting
General Management of the Contract	9
Service Delivery	20
Grounds Maintenance within Bracknell Town Centre	9
Effective Working with Other Contractors	5
Key Performance Indicators	5
Recycling and Management of Green Waste	8
Customer Service (Option)	5
Landscape Design Services, Tree Services	4
Closed Burial Grounds, Closed Landfill Sites	4
Schools and Educational Establishments	20
Traffic Management	6
SME's, Community Support, Special Events	5
	100