

NORTH LONDON WASTE AUTHORITY

REPORT TITLE:

CONSULTANCY SERVICES PROCUREMENT

MANAGING DIRECTOR

FOR SUBMISSION TO:

NORTH LONDON WASTE AUTHORITY

DATE:

13 FEBRUARY 2014

SUMMARY OF REPORT

This report informs Members of the outcome of the procurement exercise for planning and technical consultants, and recommends appointment of consultants.

RECOMMENDATIONS

That the Authority:

Agrees that the following appointments be made:

- For Lot 1: Planning Consultancy Services – Waste Planning: Bidder 1A
- For lot 2: Technical Consultancy Services – Waste Forecasting and Modelling: Bidder 2B
- For Lot 3: Technical Consultancy Services – Non-thermal Solutions: Bidder 3A
- For Lot 4: Technical Consultancy Services – Thermal Solutions: Bidder 4A

SIGNED:

Managing Director

DATE: 4 February 2014

1. Background and Purpose of Paper

- 1.1 As reported to the Authority at its meeting on 12 December 2013, the Authority published a notice in the Official Journal of the European Union (Ref: 2013/S 224-389993) on 19 November 2013, inviting tenders for the provision of consultancy services in relation to its plans for future waste disposal services.
- 1.2 The invitation was to submit tenders for the following workstreams:
- Lot 1: Planning Consultancy Services – Waste Planning
 - Lot 2: Technical Consultancy Services – Waste Forecasting and Modelling
 - Lot 3: Technical Consultancy Services – Non-thermal Solutions
 - Lot 4: Technical Consultancy Services – Thermal Solutions
- 1.3 The procurement was conducted in accordance with the open procedure under Directive 2004/18/EC as implemented by the UK Public Contracts Regulations 2006 (as amended).

2. Tender Receipt and Assessment Process

- 2.1 By the required time of 12.00 noon on 30 December 2013, the Authority had received the following tenders for each lot. No tenders were received after that date and time. All tenders received complied with the formal requirements for submission documentation.

Table 1: Tenderers

Lot 1 - Waste Planning	Lot 2 - Waste Forecasting and Modelling	Lot 3 - Non-thermal Solutions	Lot 4 - Thermal Solutions
1A	2A	3A	4A
1B	2B		4B
1C			
1D			
1E			

The names of the tenderers are given in the Part II report on this agenda.

- 2.2 The Authority assessed all tenderers on minimum requirements and reserved the right to exclude economic operators where they were ineligible to tender on a ground specified in Regulation 23 of the Public Contracts Regulations 2006; or have failed to satisfy the minimum standards required by economic operators by the contracting authority in relation to economic or financial standing or technical or professional ability as set out in Table 2 below.
- 2.3 Tenders received from tenderers who passed the minimum requirements were evaluated in accordance with the most economically advantageous tender, with a weighting of 50% to cost and 50% to quality. The full evaluation criteria are set out in the Invitation to Tender document.

3. Assessment of Minimum Requirements

3.1 Table 2 below shows the assessment of minimum requirements for each Lot.

Table 2: Minimum Requirements

Tenderer	Financial Minimum Requirements	Technical Minimum Requirements
1A	Y	Y
1B	Y	Y
1C	Y	Y
1D	Y	N
1E	Y	Y
2A	Y	Y
2B	Y	Y
3A	Y	Y
4A	Y	Y
4B	Y	Y

3.2 All tenderers were able to meet the financial minimum requirements.

3.3 Bidder 1D failed to meet the technical minimum requirements. All other tenderers met these requirements.

3.4 Bidder 1D's tender was evaluated during the period while officers sought to clarify whether the minimum technical requirements were met.

4. Evaluation Results

4.1 The evaluation scores for Lots 1-4 in relation to each of the tenderers in accordance with the evaluation framework is shown in sections 5-8 below.

5. Conclusions – Lot 1

5.1 Table 3 below shows the scores in ranking order. 1A is the top ranked tenderer and 1B is ranked second. The gap between 1A and 1B is 5.57 marks.

5.2 Even though 1D did not meet the minimum requirements, their tender has been evaluated in full. This does not affect the overall result of the evaluation as this tender ranks in 4th place.

- 5.3 It is recommended that Lot 1 is awarded to Bidder 1A.

Table 3: Summary of the Evaluation Scores – Lot 1

Tenderer	Total Weighted Score			Ranking
	Cost (0/50)	Quality (0/50)	Total (0/100)	
1A	43.57	46.00	89.57	1
1B	48.00	36.00	84.00	2
1C	48.00	31.00	79.00	3
1D	49.00	27.00	76.00	4
1E	43.00	31.00	74.00	5

6. Conclusions – Lot 2

- 6.1 Table 4 below shows the scores in ranking order. 2B is the top ranked tenderer and 2A is ranked second. On 27 January, interviews were held with both bidders as their draft scores (based upon evaluation of their submissions) were only 1 mark apart.
- 6.2 As a result of the interview, the scores were adjusted upward for bidder 2A in accordance with the evaluation framework.
- 6.3 It is recommended that Lot 2 is awarded to Bidder 2B.

Table 4: Summary of the Evaluation Scores – Lot 2

Tenderer	Total Weighted Score			Ranking
	Cost (0/50)	Quality (0/50)	Total (0/100)	
2A	49.00	44.00	93.00	2
2B	49.00	45.00	94.00	1

7. Conclusions – Lot 3

- 7.1 In Lot 3 bidder 3A was the sole tenderer. Whilst there was no competition for this lot, the bidder scored highly, achieving a score of 91 out of 100. The prices quoted were significantly below the benchmark. Their bid also scored very well on quality (43/100).
- 7.2 It is recommended that Lot 3 should be awarded to bidder 3A

8. Conclusions - Lot 4

- 8.1 Table 5 below shows the scores in ranking order. Bidder 4A is the top ranked tenderer and bidder 4B is ranked second. The gap between the tenderers is 5 marks.
- 8.2 It is recommended that Lot 4 is awarded to bidder 4A.

Table 5: Summary of the Evaluation Scores – Lot 4

Tenderer	Total Weighted Score			Ranking
	Cost (0/50)	Quality (0/50)	Total (0/100)	
4A	48.00	44.00	92.00	1
4B	48.00	39.00	87.00	2

9. Conclusion

- 9.1 The Authority is recommended to agree the award of contracts under all lots to the bidders identified above. Officers will then issue standstill letters to all the tenderers notifying them of the outcome of the evaluation process, and confirm arrangements for contract execution with the winning tenderers.

10. Legal Adviser Comments

- 10.1 The procurement has been carried out in accordance with the open procedure under the Public Contracts Regulations 2006 (as amended).

11. Finance Adviser Comments

- 11.1 Each of the recommended tenderers is the topped ranked for the relevant workstream and has met the Authority's minimum financial and technical requirements.

Background papers:

- OJEU notice (ref: 2013/S 224-389993)
<http://ted.europa.eu/udl?uri=TED:NOTICE:389993-2013:TEXT:EN:HTML>
- Amendment notice (ref: 2013/S 230-399420)
<http://ted.europa.eu/udl?uri=TED:NOTICE:399420-2013:TEXT:EN:HTML>
- Invitation to Tender
- Memorandum of Information
- Contract for Consultancy Services
<http://www.nlwa.gov.uk/procurement/consultancy-services-procurement>

Contact

Ursula Taylor
Head of Legal and Governance
North London Waste Authority
Unit 360, Lee Valley Technopark
Ashley Road, Tottenham
London N17 9LN

Tel: 020 8489 4306

Fax: 020 8365 0254 E-mail: post@nlwa.gov.uk