

CAB3258 - APPENDIX 1

This document provides an appraisal of procurement options considered for the decked Park and Ride Car Park at the Vaultex Site, Winchester.

Procurement Option	Pros	Cons	Conclusion
<p>Procurement Hub – Major Projects Framework (MPF)</p> <p>Framework Expiry date: 08 May 2022</p> <p>Contractor: Willmott Dixon</p>	<p>The framework is compliant with the Public Contract Regulations 2015 and the Councils Contract Procedure Rules.</p> <p>An appropriate sole supplier (contractor) has been appointed to the framework via a competitive and robust OJEU compliant two stage tender (restricted) process.</p> <p>The Framework operates on a direct award basis; the benefit being the project can commence as soon as possible, ensuring delivery within the required timeframe.</p> <p>The sole supplier is accountable to the Council for the whole project; rationalising contract management activities.</p> <p>The framework provides for a design and build contract which reduces timescales for delivery compared to having separate contracts.</p> <p>Robust open book market testing is conducted at</p>		<p>Recommended:</p> <p>Able to meet project timelines for delivery</p> <p>Robust and transparent supplier monitoring processes in place - providing reassurance that public monies are not being put at risk</p> <p>Minimum targets for social values which align with the council's Procurement and Contract Management</p>

Procurement Option	Pros	Cons	Conclusion
	<p>each gateway to provide cost certainty. Each works package will be tendered by the contractor and the Council will have sight of the tenders to ensure we can satisfy ourselves that best value is being achieved.</p> <p>The framework is free to join and utilise. As is standard practice the contractor is required to pay the framework owner a management fee for the procurement and running of the framework.</p> <p>There is provision for a no commitment, free feasibility study (RIBA 1) to inform initial project costs, risks, opportunities and constraints and an indicative programme for delivery.</p> <p>Gateway options are outlined in the MPF which are robust and align closely with the stage payment schedule agreed with the LEP for the LEP grant funding.</p> <p>MPF mandates that the selected partner must submit fully transparent financial information on turnover, work in progress, sales, debtors and creditors on a regular basis (this is the only UK framework to carry out monthly financial audit checks)</p> <p>MPF commits to the following minimum social value percentages that will be returned to</p>		Strategy

Procurement Option	Pros	Cons	Conclusion
	<p>communities through social engagement activities on each project:</p> <p>Framework Year:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> 1- 10% of contract value 2- 12% of contract value 3- 14% of contract value (current year) 4- 16% of contract value <p>The framework provides flexibility in which form of model contract is used.</p>		
<p>Scape Group – Major Works</p> <p>Framework Expiry date: 31 May 2021</p> <p>Contractor: Willmott Dixon</p>	<p>The framework is compliant with the Public Contract Regulations 2015 and the Councils Contract Procedure Rules</p> <p>An appropriate sole supplier (contractor) has been appointed to the framework via a competitive and robust OJEU compliant two stage tender (restricted) process.</p> <p>The Framework operates on a direct award basis; the benefit being the project can commence as soon as possible, ensuring delivery within the required timeframe.</p> <p>The sole supplier is accountable to the Council for the whole project; rationalising contract</p>	<p>There is no breakaway clause after the feasibility work. The next break is after RIBA 4 (planning approved and detailed design agreed) – this increases risk, as a greater level of commitment and spend is required upfront.</p> <p>A NEC model form contract must be used; less flexibility on choice of contract</p>	<p>Not recommended:</p> <p>The Procurement Hub provides more flexibility regards contract terms</p>

Procurement Option	Pros	Cons	Conclusion
	<p>management activities.</p> <p>The framework provides for a design and build contract which reduces timescales for delivery compared to having separate contracts.</p> <p>Robust open book market testing is conducted at each gateway to provide cost certainty. Each works package will be tendered by the contractor and the Council will have sight of the tenders to ensure we can satisfy ourselves that best value is being achieved.</p> <p>The framework is free to join and utilise. As is standard practice the contractor is required to pay the framework owner a management fee for the procurement and running of the framework.</p> <p>There is provision for a no commitment, free feasibility study (RIBA 1) to inform initial project costs, risks, opportunities and constraints and an indicative programme for delivery.</p> <p>Financial checks are regularly undertaken in connection with the financial stability of the supplier. As part of contract monitoring, financial checks would be taken at appropriate stages</p> <p>All Projects operate with strict minimum standards of fair payment, waste diversion,</p>		

Procurement Option	Pros	Cons	Conclusion
	<p>community engagement, training and apprenticeships.</p> <p>Scape commits to the following minimum social value percentages on each project:</p> <p>Framework Year:</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none">1 10% of contract value2 12% of contract value3 14% of contract value4 15% of contract value		

Procurement Option	Pros	Cons	Conclusion

Procurement Option	Pros	Cons	Conclusion
<p>Scape Group – Civil Engineering Framework.</p> <p>Expiry date: 29 January 2023</p> <p>Contractor: Balfour Beatty</p>	<p>The framework is compliant with the Public Contract Regulations 2015 and the Councils Contract Procedure Rules.</p> <p>An appropriate sole supplier (contractor) has been appointed to the framework via a competitive and robust OJEU compliant two stage tender (restricted) process.</p> <p>The Framework operates on a direct award basis, the benefit being the project can commence as soon as possible, ensuring delivery within the required timeframe.</p> <p>The sole supplier is accountable to the Council for the whole project; rationalising contract management activities.</p> <p>The framework provides for a design and build contract which reduces timescales for delivery compared to having separate contracts.</p> <p>Robust open book market testing is conducted at each gateway to provide cost certainty. Each works package will be tendered by the contractor and the Council will have sight of the tenders to ensure we can satisfy ourselves that best value is being achieved.</p> <p>The framework is free to join and utilise. As is</p>	<p>There is no breakaway clause after the feasibility work, next break is after RIBA 4 (planning approved and detailed design agreed) – this increases risk, as a greater level of commitment and spend is required up front.</p> <p>A NEC model form contract must be used therefore less flexibility on choice of contract.</p>	<p>Not recommended:</p> <p>Social values are an integral part of this framework and are subject to key performance measures however, there appears to be no minimum targets unlike the Procurement Hub and The Scape Major Works.</p> <p>The Procurement Hub provides more flexibility regards contract terms</p>

Procurement Option	Pros	Cons	Conclusion
	<p>standard practice the contractor is required to pay the framework owner a management fee for the procurement and running of the framework.</p> <p>There is provision for no commitment, free feasibility study (RIBA 1) to inform initial project costs, risks, opportunities and constraints and an indicative programme for delivery.</p> <p>Financial checks are regularly undertaken in connection with the financial stability of the supplier. As part of contract monitoring, financial checks would be taken at appropriate stages</p> <p>All Projects operate with strict minimum standards of fair payment, waste diversion, community engagement, training and apprenticeships.</p>		
The Council conducts an		The timescale required will be significantly longer than if utilising a framework agreement that allows	Not recommended:

Procurement Option	Pros	Cons	Conclusion
Open OJEU Tender process	<p>The process is compliant with the Public Contract Regulations 2015 and the Councils Contract Procedure Rules.</p> <p>There is provision to tailor the tender and selection process specific to this opportunity.</p>	<p>for direct award. A minimum of 4 months from drafting a specification to appointment would be required. The council will be unable to deliver the project within the timescales as set out by the LEP if this procurement process is selected.</p> <p>There is the possibility that the council could be overwhelmed with tender responses as you cannot cap the number of tenders received. This could delay further evaluation and award.</p> <p>Significant Officer time would be required to draft tender documents and undertake evaluation.</p>	<p>unable to meet the critical timescales to deliver this project and utilise LEP funding.</p> <p>Available frameworks are OJEU compliant.</p>
The Council Conducts a	The process is compliant with the Public Contract Regulations 2015 and the Councils Contract	The timescale required will be significantly longer than when utilising a framework agreement as a	Not recommended:

Procurement Option	Pros	Cons	Conclusion
Restricted OJEU Tender process	<p>Procedure Rules.</p> <p>There is provision to tailor the tender and selection process specific to this opportunity.</p> <p>A two stage tender process limits the number of suppliers invited to full tender and reduces Officer time spent on evaluation compared to an open OJEU tender process.</p>	<p>minimum of 5 ½ months from drafting specification to appointment is required. The Council will be unable to deliver the project within the timescales as set out by the LEP if this procurement process is selected.</p> <p>Still unable to cap the number of first stage Suitability Questionnaires (SQ) received. If a large number of suppliers submit an SQ the length of time for evaluation of Stage 1 may increase.</p> <p>Significant Officer time required to draft tender documents and manage the procurement process.</p>	<p>unable to meet the critical timescales to deliver this project and utilise LEP funding.</p> <p>Available frameworks are OJEU compliant.</p>
GEN 4-2 Civil Engineering,	The framework is compliant with the Public Contract Regulations 2015 and the Councils	The timescale required to run a further competition will be significantly longer than a direct award. A	Not recommended:

Procurement Option	Pros	Cons	Conclusion
<p>Highways and Transportation Infrastructure Framework</p> <p>Expiry date: April 2024</p>	<p>Contract Procedure Rules.</p> <p>Eight suppliers have been appointed to the framework following a competitive and robust OJEU compliant two stage tender (restricted) process.</p> <p>Further competition to select a supplier would need to be undertaken. Selection is based on quality and price.</p> <p>The successfully appointed supplier is accountable to the Council for the whole project; rationalising contract management activities.</p> <p>The framework provides for a design and build contract which reduces timescales for delivery compared to having separate contracts.</p> <p>The framework is free to join and utilise. As is standard practice the contractor is required to pay the framework owner a management fee for the procurement and running of the framework.</p> <p>The Council have used the GEN 3-1, GEN 3-2 and recently GEN 4-2 before albeit much smaller schemes (£500k & under) and therefore has knowledge of how the framework operates.</p> <p>Supplier's performance is monitored by the</p>	<p>minimum of 3 months from drafting specification to appointment would be required. The Council will not be able to deliver the project within the timescales as set out by the LEP if this framework process is selected</p>	<p>unable to meet the critical timescales to deliver this project and utilise LEP funding.</p>

Procurement Option	Pros	Cons	Conclusion
	<p>framework providers.</p> <p>Social Value is an integral part of the framework</p>		
Southern Construction Framework	The framework is compliant with the Public Contract Regulations 2015 and the Councils	The timescale required to run a further competition will be significantly longer than a direct award. A minimum of 3 months from drafting specification to	Not recommended: unable to meet the

Procurement Option	Pros	Cons	Conclusion
<p>(SCF)</p> <p>Framework Expiry Date: Jun 2023</p>	<p>Contract Procedure Rules.</p> <p>Eight suppliers have been appointed to the framework following a competitive and robust OJEU compliant two stage tender (restricted) process.</p> <p>Further competition to select a supplier would need to be undertaken. Selection is based on quality and price</p> <p>The framework is free to join and utilise. As is standard practice the contractor is required to pay the framework owner a management fee for the procurement and running of the framework.</p> <p>Social value is included in the selection criteria for further competitions.</p>	<p>appointment would be required. The Council will not be able to deliver the project within the timescales as set out by the LEP if this framework process is selected</p> <p>A feasibility study would be an additional service where as both the Procurement Hub and Scape frameworks provide free feasibility studies and the option to withdraw from the process at that point.</p>	<p>critical timescales to deliver this project and utilise LEP funding</p>
<p>NHS – Car Park Management and</p>	<p>The framework is compliant with the Public Contract Regulations 2015 and the Councils</p>	<p>Finance option is not required.</p> <p>Five suppliers are listed on this Lot however, most</p>	<p>Not recommended: unable to meet the</p>

Procurement Option	Pros	Cons	Conclusion
<p>Infrastructure (CPMI) Framework (Lot 1) Expires 29 Nov 2022</p>	<p>Contract Procedure Rules.</p> <p>Lot 1 is for car park design, build and finance.</p> <p>A direct award or further competition option is available.</p>	<p>are providers of management services of car parks.</p> <p>A justifiable direct award is unlikely. The timescale required to run a further competition will be a minimum of 3 months from drafting specification to appointment. The Council will not be able to deliver the project within the timescales as set out by the LEP if this framework process is selected.</p> <p>Considering the financial costs and the importance of delivering this scheme for the district a supplier whose core activity is construction would be preferred.</p>	<p>critical timescales to deliver this project and utilise LEP funding and also concerns about the core activity of the suppliers on the framework.</p>