

LLDC - East Wick and Sweetwater

Evaluation of Stage 1 (PQQ) Responses - January 2013

Instructions to evaluators

The evaluation sheet in the 'Eval Sheet' tab below has designed to assist us with tracking our evaluation of the PQQ responses.

Please complete your relevant section of the evaluation sheet in the 'Eval Sheet' tab below.

Against the relevant criteria / sub-criteria please add the score (or pass / fail) in the corresponding shaded row.

Please add further details and justification for your score in the box below this.

If you have any question please contact x or x.

Thank you

LLDC - East Wick and Sweetwater

Evaluation of Stage 1 (PQQ) Responses - January 2014

Stage 1 Evaluation Scoring Matrix		Section Weighting	Sub- Section Weighting
1) General Information Received			
Applicants have submitted the general information requested on their administrative details and other relevant information. Applicants must go to Supply4London to view and respond to the full set of the relevant questions.			
		Pass / Fail	N/A
2) Financial Information			
a) Turnover			
<p>Confirm that the Applicant's annual turnover in each of the last three consecutive financial years is above £100 million or equivalent financial performance.</p> <p><i>In the case of a consortium or joint venture response, this minimum annual turnover must be achieved by combining the relevant turnovers of all Relevant Companies in the last three consecutive financial years, and the minimum annual turnover in each of the last three consecutive years of at least one such Relevant Company must be no less than £50 million (or equivalent financial performance).</i></p>			
b) Net Assets:			
<p>Confirm that the Applicant's net asset value is above the minimum threshold of £30 million for the each of the last three consecutive financial years.</p> <p><i>In the case of a consortium or joint venture response, this minimum annual net assets must be achieved by combining relevant value of all Relevant Companies in the last three consecutive years, and the minimum annual net asset value in each of the last three consecutive financial years of at least one such Relevant Company must be no less than £20 million (or equivalent financial performance).</i></p>			
c) Three Years Published Accounts:			
<p>Submit files containing the Applicant's last three consecutive years published financial accounts. In the case of joint venture or consortium responses financial accounts are required for each Relevant Company.</p>			
d) Alternative Financial Statements:			
<p>Where the Applicant cannot comply with criteria 3 above, they need to submit files containing a statement of the Applicant's turnover, profit and loss and cash flow position for the most recent full year of trading (or part year if full year not applicable) and an end period balance sheet (where this information is not available in an audited form at Criteria).</p>			
e) Cash flow and Bank Letter:			
<p>Where neither Criteria 3 nor 4 can be provided, they need to submit files containing a statement of the Applicant's cash flow forecast for the current year and a confirmation from the Applicant's bank outlining the current cash and credit facility available to the Applicant. Alternative proposals to demonstrate appropriate financial standings will be considered at the Contracting Authority's discretion. The Contracting Authority wishes to stress that in case of joint venture or consortium Applications financial accounts will be required for each Relevant Company.</p>			
f) Applicant's statement:			
<p>Where none of the above criteria can be met, the Applicant is to specify how they will prove their financial information required to progress to the next stage. This is at the Contracting Authority's discretion to accept and assess.</p>			
g) Related Turnover:			

Stage 1 Evaluation Scoring Matrix		Section Weighting	Sub- Section Weighting
<p>Upload a separate statement of the Applicant's annual turnover in respect of the works or services which are of a similar type to the subject matter of the Project, for the past three consecutive years, or for the period the Applicant's organisation has been trading (if less than three years). In the case of joint venture or consortium responses accounts are required for each Relevant Company.</p>			
<p><u>h) Parent Company Guarantee:</u> Confirm that the performance by the Applicant of its obligations under Contract will be supported by a guarantee or guarantees from its/their parent or ultimate holding companies (if applicable). This must be provided with the presentation of a clear statement from the parent or ultimate holding organisation of the Applicant confirming that it will enter into one or more parent company guarantee(s) (in a form specified by the Contracting Authority) in favour of the Contracting Authority. In the case of joint venture or consortium responses accounts are required for each Relevant Company.</p>			
<p><u>i) Insurances:</u> The Applicant is to confirm that they will be able to provide the insurances identified within the PQQ at the time of entering into the Contract.</p>			
<p><u>j) Dunn and Bradstreet Score</u> Please detail the relevant D&B scores and provide comment</p>			
Score		Pass / Fail	N/A
3) Technical experience and Capability (Scored)			
<p>a) Structure of Applicant (S4L score) Provide details of the structure of the Applicant, including the relationships between any Relevant Companies and the Applicant, and indicating any additional key suppliers or contractors that you may be aligning yourself with to deliver these works. Use structure diagrams where appropriate. Include a statement on the role of each Relevant Company and what expertise they bring to the Project, including reference to how they contribute towards the Applicant's approach to the Priority Themes. Responses should not exceed 2 sides of A4 paper.</p>		6	6
<p>b) Health & Safety (S4L score)</p>		4	4

Stage 1 Evaluation Scoring Matrix		Section Weighting	Sub- Section Weighting
<p>a) Please upload a copy of your Health and Safety Policy and accompanying supporting documents (where appropriate) such as a Manual or Handbook.</p> <p>b) Please confirm your recognition of the Contracting Authority's Health, Safety & Environment Standards and give evidence of how you have worked to this type of standard on previous projects.</p> <p>Responses to b) should not exceed 1 side of A4 paper.</p>			
c) Design & Environmental Sustainability		19	
<i>i) Design (S4L scores)</i>			14
<p>Please provide a statement, including relevant examples, detailing how you have ensured the delivery of high quality design on previous projects. The response should provide evidence of how you achieved the following:</p> <p>a) High quality urban design;</p> <p>b) High quality architecture that provides cohesion yet diversity;</p> <p>c) A high quality public realm;</p> <p>d) Varied design approaches and outcomes for different types of housing tenure;</p> <p>e) Incorporated the principles of inclusive design (as set out in the Contracting Authority's Inclusive Design Strategy and Standards), including creating Lifetime Neighbourhoods that attract diverse residents, and how you have worked with diverse communities and disabled people to inform the design approach.</p> <p>Responses should not exceed 5 sides of A4 paper plus relevant images.</p>			
<i>ii) Environmental sustainability (S4L scores)</i>			5

Stage 1 Evaluation Scoring Matrix		Section Weighting	Sub- Section Weighting
<p>Please provide a statement, including relevant examples, detailing how you have addressed environmental sustainability on previous projects, including:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> a) achieving high BREEAM or Code for Sustainable Homes ratings b) reducing environmental impact during the construction process e.g. waste reduction, efficient transport of materials and employees' travel to work <p>The responses should not exceed 2 sides of A4 paper.</p>			
d) Employment and Supply Chain		8	
<i>i) Employment and Working with SMEs (S4L score)</i>			8
<p>Please explain, using examples, how you have previously delivered sustainable employment, apprenticeships and training outcomes. It is anticipated that responses will include:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> a) how and where you have delivered targeted training and employment opportunities, apprenticeships and paid work placements through the design, build and end-use phases. Response should highlight examples of partnership working; b) how and where you have implemented examples of good practice in employing a diverse workforce, particularly addressing the under-representation of women, BAME communities and disabled people; c) your approach and track record of paying London Living Wage or, where relevant, Construction Working Rule Agreement rates, whichever is higher. <p>Please explain, using examples, how you have implemented programmes to engage SMEs in your supply chain. Responses should demonstrate your track record of using of diverse suppliers: black, Asian, and ethnic minority businesses, women-owned business and business owned by disabled people as well as engaging small to medium sized suppliers (249 or fewer employees).</p> <p>Responses should not exceed 3 sides of A4.</p>			
e) Community Engagement		6	
<i>i) Community Engagement (S4L scores)</i>			6

Stage 1 Evaluation Scoring Matrix		Section Weighting	Sub- Section Weighting
<p>Please provide your experience of engaging with diverse communities during the planning and development process. The response should include reference to:</p> <p>a) best practice consultation and engagement with local and diverse communities during the planning and development phase. Show how you approached the standards set out the Development Corporation's Code for Consultation and how specialist consultation / engagement teams were used;</p> <p>b) incorporating and engaging existing and emerging communities into the ongoing management of a development, including managing access and communications with residents;</p> <p>c) how you have met or exceeded the considerate construction standards as set out by the Code of Construction;</p> <p>d) how you have approached early phases of development to help create activity and build communities;</p> <p>e) how you have implemented Corporate Social Responsibility programmes in the local community.</p> <p>Responses should not exceed 2 sides of A4.</p>			
<p>f) Case Studies of delivering complex projects</p>		57	
<p><i>i) Case Study 1 (S4L scores)</i></p>			19
<p>The examples should demonstrate how you addressed the following:</p> <p>a) Delivery of substantial site infrastructure including how the works were procured and how you ensured best value;</p> <p>b) Working on brownfield sites including areas in need of remediation;</p> <p>c) Securing and implementing planning consent for large mixed use schemes;</p> <p>d) Managing multiple stakeholders including neighbouring landowners and occupiers;</p> <p>e) Good partnering skills within the development partnership with the landowner and balancing objectives;</p> <p>f) Implementation of Quality Management Systems, including reference to any third party accreditations;</p> <p>g) Ongoing asset and estate management;</p> <p>h) Securing funding for projects that have involved a longer term hold.</p> <p>Additional marks will be awarded for projects that include a substantial proportion of Private Rented housing.</p> <p>For each Case Study, please include the following information:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Project Title • Date of completion • Total build cost • Contract type e.g. design and build, joint venture, land sale <p>Responses for each Case Study should not exceed 6 sides of A4</p>			
<p><i>ii) Case Study 2 (S4L scores)</i></p>			19
<p>The examples should demonstrate how you addressed the following:</p> <p>a) Delivery of substantial site infrastructure including how the works were procured and how you ensured best value;</p> <p>b) Working on brownfield sites including areas in need of remediation;</p> <p>c) Securing and implementing planning consent for large mixed use schemes;</p> <p>d) Managing multiple stakeholders including neighbouring landowners and occupiers;</p> <p>e) Good partnering skills within the development partnership with the landowner and balancing objectives;</p> <p>f) Implementation of Quality Management Systems, including reference to any third party accreditations;</p> <p>g) Ongoing asset and estate management;</p> <p>h) Securing funding for projects that have involved a longer term hold.</p> <p>Additional marks will be awarded for projects that include a substantial proportion of Private Rented housing.</p> <p>For each Case Study, please include the following information:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Project Title • Date of completion • Total build cost • Contract type e.g. design and build, joint venture, land sale <p>Responses for each Case Study should not exceed 6 sides of A4</p>			
<p><i>iii) Case Study 3 (S4L scores)</i></p>			19

Stage 1 Evaluation Scoring Matrix	Section Weighting	Sub- Section Weighting
<p>The examples should demonstrate how you addressed the following:</p> <p>a) Delivery of substantial site infrastructure including how the works were procured and how you ensured best value;</p> <p>b) Working on brownfield sites including areas in need of remediation;</p> <p>c) Securing and implementing planning consent for large mixed use schemes;</p> <p>d) Managing multiple stakeholders including neighbouring landowners and occupiers;</p> <p>e) Good partnering skills within the development partnership with the landowner and balancing objectives;</p> <p>f) Implementation of Quality Management Systems, including reference to any third party accreditations;</p> <p>g) Ongoing asset and estate management;</p> <p>h) Securing funding for projects that have involved a longer term hold.</p> <p>Additional marks will be awarded for projects that include a substantial proportion of Private Rented housing.</p> <p>For each Case Study, please include the following information:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Project Title • Date of completion • Total build cost • Contract type e.g. design and build, joint venture, land sale <p>Responses for each Case Study should not exceed 6 sides of A4</p>		
Case Study Total Score (S4L score - hard coded)		57
TOTAL WEIGHTED SCORE		
Stage 1 Evaluation Ranking		

S4L check

Score	Outline Guidance to Evaluators
0	Extremely poor response. The element of the Submission fails to address the Contracting Authority's requirement; numerous commitments are unjustified/unsupported commercially and operationally; or the level of risk borne by the Contracting Authority explicitly or implicitly is unacceptable; or failure to demonstrate an acceptable approach to delivery.
*1-20	Poor response: there is lack of content/explanation in addressing the Contracting Authority's requirements; some submissions are unjustified/unsupported or lack significant content/explanations; or a significant proportion of the submission is unacceptable from a risk perspective; or a degree of failure to demonstrate an acceptable approach to delivery.
21 - 40	A response that falls below the expectations set. The Contracting Authority's requirements are addressed but the submission lacks significant content/explanation; some areas of the submission are unacceptable from a risk perspective; or some proposals lack an acceptable approach to delivery
41 - 60	A satisfactory response that meets expectations. The Contracting Authority's requirements are addressed; all submissions have a reasonable level of content/justification and explanation and a small proportion of the submission is unacceptable from a risk perspective; a small proportion of it lacks an acceptable approach to delivery
61 - 80	A good response. The Contracting Authority's requirements are addressed; submissions have a good level of content/justification and explanation; and the details are acceptable from a risk perspective; either operational or commercial underpinning is present for all key criteria; good/sound approach to delivery.
81 -100	A very good response: the Contracting Authority's requirements are addressed and the Applicant's proposals include sound, innovative suggestions; and it is detailed in content, justification and explanation; the submission is acceptable from a risk perspective and is all underpinned operationally and commercially; and a very good/sound approach to delivery.