




**ISSUED VIA Email and the  
Supply4London.com  
TENDERING PORTAL ('the Portal')**

10 December 2013

Attention:   
Buckingham Group Contracting Ltd  
Silverstone Road  
Stowe  
Buckinghamshire  
MK18 5LJ

Level Ten  
Level Ten  
Stratford Place  
1 Montfichet Road  
London E20 1EJ

+44 (0) 20 3288 1800  
info@londonlegacy.co.uk  
www.londonlegacy.co.uk  
www.noordinarypark.co.uk

Dear 

**RE: STADIUM TRANSFORMATION WORKS | TIER-1 MAIN CONTRACTOR | OJEU CONTRACT  
NOTICE 2012/S 247-406933 | CONTRACT AWARD DECISION**

Thank you for your recent tender submission ('the Tender'), in response to the Invitation to Tender ('the ITT') published on 16 July 2013 in respect of the above procurement.

The London Legacy Development Corporation ('LLDC') has completed the evaluation of the Tenders received and we are writing to inform you of the decision to award the contract for the Tier-1 Main Contractor to Balfour Beatty Group Limited who attained the highest-overall scores on the basis of the Award Criteria (MEAT) set out within the ITT.

The table below sets out the consortium of Buckingham Group Contracting Ltd and Lafarge Tarmac Limited scores against the successful Tenderer's scores.

In accordance with the Public Contracts Regulations 2006 (as amended, 'the Regulations'), it is the intention of E20 Stadium LLP to enter into a contract with the successful Tenderer following the expiry of the mandatory 10-day standstill period ('the Standstill Period') on 23 December 2013.

We recognise that our decision may come as a disappointment to you and trust you are satisfied with the level of information provided. We hope, however, that the outcome of this process will not deter or discourage you from bidding for future opportunities promoted by the LLDC.

Finally, we would like to thank you for your time and effort invested to submit your Tender. It is very much appreciated.

  
**Procurement Lead, Stadium Transformation**

For and on behalf of  
**London Legacy Development Corporation**

Award Criteria	Weighting	Successful Tenderer's Score	Comment on Merits of Successful Tenderer's Submission	Tenderer's Score	Comment on Evaluation of Tenderer's Submission
1.1.1.1 The Prices (1.0-1.15 of the Pricing Schedule)	21%	19.14%	The Successful Tenderer submission was competitive against some of the Commercial (Financial) elements of the Award Criteria and it was apparent that they had submitted the cheapest price for the following items (1.1.1.2., 1.1.1.3 and 1.1.1.4.), which resulted in the Tenderer scoring the maximum score against these elements.  The Successful Tenderer submission was not competitive against some of the Commercial (Financial) elements of the Award Criteria, when each of the responses that the Successful Tenderer submitted were evaluated using the formula (rules) contained within the Award Criteria set out on page 22 in Part 1 of 2 of the ITT.	21.00%	The Tenderer submission was competitive against some of the Commercial (Financial) elements of the Award Criteria and it was apparent that they had submitted the cheapest price for the following items (1.1.1.1. and 1.1.1.5.), which resulted in the Tenderer scoring the maximum score against these elements.  The Tenderer submission was not competitive against some of the Commercial (Financial) elements of the Award Criteria, when the responses were evaluated using the formula (rules) contained within the Award Criteria set out on page 22 in Part 1 of 2 of the ITT.
1.1.1.2 Preliminaries (1.16 of the Pricing Schedule)	8%	8.00%		7.95%	
1.1.1.3 The Direct Fee %age of Total Tendered Price	2%	2.00%		1.76%	
1.1.1.4 The Subcontracted Fee %age of Total Tendered Price	2%	2.00%		1.76%	
1.1.1.5 The Peoples Overheads Fee %age of Total Prices	2%	1.20%		2.00%	
1.2. Acceptance of Contractual Terms	5%	3.00%	The Successful Tenderer's score reflects minor changes proposed to the contract terms and conditions that were compliant with the requirements of the ITT and acceptable to the Contracting Authority representing a shift in the risk profile of the contract to the Contracting Authority.	5.00%	Tenderer accepts all the terms contained within the Contract.
2.1.1. Health and Safety	6%	4.80%	Comprehensive and informed submission which demonstrates the Successful Tenderer's ability to undertake H&S duties specific to the project. The response is aligned with HSE Standard and includes a plan for implementation with examples of relevant projects and risk management; however, it does not describe occupational health requirements particularly well. The	4.80%	A good quality submission which demonstrates the Tenderer's ability to undertake H&S duties specific to the project. All Ways Safely behavioural programme, risk reviews and application of the Employer Standard indicate alignment with key objectives with a plan for implementation. Examples of risk management in the construction of the Amex Stadium.

Award Criteria	Weighting	Successful Tenderer's Score	Comment on Merits of Successful Tenderer's Submission	Tenderer's Score	Comment on Evaluation of Tenderer's Submission
			Successful Tenderer has detailed their commitment to support the Safety Leadership teams, including establishing Stadium Project Leadership Team with evidence of experience provided.		Indication of the key risks and the control measures however did not detail risks in relation to lifting and does not describe occupational health requirements particularly well. Statement made to support the Safety Leadership team (SHELTY), but no specific reference to the Stadium Project Leadership Team.
2.1.2. Quality Management	3%	2.40%	Clear Quality Plan developed covering all relevant areas requested in the question. Thorough explanations of how the plan will be implemented, although it could have made more specific references to the Stadium and its particular challenges.	2.40%	A comprehensive response was submitted however, no detail was provided on having evidence of where the proposed approach has been effectively used elsewhere.
2.1.3.1. Employment and Skills – Strategy	1.5%	1.50%	Excellent submission covering the main elements of the Project Information and the Successful Tenderer demonstrates a flexible and innovative approach to delivery of employment and skills outcomes.	0.90%	Reference to the IBC in the response which is not specific to the requirements of this project. Generally the response was lacking detail on some of the mechanics of how the strategy may be delivered. In particular how the supply chain will be engaged on the delivery of these commitments and requirements to payment of LLW how these would be passed down the supply chain.  The approach to vacancy management was also not clear as to how it relates to this contract.
2.1.3.2. Employment and Skills – Proposed Targets	1.5%	1.50%	Excellent commitments. All minimum targets have been exceeded.	1.20%	Based on matrix scoring for targets proposed. The BAME target could be higher given the demographic of the area.
2.1.4. Inclusion	2%	1.20%	Relatively standard response identifying the key points required and committing to	1.20%	Clearly mentions robust equalities and inclusion practises and awareness of

<b>Award Criteria</b>	<b>Weighting</b>	<b>Successful Tenderer's Score</b>	<b>Comment on Merits of Successful Tenderer's Submission</b>	<b>Tenderer's Score</b>	<b>Comment on Evaluation of Tenderer's Submission</b>
			inclusive policies.		equality duty. However there was not enough evidence of other areas mentioned in the response to award a higher score.
2.1.5. Community Engagement	2%	1.60%	Good submission covering all the award criteria with the focus on engagement, however, the submission does cover responsible site management which was an area identified.	1.20%	Good submission on three of the four areas involved, however it lacks detail regarding supporting the Employers' wider community engagement objectives. Elements of best practice included in the submission but there was no real mention of further initiatives identified.
2.1.6. Inclusive Design	2%	1.60%	The Successful Tenderer's response includes a team with excellent experience and knowledge of the site. The Tenderer intends to appoint Buro Happold as the access consultants who have experience and knowledge of working on projects on the Park, including the stadium transformation design work.	1.60%	Response includes a team with excellent experience and knowledge of the site. The Tenderer intends to appoint Buro Happold as the access consultants who have experience and knowledge of working on projects on the Park, including the Stadium transformation design work.
2.1.7.1. Sustainable Design	2%	1.60%	Very good response provided addresses the minimisation of impacts associated with steel comprehensively and has already identified opportunities to design out waste. Refers to previous experience which was highly relevant and effective in the approach stated.	0.80%	This is a fair response to this award criteria stating a commitment to implement measures for each of the categories described, however it does not set out what those measures are likely to be.
2.1.7.2. Environmental Legislation	1%	0.80%	The response referenced ISO14001 certification meaning that the Successful Tenderer has a process in place for keeping abreast of legal requirements in relation to the project. A good outline is given in response to how risks and issues will be managed throughout the project.	0.80%	Strong detailed submission covering identification and management environmental risks and issues. Good detail provided regarding roles and responsibilities. Good level of detail and mitigation provided for potential aspects.

<b>Award Criteria</b>	<b>Weighting</b>	<b>Successful Tenderer's Score</b>	<b>Comment on Merits of Successful Tenderer's Submission</b>	<b>Tenderer's Score</b>	<b>Comment on Evaluation of Tenderer's Submission</b>
2.2.1 Project Programme	8%	6.40%	Programme demonstrates a good approach to the delivery of the project and is broadly compliant with the requirements of the works information. There are few constraints in the programme and the majority of activities have been logically linked but there are areas that would cause concern.	6.40%	Programme demonstrates a good approach to the delivery of the project and is broadly compliant with the requirements of the works information. There are few constraints in the programme and the majority of activities have been logically linked and there is no negative float present in the programme. Post RWC15 activity durations are unrealistic.
2.2.2 Method Statements	8%	6.40%	Very good method statements which demonstrate a good understanding of the project requirements, constraints and risks. In addition, it clearly identifies the key project specific interfaces and how they will be managed. There was a lack of detail on testing and commissioning of the retractable seating and the existing piles prior to strengthening works and on how productivity will be managed with respect to safety and quality.	3.20%	Overall, the method statements are generic and do not sufficiently demonstrate the technicalities of the works involved and are lacking supporting information in the form of sequence and phasing drawings. For instance there was no specific mention of testing and commissioning of the retractable seating, nor the installation of the gangways/bridges and how output and progress will be measured. The method statements do not highlight the key project specific interfaces in sufficient detail, and/or describe how each of these interfaces will be managed with adjacent work streams which may dictate the sequence of works.
2.2.3 Project Execution Plan	8%	6.40%	Good Project Execution Plan provided however some responses are generic and not specific to the project.	3.20%	The Tenderer has submitted an average response to Project Execution Plans that does not address all aspects of the Project Information and lacks detail on how the delivery would be undertaken.
2.2.4 Risk Management	3%	1.80%	The Successful Tenderer's response outlines key processes but did not contain a high level of detail. The Risk Management plan does not include matrix for impact scoring or clear	2.40%	Detailed response complementing the Tenderer's existing embedded corporate risk process with an understanding of the project

Award Criteria	Weighting	Successful Tenderer's Score	Comment on Merits of Successful Tenderer's Submission	Tenderer's Score	Comment on Evaluation of Tenderer's Submission
			explanation of relevance. The submitted risk register has 26 risks most of which are highly relevant to the delivery of this project.		requirements. The Tenderer has included a scoring matrix with impact scoring with descriptions. Recognition of Contracting Authority's risk management strategy and the level of integration required for this project.
2.2.5 Supply Chain Management	2%	1.60%	Good response that demonstrates the Tenderer understands the supply chain requirements. Examples of approved supplier management provided, together with defined processes to engage with local and diverse business networks.	1.60%	Good response with relevant examples incorporated which demonstrates the Tenderer's understanding of supply chain requirements. Engaging with local businesses is defined with further initiatives together with demonstrated measures to comply with the Contracting Authority's aims and objectives.
2.2.6 Design Management	4%	3.20%	The Successful Tenderer has provided good evidence of how design management will deliver integrated design across designers and subcontractors. Design management process is described, with project specific examples addressing interfaces and subcontract design. Documentation management and quality assurance is not described in the Tenderer's submission. Also the design management tools and methodologies that are mentioned do not make clear how central each is to the process of design delivery.	0.80%	The Tenderer's response is poor with respect to the outline design proposals submitted. There is a general statement about day-to-day team management involving consultants, sub-contractors, stakeholders and the client, but it fails to distinguish responsibilities and sign-off. The Design Management process lists a number of items which will be undertaken as design management, however the Tenderer's submission describing a managed process to achieve timely completion and coordination and integration of information lacks detail. The outline delivery plan provided does not specifically describe the deliverables and design inputs. The resource histogram provided, it is not clear why resources have been allocated in this manner.

<b>Award Criteria</b>	<b>Weighting</b>	<b>Successful Tenderer's Score</b>	<b>Comment on Merits of Successful Tenderer's Submission</b>	<b>Tenderer's Score</b>	<b>Comment on Evaluation of Tenderer's Submission</b>
2.3.1 Project Organisations Chart	3%	2.40%	Summary level of job roles and duration in weeks on the project included however the job roles do not name specific people. A clear organisational chart provided that shows the specific relation of Balfour Beatty staff named in Contract Data Part 2. However, the commentary does not fully explain Project Team composition, operation or required reporting and communication lines.	1.80%	Project structure is unclear in terms of reporting. Key people are named however, there are a number of un-named posts including project managers and commercial.
2.3.2 Key People	3%	2.40%	Comprehensive and detailed CV's for all of the key personnel have been submitted including for the design element of the project. No stadia experience, but full detail of relevant experience including London 2012 Aquatics Centre and suitability for proposed role is provided. High calibre people are proposed for most of the key positions.	3.00%	Comprehensive and detailed CV's for all of the key personnel have been submitted. Very strong experience across the team on stadia development and construction.
<b>Totals</b>	<b>100.00%</b>	<b>82.94%</b>		<b>76.77%</b>	