

**London Legacy Development
Corporation**
Finance, Procurement & Professional
Services
Level 9, 5 Endeavour Square
London E20 1JN

[REDACTED]
[REDACTED]
[REDACTED]
[REDACTED]
[REDACTED]
[REDACTED]

03 November 2023

Sent By: Email via the Delta e-Sourcing Portal

Dear [REDACTED]

PIP-230912-01 - Lease of Park Kiosk (one)

Notification of Contract Award Decision

Thank you for submitting your Tender for the above-mentioned Find a Tender opportunity, I am writing to advise that the Tender process is now complete. We recognise and thank you for your patience as the proposals were considered.

We regret to inform you that on this occasion, [REDACTED] proposal was unsuccessful. The successful tenderer is [REDACTED].

All responses were evaluated against the criteria and weightings as detailed in the ITT and set out in Appendix 1. Appendix 2 summarise your submission weighted scores against those criteria and those of the successful tenderer. Should you wish to have more detailed feedback, please contact edwardfane@londonlegacy.co.uk and he will be happy to set up a call with you.

Thank you for your interest in this procurement, your efforts during this process are fully recognised and appreciated. We hope this result does not deter you from competing for future opportunities with LLDC.

Yours sincerely

[REDACTED]

[REDACTED]
Assistant Commercial Manager
[REDACTED] [@tfl.gov.uk](mailto:[REDACTED]@tfl.gov.uk)

For and on behalf of
London Legacy Development Corporation (LLDC)

Appendix 1 - Tender Evaluation Feedback

1. Overall Score

Total Score				
Supplier	Quality Score	Financial Score	Overall Score	Score Rank
Successful tenderer	75.00%	Pass	75.00%	1
[REDACTED]	50.00% (Fail)	Pass	Fail	Fail

2. Quality Requirements

Technical					
	B1a - Business Plan	B1b - Investment Proposal	B2 - Approach to Health & Safety	B3a - Experience	B3b - Key People
Successful tenderer	37.50%	7.50%	7.50%	7.50%	7.50%
[REDACTED]	25.00%	5.00%	7.50%	5.00%	5.00%
Social Value					
	B4a - Socio economic		B4b – Sustainability		
Successful tenderer	2.50%		5.00%		
[REDACTED]	0.00% (Fail)		2.50%		

3. Score Descriptors & Guidance

Score	Descriptor	Explanation
4 (Max Score Available)	Outstanding	Exceptional demonstration by the Bidder of the relevant ability, understanding, experience, skills, and resources & quality measures required to provide the supplies/ services. Response identifies factors that will offer potential added value and continuous improvement, with evidence to support the response
3	Good	Above average demonstration by the Bidder of the relevant ability, understanding, experience, skills, resource & quality measures required to provide the supplies / services. Response identifies factors that will offer potential added value, with evidence to support the response
2	Meet the Requirement	Demonstration by the Bidder of the relevant ability, understanding, experience, skills, resources & quality measures required to provide the supplies / services, with evidence to support the response.
1	Poor (Fail)	Some minor reservations of the Bidder's relevant ability, understanding, experience, skills, and resource & quality measures required to provide the suppliers / services, with little or no evidence to support the response.
0	Unacceptable (Fail)	The response does not meet the requirement. Does not comply and/or insufficient information provided to demonstrate that the Bidder has the ability, understanding, experience, skills, resource & quality measures required to provide the supplies / services, with little or no evidence to support the response.

4. Reasons for award decision

In summary, the successful bidder proposal has achieved a greater score than the [REDACTED] proposal in terms of the Technical evaluation and Social Value Evaluation. Therefore, a better Most Economical & Advantageous Tender (MEAT). Full details of the technical evaluation are provided above.

The successful bidder scored better than [REDACTED] in Business Plan, Investment Proposal, Experience, Key People, Socio-economic and Sustainability sections of the quality evaluation criteria, which was the key drivers for the difference in overall scores. Also, in your response you omitted providing a response to the socio- economic question, which meant you achieved a fail overall.

The successful tenderer presented a clear approach to delivering the operations required by LLDC and demonstrated a high level of operating and retail experience. The response evidenced a solid track record of working within the retail industries relevant to LLDC's locale and a demonstrated commitment to socio-economic outcomes.