**THIS IS NOT A CALL FOR COMPETITION**

**MIDLANDS HIGHWAY ALLIANCE PLUS (MHA Plus)**

**Professional Services Partnership 4 (PSP4)**

**PRIOR INFORMATION NOTICE (PIN)**

**PURPOSE AND PROCESS**

Leicestershire County Council (“the Council”) acting on behalf of the Midlands Highway Alliance Plus (MHA Plus) invites proposals for how the current Professional Services Partnership 3 framework should be replaced to ensure the continued effective delivery of professional services and seconded staff to the member authorities of the MHA Plus.

The Council is at an early stage in the development of its proposals for procuring Professional Services Partnership 4, and prior to formulating any formal procurement opportunity, seeks input from the market as to what might be the most potentially attractive way of packaging and scoping a future procurement opportunity.

The responses to this consultation will be used to develop a proposal to take forward to the MHA Plus Program Board on 8th June 2022 for a recommendation to refer it to the Executive Board for approval.

Details of the current model are included in the Background section below. Interested parties can provide responses to all or some of the questions including expressing any views on how the different options could be altered to make bidding more attractive.

If your organisation would like to provide its initial thoughts for inclusion in those considerations these should be received no later than **12:00 noon on 19th May 2022** and should be returned to the Council using the EastMidsTenders electronic tendering system.

Any queries about this document or the process should be referred via the EastMidsTender system using the discussions section.

This exercise will provide an opportunity for the MHA Plus to obtain insight into how potential providers might approach the delivery of the services in question. It also gives useful early insight into the likely level of interest in a proposed project from that market.

Potential bidders will not be prejudiced by any response or failure to respond to the soft market questionnaire. Potential bidders must also note that a response to this notice does not guarantee an invitation to participate in this or any future procurement. Any procurement of the supply and services by the Council will be carried out strictly in accordance with the Public Contracts Regulations 2015.

**BACKGROUND**

The PSP3 framework scope includes all services required for the execution of the design and supervision of highway, civil and municipal engineering works. Typical works may involve, but not exclusively be, highway improvements, highway maintenance, highway infrastructure works (including bridges, subways, culverts and retaining walls), public realm works (town centre enhancements), drainage improvements, canal works, and other infrastructure works such as waste management facilities.

The framework consists of two lots, one for professional services (Lot 1) with 2 suppliers, and one for secondments (Lot 2) with 2 suppliers.

1. **Lot 1 and Lot 2 spend by authorities (to 31 December 2021)**

|  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- |
| **Authority** | **Professional Services - Projects (Lot 1)** | **Secondments (Lot 2)** |
| **Sub Region 1** |  |  |
| CHESHIRE EAST COUNCIL | **£00** | **£00** |
| CHESHIRE WEST & CHESTER COUNCIL | **£00** | **£54,872** |
| COVENTRY CITY COUNCIL | **£00** | **£181,117** |
| DUDLEY METROPOLITAN BOROUGH COUNCIL | **£00** | **£00** |
| HEREFORDSHIRE COUNCIL | **£00** | **£00** |
| SANDWELL METROPOLITAN BOROUGH COUNCIL | **£470,762** | **£2,232,987** |
| SOLIHULL METROPOLITAN BOROUGH COUNCIL | **£00** | **£00** |
| SHROPSHIRE COUNCIL | **£00** | **£632,208** |
| STAFFORDSHIRE COUNTY COUNCIL | **£00** | **£1,216,036** |
| STOKE-ON-TRENT CITY COUNCIL | **£618,913** | **£1,374,084** |
| TELFORD AND WREKIN COUNCIL | **£781,895** | **£2,447,714** |
| WALSALL COUNCIL | **£291,307** | **£00** |
| CITY OF WOLVERHAMPTON COUNCIL | **£2,083,589** | **£1,569,363** |
| WORCESTERSHIRE COUNTY COUNCIL | **£2,933** | **£68,624** |
| WEST MIDLANDS COMBINED AUTHORITY | **£306,169** | **£4,055,809** |
|  |  |  |
| **Sub Region 2** |  |  |
| BARNSLEY METROPOLITAN BOROUGH COUNCIL | **£156,896** | **£2,290,563** |
| DERBY CITY COUNCIL | **£870,515** | **£931,259** |
| DERBYSHIRE COUNTY COUNCIL | **£4,649,324** | **£6,085,552** |
| DONCASTER COUNCIL | **£52,275** | **£00** |
| LINCOLNSHIRE COUNTY COUNCIL | **£155,229** | **£502,717** |
| NOTTINGHAM CITY COUNCIL | **£330,141** | **£869,166** |
| NOTTINGHAMSHIRE COUNTY COUNCIL\*  \* including VIA East Midlands | **£1,351,039** | **£1,430,652** |
| ROTHERHAM METROPOLITAN BOROUGH COUNCIL | **£1,280,618** | **£350,761** |
| **Sub Region 3** |  |  |
| LEICESTER CITY COUNCIL | **£615,656** | **£417,923** |
| LEICESTERSHIRE COUNTY COUNCIL | **£449,356** | **£4,329,127** |
| RUTLAND COUNTY COUNCIL | **£51,849** | **£163,953** |
| WARWICKSHIRE COUNTY COUNCIL | **£00** | **£24,137** |
| **Sub Region 4** |  |  |
| BEDFORD BOROUGH COUNCIL | **£654,434** | **£21,496** |
| BUCKINGHAMSHIRE COUNTY COUNCIL | **£2,414,917** | **£204,352** |
| MILTON KEYNES COUNCIL | **£482,245** | **£803,623** |
| NORTHAMPTONSHIRE COUNTY COUNCIL\*  \*Now West Northamptonshire and West Northamptonshire Councils | **£00** | **£00** |
| OXFORDSHIRE COUNTY COUNCIL | **£13,270,495** | **£7,606,643** |
| PETERBOROUGH CITY COUNCIL | **£00** | **£175,484** |

1. **Indicative % Split by discipline**

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
| Asset Management | 3% |
| Bridges | 11% |
| Environmental | 3% |
| General Civil/ Highways | 58% |
| Geotechnical | 2% |
| H&S | 1% |
| Other | 4% |
| Planning/ Transport Planning | 15% |
| Water | 3% |

**FUTURE COMMISSIONING INTENTIONS**

MHA Plus will consider the responses to this PIN to inform the appraisal of the options.

For the avoidance of doubt no information provided in response to this questionnaire will be used in assessing providers during any future procurement process.

**REQUEST FOR INFORMATION**

This section contains requests for information in key areas that will help to inform the options available for future service delivery. This information is requested in order to seek the market’s views on the development of the services, the capacity of the market to supply these services, and the level of interest in any potential procurement activity.

Only those providers able to supply this type of service should respond to this market testing exercise.

Interested parties can provide responses to all or some of the questions. Please feel free to provide additional information regarding services offered which you think the MHA Plus would find useful in relation to this exercise.

Interested Parties should note that any responses received during this exercise will be treated as confidential information and it is the intention of the Council(s) not to share this information with any third parties. However, Please be aware that we are subject to the disclosure requirements of the Freedom of Information Act (FoIA) and that potentially any information we hold is liable to disclosure under that Act. For this reason, we would strongly advise that any information you consider to be confidential is labelled as such. In the event that a request is subsequently made for disclosure under the FoIA that request will be dealt with in accordance with the legislation

**PLEASE COMPLETE THE FOLLOWING SECTIONS**

**Full name, address, and website:**

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
| **Organisation name** |  |
| **Address** |  |
| **Town/city** |  |
| **Postcode** |  |
| **Country** |  |
| **Website** |  |

**Main contact for correspondence about this questionnaire:**

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
| **Name** |  |
| **Position** |  |
| **Telephone number** |  |
| **Mobile phone number** |  |
| **email address** |  |

**General Business Activity**

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
| **Please describe your general business?** |  |

**KEY QUESTIONS FOR CONSIDERATION**

**A response to the questions below would be welcomed.**

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
| **1.** | The scope of the framework is broad and intended to cover all aspects of local highway authority work. The current PSP3 model is divided into 2 lots split as follows:  Lot 1 Professional Services (the scope includes the engineering, environmental, planning and design services required throughout the delivery lifecycle of highway-related projects, including major highway improvements, maintenance, road safety, town centre regeneration projects and transport studies)  Lot 2 Secondments (for the secondment of professional and technical staff to support local authority highway and related projects and services)  Authorities may choose to use either or both Lots.  Please provide your views on the effectiveness of this model and, if applicable, how it could be improved? |
| [insert response] |

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
| **2.** | Both lots are divided into geographical regions as follows:  Region 1 (Cheshire West & Chester, Coventry, Herefordshire, Sandwell, Shropshire, Staffordshire, Stoke-on-Trent, Telford & Wrekin, Walsall, Wolverhampton, Worcestershire, West Midlands Combined Authority)  Region 2 (Barnsley, Derby City, Derbyshire, Doncaster, Lincolnshire, Nottingham City, Nottinghamshire, Rotherham)  Region 3 (Leicester, Leicestershire, Rutland, Warwickshire)  Region 4 (Bedford, Buckinghamshire, Milton Keynes, Northamptonshire, Oxfordshire, Peterborough)  Currently Regions 1 and 2 are combined into one area, and Regions 3 and 4 are combined into another area.  Does the current Geographical split work? Please provide any feedback on the way the regions are combined. |
| [insert response] |

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
| **3.** | The framework moved from being a single supplier model (PSP2) to a multi-supplier framework (PSP3).  Please provide your views on the multi-provider model and the implications for allocation of work and collaboration with other suppliers on the framework, the wider supply chain, and clients. |
| [insert response] |

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
| **4.** | The contract form used for PSP3 was the NEC 4 Professional Services contract.  Please provide any thoughts on using the NEC 4 form of contracts for the procurement. |
| [insert response] |

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
| **5.** | Social Value requirements commit public services to think about how they can also secure wider social, economic and environmental benefits.  How do you think Social Value can be incorporated into the contract? |
| [insert response] |

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
| **6.** | Any other considerations? |
| [insert response] |