**Parmiters Sports Ground   
TENDER FOR REFURBISHMENT WORKS OF PAVILION**

# **Project Brief**

Undertake the refurbishment works at Parmiters Sports Ground.

Address of site

Parmiters Sports Ground, Nelson Rd, London E4 9AS

## Information

* There is a pavilion complete with changing rooms, toilets, storage areas that are currently in use that require refurb
* Vehicle access for the refurbishment works is possible.
* This is a 70% price and 30% quality tender.

## Criteria

* See attached ‘Pricing Schedule’ for criteria of works.

## Information to be included with tender

* Provide details of works to be undertaken, images and details/specification of materials to be used and equipment to be installed including product specifications.
* Details of all costs to be included on the attached ‘Pricing Schedule’
* Copies of current certificates of insurance confirming appropriate levels (see ‘Insurance’ section below)
* Provide a detailed description (Method Statement) of how you will undertake the works
* Provide Risk Assessment for the works
* Confirmation and details of warranty for the works, materials and equipment including length of warranty etc

## Other information

All communications regarding this tender must be submitted via the London Tenders Pro-Contract portal <https://www.londontenders.org/>

**Tender Submission**

Using the ‘Pricing Schedule’ attached please provide details of all equipment, surfacing, installation and associated costs. Also, make sure you have attached all documentation required in project brief and any supporting documents.

**The deadline for submission of designs and details of costs is mid-day on Friday 2nd September 2022. Please ensure that your tender and any information is submitted via London Tenders Pro-Contract portal.**

**Tender Evaluation**

Tenders will be evaluated on the basis of 70% price and 30% quality. The Council is not bound to accept the lowest quotation and reserves the right at its absolute discretion to accept or not accept any quotation submitted. The Council shall not be under any liability in respect of any expenses or loss that may be suffered or incurred by the consultation in the preparation of its quotation.

The overall tender assessment will be carried out using a mathematical system of combining quality scores and prices according to their relative weighting, in this case price 70, quality 30.

The first step is to give the tender with the lowest price a maximum score of 100%, the prices of the other tenders are expressed as an inverse percentage of that maximum score, as shown in the following example:

Relative Price Score

**Contractor Price Percentage**

Contractor ‘A’ £10,000 100%

Contractor ‘B’ £10,500 95.2%

Contractor ‘C’ £12,000 83.3%

Contractor ‘D’ £12,500 80.0%

The adjusted price percentages are multiplied by the weighting for price (70) and the results are shown in column 4 of the ‘Price/quality weighting table’ (see Appendix D).

Next, a maximum quality score of 100% is given to the tender with the highest quality score. The other scores are expressed as percentages of that score as in the following example:

Quality Score

The quality will be evaluated using the table in Appendix C.

**Contractor Points Percentage**

Contractor ‘B’ 150 100%

Contractor ‘C’ 135 90%

Contractor ‘A’ 100 66.7%

Contractor ‘D’ 115 76.7%

The adjusted quality scores are multiplied by the predetermined quality weighting of 30 to give the weighted quality score. The results are shown in column 9 of the price/quality weighting table.

The weighted price score and the weighted quality score for each tenderer are then added to give a total weighted score, shown in column 11 of the ‘Price/quality weighting table’ (see Appendix D)

**Appendix C - Tender Assessment**

Each criterion is weighted to give a total of 100% for the assessment of the tenders. Tenders will be given a score out of 5 for each criterion using the scoring system below.

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
| **Score** | **Criteria for awarding score** |
| 0 | Completely fails to meet required standard or does not provide a proposal. |
| 1 | Proposal significantly fails to meet the standards required, contains significant shortcomings and/or is inconsistent with other proposals. |
| 2 | Proposal falls short of achieving expected standard in a number of identifiable respects. |
| 3 | Proposal meets the required standard in most material respects, but is lacking or inconsistent in others. |
| 4 | Proposal meets the required standard in all material respects. |
| 5 | Proposal meets the required standard in all material respects and exceeds some or all of the major requirements. |

| **Scoresheet** | | | | |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| **Service title** | Parmiters Sports Ground | | | |
| **Name of organisation** |  | | | |
| **Criteria** | **Evidence** | **Weight factor (%)** | **Score out of 5** | **Weight x score** |
| Interpretation of design brief and value for money | Demonstration of understanding and interpretation of design brief. Imaginative design that is sympathetic to the site.  Requirements of brief full met  Added value, innovative design ideas, appropriate equipment included over and above requirements | 75% |  |  |
| Quality of quotation | Clear, well presented, detailed information including accurate designs, product specifications, plans, rationale, drawings, photographs etc. where necessary.  Quality and length of warranty for works, materials and equipment | 15% |  |  |
| Track record | Track record and experience of delivering works of a similar nature to the specification. | 5% |  |  |
| Resources | Evidence of appropriate qualifications and training of staff. Details of maintenance work costs for equipment, if applicable.  Current certificates of appropriate types and levels of insurance provided | 5% |  |  |
| **TOTAL** |  | **100%** |  |  |

**Appendix D Sample Price/Quality Weighting**

|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
|  | **Price Score** | | | | |  | **Quality Score** | | | | |  | **Overall Score** | |
|  | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 | 5 |  | 6 | 7 | 8 | 9 | 10 |  | 11 | 12 |
| **Tenderer** | Price (£) | Price Score (reciprocal of % of lowest) | Price Weighting | Weighted Price Score (2x3) | **Price Ranking** |  | Quality Score | Adjusted Quality Score (% of highest score) | Quality Weighting | Weighted Quality Score (7x8) | **Quality Ranking** |  | **Total Weighted Score (4+9)** | **Overall Ranking** |
| Contractor ‘A’ | 10,000 | 100 | 70 | 7000 | 1 |  | 100 | 66.7 | 30 | 2001 | 4 |  | **9001** | **2** |
| Contractor ‘B’ | 10,500 | 95.2 | 70 | 6664 | 2 |  | 150 | 100 | 30 | 3000 | 1 |  | **9664** | **1** |
| Contractor ‘C’ | 12,000 | 83.3 | 70 | 5831 | 3 |  | 135 | 90.0 | 30 | 2700 | 2 |  | **8531** | **3** |
| Contractor ‘D’ | 12,500 | 80 | 70 | 5600 | 4 |  | 115 | 76.7 | 30 | 2301 | 3 |  | **7901** | **4** |