

LONDON BOROUGH OF HAMMERSMITH & FULHAM

Report to: Cabinet Member for Housing and Homelessness, Councillor Frances Umeh

Date: 13/03/2023

Subject: Contract Award Report – Consultancy Services Framework Agreement

Report of: Richard Buckley, Assistant Director, Resident and Building Safety

Report author: David von Ackerman – Head of procurement

Responsible Director: Jon Pickstone, Strategic Director for The Economy Department

SUMMARY

This report seeks approval from the Cabinet Member for Housing and Homelessness to award the contract for the 'Consultancy Services Framework Agreement' for the following eight (8) lots in relation to professional consultancy services required for project works. These projects will undertake capital works to LBHF housing stock and are part of the wider housing stock improvement programme. The consultancy needed is as follows:

| Lot | Services |
|--|---|
| Lot 1: Multi-disciplinary Services – capital projects with a value between £0 to £500,000 | The Services may cover all or any of the following disciplines: <ul style="list-style-type: none">• Quantity Surveyors• Contract Administrators• Project Managers• Principal Designers• CDM Compliance Consultants• Building Surveyors• Employer's Agents |
| Lot 2: Multi-disciplinary Services – capital projects with a value between £500,001 to £3.5m | |
| Lot 3: Multi-disciplinary Services – capital projects valued between £3,500,001 to £6.5m | |
| Lot 4: Multi-disciplinary Services – capital projects valued at above £6,500,001 | |
| Lot 5: Civil and Structural and Mechanical and Electrical Engineering Services | The Services comprise any or all of the following: <ul style="list-style-type: none">• Structural Engineering;• Civil Engineering; and• Mechanical and Electrical (M&E) and Public Health Engineering |
| Lot 6: Architectural Services for building related projects with values up to £500,000 | Architectural services |
| Lot 7: Clerk of Works up to £500,000 | Clerk of Works services |
| Lot 8: Fire Consultancy Services up to £2,000,000 | Passive compartmentation surveys, fire risk assessments and fire door inspections |

RECOMMENDATIONS

That the Cabinet Member for Housing and Homelessness:

1. Agrees that the appendices to this report are exempt from disclosure on the grounds that they contain information relating to the financial or business affairs of a particular person (including the authority holding that information) under Paragraph 3 of Schedule 12A of the Local Government Act 1972;
2. Notes that there is no absolute commitment to spend under this award of the framework and its lots, instead it offers the Economy a rapid, highly cost-effective route to appoint vetted providers to pieces of work – compliant with contract standing orders approval processes for each of those awards having been secured. The theoretical maximum spend was based on this framework being a major source of professional services that are expected to be required over the next three years.
3. Approves the award of contract for Lot 1, with an estimated contract value of £500,000 (£0.5m) over the duration of the framework agreement, to *Quatrefoils Limited, Fulkers LLP, Faithful+Gould and Faithorn Farrell Timms LLP*;
4. Approves the award of contract for Lot 2, with an estimated contract value of £3,500,000 (£3.5m) over the duration of the framework agreement, to *Keegans Limited, Pellings LLP, Michael Dyson Associates Ltd., Philip Pank Partnership, John Rowan and Partners LLP and Faithful+Gould*;
5. Approves the award of contract for Lot 3, with an estimated contract value of £5,000,000 (£5m) over the duration of the framework agreement, to *Keegans Limited, Pellings LLP, Philip Pank Partnership and John Rowan and Partners LLP*;
6. Approves the award of contract for Lot 4, with an estimated contract value of £3,000,000 (£3m) over the duration of the framework agreement, to *Keegans Limited, Pellings LLP, John Rowan and Partners LLP, Baily Garner LLP, Faithful+Gould, and Stace LLP*;
7. Approves the award of contract for Lot 5, with an estimated contract value of £3,000,000 (£3m) over the duration of the framework agreement, to *Ingleton Wood LLP, Services Design Solution Ltd., Frankham Consultancy Group Ltd., and ByrneLooby*;
8. Approves the award of contract for Lot 6, with an estimated contract value of £500,000 (£0.5m) over the duration of the framework agreement, to *Potter, Church & Holmes Architects, DMWR Architects, Quatrefoils Limited, and LSI Architects LLP*;
9. Approves the award of contract for Lot 7, with an estimated contract value of £500,000 (£0.5m) over the duration of the framework agreement, to *John*

Rowan and Partners LLP, MDA Consulting Ltd., Hickton Consultants Ltd., Airey Miller Limited, and Baily Garner LLP;

10. Approves the award of contract for Lot 8, with an estimated contract value of £2,000,000 (£2m) over the duration of the framework agreement, to *Faithorn Farrell Timms LLP, Ventro Limited, Keegans Limited, and Tetra Consulting Ltd.*

Wards Affected: All

| Our Values | Summary of how this report aligns to the H&F Values |
|---|--|
| Building shared prosperity | Through this framework prosperity would be increased by having high performing, cost effective, capital project technical consultants and professional services working for the Council. |
| Creating a compassionate council | The HRA Business Plan allows for the on-going investment in the properties which directly support residents in living healthy and independent lives. Having a set of dynamic and cost-efficient technical consultants who are invested in the Council's ambitions will help the Council to achieve its aims in terms of capital works more compassionately. |
| Doing things with local residents, not to them | The concerned delivery teams will engage will residents and residents can be involved in mini-competitions under this framework. |
| Being ruthlessly financially efficient | A tendering exercise was conducted in line with the Council's Being Ruthlessly Financially Efficient priority to achieve the best value for money outcome. |
| Taking pride in H&F | This framework will provide the Council with the ability to define, control and improve quality of cost and delivery for the capital programme. It will also give the Council the ability to set and monitor contractual terms and insurance requirements which will protect the Council. Having high performing technical consultants will reflect well on the Council. |
| Rising to the challenge of the climate and ecological emergency | The Council will have more control over environmental issues if it procures its own frameworks rather than rely on the environmental criteria of other frameworks. Sustainability was evaluated as part of the |

| Our Values | Summary of how this report aligns to the H&F Values |
|------------|---|
| | procurement process. |

Financial Impact

The recommendations in this report do not have any direct financial implications as setting up the proposed framework will be resourced by internal staffing and existing budgets. Any call-off from the framework will be subject to confirmation of available budget within the HRA Asset Management and Compliance programme which has a budget of £231m for the period of 2022/23 to 2025/26. The estimated spend per lot is shown below:

| Lots | Description | Estimated contract value (over 4 years) |
|-------------|--|--|
| Lot 1 | Multi-disciplinary consultancy services for projects between £0 to £500,000 | £500,000 |
| Lot 2 | Multi-disciplinary consultancy services for projects between £500,001 to £3.5m | £3.5m |
| Lot 3 | Multi-disciplinary consultancy services for projects between £3,500,001 to £6.5m | £5m |
| Lot 4 | Multi-disciplinary consultancy services for projects over £6.5m | £3m |
| Lot 5 | Engineering Services (Civil and Structural and M&E) | £3m |
| Lot 6 | Architects | £500,000 |
| Lot 7 | Clerk of Works | £500,000 |
| Lot 8 | Fire Consultancy | £2,000,000 |

Before each call-off, Finance Officers will assess the framework members' financial position through undertaking a Credit Safe check to establish if the company has a Credit Safe Risk Score of 50 or above as well as an annual contract limit in excess of the maximum lot value.

It is expected that the consultancy costs will be capital in nature. However, should feasibility work carried out by the consultant be carried out on projects which are ultimately aborted, the associated costs will fall to revenue.

Progression of capital schemes from this framework will require a separate approval paper from the service which will need to include the specific financial implications. This will include confirmation of approved funding, payment arrangement and financial status checks on the proposed contractor.

Implications prepared by Llywelyn Jonas, Principal Accountant (Housing Capital), 12/12/2022

Verified by Danny Rochford, Head of Finance, 18/01/2023

Legal Implications

The Council has a requirement for a wide range of consultants in order to carry out its functions as a housing authority under the Housing Act 1985. The establishment of its own framework for consultants will assist it in carrying out these obligations.

The proposed framework is a public services contract under the Public Contracts Regulations 2015. In order to procure the framework, the Council used the restricted procedure which allows for shortlisting of bidders by way of a selection questionnaire prior to issuing invitations to tender.

These are high value contracts under the Council's Contract Standing Orders. The procurement followed the strategy approved by Cabinet, to advertise the proposed competition and, following the shortlisting process, to undertake evaluation in accordance with the published criteria. In relation to lots 1-4 the Council also adopted a Lot Strategy (explained in Appendix 2) to ensure that it was not overly reliant on a small number of consultants.

In order to ensure continuing value for money the selection of consultants from the framework will normally be by way of a mini-competition among the consultants for each lot.

John Sharland, Senior solicitor (Contracts and procurement),
email: john.sharland@lbhf.gov.uk
Dated 5 July 2022

Background Papers Used in Preparing This Report

| Sr. | Description of Background Papers | Date |
|-----|---|-----------------|
| 1. | Procurement Strategy for Consultancy Services Framework – PUBLISHED | 7 December 2020 |

DETAILED ANALYSIS

Proposals and Analysis of Options

1. Delivering the services carried out by the Economy department requires extensive support from specialist external technical consultants and other professional services. Prior to this framework agreement the Council would rely on other third-party frameworks or carry out one-off procurement exercises to appoint consultants. Through the setting up of the Consultancy Services Framework the Council will have its own inhouse pool of pre-vetted, high-quality technical consultants to support with delivering its capital programme over the next four (4) years. The Consultancy Services Framework consists of eight (8) lots.

Tender Procedure

2. The Cabinet Paper titled, '*Procurement Strategy for Consultancy Services Framework*' dated, 7 December 2020, approved a 2-stage restricted procurement procedure to be carried out through the Council's e-procurement portal, *CapitalEsourcing*.
3. The restricted procurement procedure is a two-stage process and was selected because there was a need to prequalify bidders and shortlist the number of bidders permitted to submit bids. Consultants will be selected, including through mini-competitions when, generally, above £100,000 within the Lots of this framework, compliant with CSOs for each job to ensure value for money.
4. The first stage in the restricted procedure is the selection process, where the bidder's capability, capacity and experience to perform the contract is assessed using the Selection Questionnaire (SQ) to shortlist bidders. This means the number of bidders can be reduced at the selection stage.
5. As part of the second stage in the restricted procedure the top ten (10) scoring Tenderers for each Lot were invited to submit bids at the tender stage. The rationale for inviting the top ten (10) scoring Tenderers to participate in the tender stage was to increase the potential for competition and to achieve the number of Tenderers to be appointed to the Framework. The Invitation to Tender (ITT) document was issued to the shortlisted bidders and the bids were assessed to determine the most economically advantageous tender, the basis of contract award.
6. The SQ was published on the Council's e-procurement portal, CapitalEsourcing, 'Finder a Tender Service (FTS)' and 'Contracts Finder' on 30th July 2021. The SQ closed on 13th September 2021.
7. The SQ required participating bidders to self-declare their status against the exclusion grounds and included specific technical questions to evaluate consultants in order to prequalify them for the ITT stage. Table-1 presents an overview of the selection stage.

| Lots | Number of Tenderers who participated in the selection stage | Number of Tenderers rejected at selection stage | Number of Tenderers selected for the ITT stage |
|-------------|--|--|---|
| Lot 1 | 21 | 10 | 11 |
| Lot 2 | 27 | 16 | 11 |
| Lot 3 | 20 | 10 | 10 |
| Lot 4 | 18 | 8 | 10 |
| Lot 5 | 6 | - | 6 |
| Lot 6 | 14 | 3 | 11 |
| Lot 7 | 10 | 4 | 6 |
| Lot 8 | 9 | 1 | 8 |

(Table-1: Overview of the selection stage)

8. Further information on the SQ prequalification is provided in the Tender Analysis at Appendix 1 (exempt).
9. The ITT document was published on the Council's e-procurement portal, *CapitalEsourcing*, on 18 January 2022 and the tender closing date was Wednesday, 16 March 2022.
10. The tenders were opened on Wednesday, 16 March 2022.

Lot Strategy for Lots 1 to 4

11. In relation to the multidisciplinary lots (i.e., Lots 1 to 4) a 'Lot Strategy' was applied to ensure a suitable distribution of work across the Consultants appointed to these lots, and to ensure that the Council is not overly reliant on any one consultant across multiple lots. The 'Lot Strategy for Lots 1 to 4' is set out in Appendix 2.

Framework Call-off process

12. There are two (2) call-off options under the framework – direct award and mini-competition. Direct Award is possible to the first ranked Tenderer on the Lot if there is an emergency that is health and safety related. Otherwise, the default method of call-off is mini-competition to ensure the best value for money outcome is achieved.

Tender Evaluation

13. A team of three (3) evaluators were set-up for each lot to evaluate Tenderer's responses to the quality questions.
14. Tenders were evaluated based on the most economically advantageous tender and the two key areas assessed was Quality (50%) and Price (50%).
15. Following the technical and commercial evaluation of all tenders, Tables 2 to 9 below set out the scores achieved by each Tenderer across all the eight (8) lots. Further information on scoring for Lots 1 to 8 are provided at Appendices 3 to 9.

| Tender Scores for: Lot 1: Multi-disciplinary Services – capital projects with a value between £0 to £500,000 | | | | |
|---|---------------------|---|---|--|
| Ranking | Tenderer | Quality Score before weighting | Price Score before weighting | Total Score after weighting |
| 1 st | Quatrefoils Limited | 70.00 | 94.351 | 82.176 |
| - | Tenderer 7 | 70.00 | 87.95 | 78.975 |
| 2 nd | Fulkers LLP | 55.00 | 100.00 | 77.50 |
| 3 rd | Faithful+Gould | 85.00 | 54.365 | 69.683 |
| - | Tenderer 6 | 90.00 | 45.326 | 67.663 |

| | | | | |
|-----------------|----------------------------|-------|--------|--------|
| - | Tenderer 9 | 70.00 | 63.68 | 66.840 |
| 4 th | Faithorn Farrell Timms LLP | 60.00 | 71.65 | 65.825 |
| 5 th | Tenderer 1 | 75.00 | 48.05 | 61.525 |
| 6 th | Tenderer 8 | 60.00 | 57.618 | 58.809 |
| 7 th | Tenderer 4 | 60.00 | 42.555 | 51.278 |

(Table-2: Tender Scores for Lot 1 [Refer Appendix 3 - Tender Analysis for Lot 1])

16. Following the tender evaluation and, as can be seen in Table-2 above, officers recommend acceptance of the tenders submitted by *Quatrefoils Limited*, *Fulkers LLP*, *Faithful+Gould*, and *Faithorn Farrell Timms LLP* for Lot 1 - the successful Tenderers with combined quality and price scores of 82.176, 77.50, 69.683 and 65.825 respectively.

| Tender Scores for: Lot 2: Multi-disciplinary Services – capital projects with a value between £500,001 to £3.5m | | | | |
|---|-------------------------------|--------------------------------|------------------------------|-----------------------------|
| Ranking | Tenderer | Quality Score before weighting | Price Score before weighting | Total Score after weighting |
| 1 st | Keegans Limited | 68.76 | 100.00 | 84.38 |
| 2 nd | Pellings LLP | 63.72 | 88.927 | 76.324 |
| 3 rd | Michael Dyson Associates Ltd. | 69.60 | 78.916 | 74.258 |
| 4 th | Philip Pank Partnership | 61.824 | 80.779 | 71.302 |
| 5 th | John Rowan and Partners LLP | 88.107 | 51.627 | 69.867 |
| 6 th | Faithful+Gould | 86.00 | 52.585 | 69.293 |
| 7 th | Tenderer 1 | 73.008 | 58.92 | 65.964 |
| 8 th | Tenderer 10 | 56.20 | 73.359 | 64.78 |
| 9 th | Tenderer 11 | 56.40 | 60.67 | 58.535 |
| 10 th | Tenderer 6 | 59.44 | 51.917 | 55.679 |
| 11 th | Tenderer 3 | 60.80 | 46.327 | 53.564 |

(Table-3: Tender Scores for Lot 2 [Refer Appendix 4 - Tender Analysis for Lot 2])

17. Following the tender evaluation and, as can be seen in Table-3 above, officers recommend acceptance of the tender submitted by *Keegans Limited*, *Pellings LLP*, *Michael Dyson Associates Ltd.*, *Philip Pank Partnership*, *John Rowan and Partners LLP*, and *Faithful+Gould* for Lot 2 - the successful Tenderers with combined quality and price scores of 84.38, 76.324, 74.258, 71.302, 69.687 and 69.293 respectively.

| Tender Scores for: Lot 3: Multi-disciplinary Services – capital projects valued between £3,500,001 to £6.5m | | | | |
|---|-----------------|--------------------------------|------------------------------|-----------------------------|
| Ranking | Tenderer | Quality Score before weighting | Price Score before weighting | Total Score after weighting |
| 1 st | Keegans Limited | 72.76 | 92.81 | 82.785 |

| | | | | |
|-----------------|-------------------------|--------|--------|--------|
| 2 nd | Pellings LLP | 60.72 | 100.00 | 80.36 |
| 3 rd | Philip Pank Partnership | 64.824 | 82.876 | 73.85 |
| 4 th | John Rowan and Partners | 88.107 | 53.886 | 70.997 |
| 5 th | Tenderer 2 | 84.00 | 55.027 | 69.514 |
| 6 th | Tenderer 1 | 77.008 | 54.421 | 65.715 |
| 7 th | Tenderer 7 | 60.20 | 66.417 | 63.309 |
| 8 th | Tenderer 8 | 65.40 | 60.615 | 63.008 |

(Table-4: Tender Scores for Lot 3 [Refer Appendix 5 - Tender Analysis for Lot 3])

18. Following the tender evaluation and, as can be seen in Table-4 above, officers recommend acceptance of the tender submitted by *Keegans Limited, Pellings LLP, Philip Pank Partnership, and John Rowan and Partners* for Lot 3 - the successful bidders with combined quality and price scores of 82.785, 80.36, 73.85 and 70.997 respectively.

| Tender Scores for: Lot 4: Multi-disciplinary Services – capital projects valued at above £6,500,001 | | | | |
|---|-----------------------------|--------------------------------|------------------------------|-----------------------------|
| Ranking | Tenderer | Quality Score before weighting | Price Score before weighting | Total Score after weighting |
| 1 st | Keegans Limited | 75.76 | 90.407 | 83.084 |
| 2 nd | Pellings LLP | 60.72 | 100.00 | 80.36 |
| 3 rd | John Rowan and Partners LLP | 88.107 | 71.575 | 79.841 |
| 4 th | Baily Garner LLP | 73.008 | 76.112 | 74.56 |
| 5 th | Faithful+Gould | 84.00 | 64.477 | 74.239 |
| 6 th | Stace LLP | 60.40 | 80.892 | 70.646 |
| 7 th | Tenderer 8 | 59.20 | 80.097 | 69.649 |
| 8 th | Tenderer 7 | 80.80 | 54.388 | 67.594 |
| 9 th | Tenderer 5 | 43.20 | 61.633 | 52.417 |

(Table-5: Tender Scores for Lot 4 [Refer Appendix 5 - Tender Analysis for Lot 4])

19. Following the tender evaluation and, as can be seen in Table-5 above, officers recommend acceptance of the tender submitted by *Keegans Limited, Pellings LLP, John Rowan and Partners LLP, Baily Garner LLP, Faithful+Gould, and Stace LLP* for Lot 4 - the successful Tenderers with combined quality and price scores of 83.084, 80.36, 79.841, 74.56, 74.239 and 70.646 respectively.

| Tender Scores for: Lot 5: Civil and Structural and Mechanical and Electrical Engineering Services | | | | |
|--|-------------------------------|--------------------------------|------------------------------|-----------------------------|
| Ranking | Tenderer | Quality Score before weighting | Price Score before weighting | Total Score after weighting |
| 1 st | Ingleton Wood LLP | 78.80 | 100.00 | 89.40 |
| 2 nd | Services Design Solution Ltd. | 86.80 | 77.781 | 82.291 |

| Tender Scores for: Lot 5: Civil and Structural and Mechanical and Electrical Engineering Services | | | | |
|--|---------------------------------|---------------------------------------|-------------------------------------|------------------------------------|
| Ranking | Tenderer | Quality Score before weighting | Price Score before weighting | Total Score after weighting |
| 3 rd | Frankham Consultancy Group Ltd. | 67.60 | 65.181 | 66.391 |
| 4 th | ByrneLooby | 77.40 | 39.648 | 58.524 |

(Table-6: Tender Scores for Lot 5 [Refer Appendix 6 - Tender Analysis for Lot 5])

20. Following the tender evaluation and, as can be seen in Table-6 above, officers recommend acceptance of the tender submitted by *Ingleton Wood LLP, Services Design Solution Ltd., Frankham Consultancy Group Ltd., and ByrneLooby* for Lot 5 - the successful Tenderers with combined quality and price scores of 89.40, 82.291, 66.391 and 58.524 respectively.

| Tender Scores for: Lot 6: Architectural Services for building related projects with values up to £500,000 | | | | |
|--|------------------------------------|---------------------------------------|-------------------------------------|------------------------------------|
| Ranking | Tenderer | Quality Score before weighting | Price Score before weighting | Total Score after weighting |
| 1 st | Potter, Church & Holmes Architects | 90.00 | 100.00 | 95.00 |
| 2 nd | DMWR Architects | 90.00 | 91.714 | 90.857 |
| 3 rd | Quatrefoils Limited | 70.00 | 98.052 | 84.026 |
| 4 th | LSI Architects LLP | 80.00 | 77.607 | 78.804 |
| 5 th | Tenderer 9 | 80.00 | 72.475 | 76.238 |
| 6 th | Tenderer 4 | 75.00 | 75.412 | 75.206 |
| 7 th | Tenderer 5 | 70.00 | 76.323 | 73.162 |
| 8 th | Tenderer 1 | 85.00 | 38.976 | 61.988 |
| 9 th | Tenderer 3 | 70.00 | 47.57 | 58.785 |

(Table-7: Tender Scores for Lot 6 [Refer Appendix 7 - Tender Analysis for Lot 6])

21. Following the tender evaluation and, as can be seen in Table-7 above, officers recommend acceptance of the tender submitted by *Potter, Church & Holmes Architects, DMWR Architects, Quatrefoils Limited, and LSI Architects LLP* for Lot 6 - the successful Tenderers with combined quality and price scores of 95.00, 90.857, 84.026 and 78.804 respectively.

| Tender Scores for: Lot 7: Clerk of Works | | | | |
|---|-----------------|---------------------------------------|-------------------------------------|------------------------------------|
| Ranking | Tenderer | Quality Score before weighting | Price Score before weighting | Total Score after weighting |
| 1 st | John Rowan and | 78.884 | 85.035 | 81.96 |

| Tender Scores for: Lot 7: Clerk of Works | | | | |
|---|--------------------------|--------------------------------|------------------------------|-----------------------------|
| Ranking | Tenderer | Quality Score before weighting | Price Score before weighting | Total Score after weighting |
| | Partners LLP | | | |
| 2 nd | MDA Consulting Ltd. | 60.40 | 100.00 | 80.20 |
| 3 rd | Hickton Consultants Ltd. | 71.20 | 67.038 | 69.119 |
| 4 th | Airey Miller Limited | 69.80 | 58.998 | 64.399 |
| 5 th | Baily Garner | 76.56 | 51.422 | 63.991 |
| 6 th | Tenderer 6 | 80.60 | 45.837 | 63.219 |

(Table-8: Tender Scores for Lot 7 [Refer Appendix 8 - Tender Analysis for Lot 7])

22. Following the tender evaluation and, as can be seen in Table-8 above, officers recommend acceptance of the tender submitted by *John Rowan and Partners LLP, MDA Consulting Ltd., Hickton Consultants Ltd., Airey Miller Limited, and Baily Garner LLP* for Lot 7 - the successful Tenderers with combined quality and price scores of 81.96, 80.20, 69.119, 64.399 and 63.991 respectively.

| Tender Scores for: Lot 8: Fire Consultancy Services | | | | |
|--|----------------------------|--------------------------------|------------------------------|-----------------------------|
| Ranking | Tenderer | Quality Score before weighting | Price Score before weighting | Total Score after weighting |
| 1 st | Faithorn Farrell Timms LLP | 60.733 | 100.00 | 80.367 |
| 2 nd | Ventro Limited | 61.00 | 86.262 | 73.631 |
| 3 rd | Keegans Limited | 73.80 | 65.30 | 69.55 |
| 4 th | Tetra Consulting Limited | 62.733 | 48.382 | 55.558 |

(Table-9: Tender Scores for Lot 8 [Refer Appendix 9 - Tender Analysis for Lot 8])

23. Following the tender evaluation and, as can be seen in Table-9 above, officers recommend acceptance of the tender submitted by *Faithorn Farrell Timms LLP, Ventro Limited, Keegans Limited, and Tetra Consulting Limited* for Lot 8 - the successful Tenderers with combined quality and price scores of 80.367, 73.631, 69.55 and 55.558 respectively.

Reasons for Decision

24. The appointed Consultants under the different lots will enable the Council to meet its ongoing need for technical consultants to support the delivery of the capital programme over the next four (4) years.
25. The Cabinet Paper titled, '*Procurement Strategy for Consultancy Services Framework*' dated, 7 December 2020, approved the procurement strategy for procuring technical consultants.

Equality Implications

26. There are no anticipated negative implications for groups with protected characteristics, under the Equality Act 2010, by the approval of the contract awards and related recommendations outlined in this report.

Risk Management Implications

27. The delivery of the capital programme, specifically the ongoing investment into the homes of the Council's tenants and leaseholders, is a key priority, which will directly support residents in living healthy and independent lives. A competitive tender process has been completed, which is in line with the objective of being ruthlessly financially efficient. As a result of the tender exercise, the report recommends appointing a number of providers to each Lot on the framework which will provide a range of pre-vetted, high-quality technical consultants to assist the Council in delivering its capital programme over the next four years.

David Hughes, Director of Audit, Fraud, Risk and Insurance. 30 June 2022

Climate and Ecological Emergency Implications

28. As part of the Framework award- standard selection questionnaire process, we qualified suppliers on their historic track record in relation to compliance with environmental laws.
29. The framework award stage also assessed suppliers on previous experience with works pertaining to environmental initiatives.
30. Access to the framework will not guarantee the supplier a particular volume of projects. The client team is working with relevant environmental teams at LBHF and therefore at the 'call-off' stage, the client team will include an element of project specific environment/climate performance into the assessment criteria for winning framework projects.

Jim Cunningham, Climate Policy & Strategy Lead, 07/03/2023

Procurement implications

31. The results of the evaluation process were verified against the e-tendering system on 6 September 2022 by Dominic D'Souza (Commercial Manager).
32. The procurement was then taken over, after Dominic's departure, by the Procurement and Commercial Team.
33. The procurement is wholly compliant under the Public Contract Regulations 2015 and will be applied to ensure all CSOs are applied to each award under this framework of Lots.

David von Ackerman – Head of Procurement 7/12/2022

Local Economy and Social Value

34. The Council's Social Value policy introduced in May 2020 requires that suppliers on this framework contribute social value measures to a proxy value of at least 10% of the value of the call-off contract.
35. The Procurement Strategy for this framework dated 7/12/2020 states that social value contributions are assessed in mini-competitions and proposals for these contributions will have a 20% weighting of the quality score which, in turn, will have a 50% weighting of the overall score (such that the total social value weighting will be 10%). In addition to this, it is recommended that suppliers propose social value contributions of a proxy value of at least 10% of the proposed price in advance of the contract being awarded. The LBHF 'themes outcomes and measures' framework is the method the Council uses to invite proposals of social value measures and the method by which they will be delivered.
36. It is recommended that the commissioner will work closely with Legal to ensure appropriate social value clauses are included in the contract awarded so that the Council can enforce its right to compensation if social value commitments are not delivered.

Paul Clarke, Economic Development Officer, 11 July 2022

Consultation

37. These agreements are subject to two stages of statutory consultation with leaseholders under the Service Charges (Consultation Requirements) (England) Regulations 2003.
38. The first stage of consultation was carried out from 11 November 2020 to 14 December 2020. This outlined the types of professional services we were seeking to secure.
39. The second phase of consultation will provide leaseholders with the names and addresses of the proposed providers for each Lot and an opportunity to inspect their priced rates.
40. No contract will be awarded until that consultation process has concluded and the council has had due regard for all observations.

Ciaran Maguire, Head of Home Ownership Services, 20 July 2022

List of Exempt Appendices:

| | |
|--------------|--|
| Appendix 1: | Tender Analysis – SQ and ITT Stages |
| Appendix 2: | Lot Strategy for Lots 1 to 4 |
| Appendix 3: | Tender Analysis – Lot 1: Multi-disciplinary Services – capital projects with a value between £0 to £500,000 |
| Appendix 4: | Tender Analysis – Lot 2: Multi-disciplinary Services – capital projects with a value between £500,001 to £3.5m |
| Appendix 5: | Tender Analysis – Lot 3: Multi-disciplinary Services – capital projects valued between £3,500,001 to £6.5m |
| Appendix 6: | Tender Analysis – Lot 4: Multi-disciplinary Services – capital projects valued at above £6,500,001 |
| Appendix 7: | Tender Analysis - Lot 5: Civil and Structural and Mechanical and Electrical Engineering Services |
| Appendix 8: | Tender Analysis - Lot 6: Architectural Services for building related projects with values up to £500,000 |
| Appendix 9: | Tender Analysis – Lot 7: Clerk of Works £500,000 |
| Appendix 10: | Tender Analysis – Lot 8: Fire Consultancy Services £2,000,000 |

End