

COMMERCIAL STRATEGY APPROVAL

CAPITAL CONSTRUCTION PROJECTS

KEY FACTS

| | | | | | | | | | | | | |
|-----------------------------------|---|----------------------|------------|-------------------------|------|----------------------------|-------|----|---------|-----|-----|-----|
| Project title | Ecclesall Infants Permanent Expansion | Project value | £5,600,000 | Client Portfolio | CYPF | Evaluation Criteria | Price | 0% | Quality | 90% | E&S | 10% |
| Purpose and scope of works | To build a 2 storey extension providing an additional 450 pupil places (to total 630) and additional kitchen space. The extension will contain new class bases and more than likely be accommodated on 2 floors. It would also contain toilets, cloak area, hygiene room, staff room, group rooms, lift, stairs and a link corridor. Work will include the removal of the temporary classroom units provided and reinstatement. Some internal refurbishment/reconfiguration to the existing school will also be carried out to create additional spaces needed. The school will be completed in summer 2018 ready for opening in September. | | | | | | | | | | | |

RECOMMENDATIONS AND APPROVALS

PROCUREMENT STRATEGY

| | | | |
|------------------------|--|------------------------|--|
| Recommendation: | <p>To approve the procurement of Ecclesall Infants Permanent Expansion using:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> A construction framework (YORbuild2 planned) NEC Option A contract Single stage design and build process A cost-led procurement approach The ancillary contracts as set out in this Strategy at section C8 <p>To grant delegated authority to the Director of Finance and Commercial Services (or their nominated deputy) to accept tenders and award contracts set out in this Strategy in relation to this scheme.</p> | Recommendation: | The tender of Balfour Beatty Construction Ltd in the sum of £4,652,574.40 be accepted and a Letter of Acceptance issued accordingly. |
|------------------------|--|------------------------|--|

PROJECT TEAM APPROVALS

| | Who | Signature | Date | Signature | Date |
|---|------------------------|----------------|------------|--------------|------------|
| Cost Manager | Richard Pierpoint, CDS | R.Pierpoint | 28/09/2016 | R.Pierpoint | 10/03/2017 |
| Project Manager | Glen John-Lewis, CDS | G John-Lewis | 30/09/2016 | G John-Lewis | 13/03/2017 |
| Contract Manager | Glen John-Lewis, CDS | G John-Lewis | 30/09/2016 | G John-Lewis | 13/03/2017 |
| Client Lead | Patricia Slater, CYPF | P Slater | 12/10/2016 | P Slater | 15/03/2017 |
| Technical Manager – C & C M | Richard Eccles, CDS | R. Eccles | 4/10/2016 | R. Eccles | 13/03/2017 |
| Procurement Professional | Phil Moorcroft, CS | Phil Moorcroft | 5/10/2016 | P Moorcroft | 27/03/2017 |
| Project Sponsor | John Doyle, CYPF | John Doyle | 12/10/2016 | J Doyle | 15/03/2017 |
| Head of Capital Delivery Service | Sean McClean, CDS | S. McClean | 30/09/2016 | S. McClean | 13/03/2017 |
| Capital Programme Group | Paul Schofield | P Schofield | 24/10/2016 | K Bollington | 27/03/2017 |
| Commercial Director | Kerry Bollington, CS | K Bollington | 15/11/2016 | K Bollington | 18/04/2017 |

COMMERCIAL SERVICES' APPROVAL DETAILS

| | | | | | |
|--------------------------------|-----------|--|--|------------------------------|----------|
| Commercial Approval No. | CS-071-16 | Original Commercial Approval (if extension) | | CDS Project Reference | CY/05145 |
|--------------------------------|-----------|--|--|------------------------------|----------|



PROCUREMENT STRATEGY APPROVAL

SECTION A CAPITAL APPROVAL MILESTONES AND PROCUREMENT PROGRAMME

| | | | | | |
|------------|---|---|------------|--|--|
| A1 | GATEWAY 1A (RELEVANT BOARD) Initial Business Case | Name of Board: Capital & Growth Board (C&G) Date of approval: 10/08/16 | A2 | GATEWAY 1B (CAPITAL PROGRAMME GROUP) Initial Business Case | Date of approval: 26/08/16 |
| A3 | GATEWAY 2A (RELEVANT BOARD) Outline Business Case | Name of Board: C&G Date of approval: 12/10/16 | A4 | GATEWAY 2B (CAPITAL PROGRAMME GROUP) Outline Business Case | Date of approval: 24/10/16 |
| A5 | CABINET OR LEADER DELEGATION | Cabinet Date of approval: 23/11/16 | A6 | Issue advertisement to market / notify framework participants | Date: 24/10/16 (Issue of YORHub Project Information Template to Rotherham MBC Framework Manager) at risk |
| A7 | Return of PQQ (if applicable) | Date: N/A | A8 | Issue of tender documents | Date:30/11/16 |
| A9 | Deadline for tender / mini-competition returns | Date: 24/01/17 | A10 | Evaluation of tender deadline | Date:14/02/17 |
| A11 | GATEWAY 3A (RELEVANT BOARD) Final Business Case | Name of Board: C&G Proposed date of approval: 15/03/17 | A12 | GATEWAY 3B (CAPITAL PROGRAMME GROUP) Final Business Case and Contract Award Approval | Proposed date of approval: 24/03/17 |

SECTION B BUDGET

| | | | | | |
|-----------|--|-----------------------------|--|------------------------|--|
| B1 | TOTAL CAPITAL PROJECT BUDGET | B1a | This must agree to the latest approved value – quote the Q-tier CAF version | £5,600,000 | OEO Business Unit No.: 90861 CAF version: Ver 2. |
| | The total project budget is the summation of B1b-B1f | B1b | Construction cost (estimated tender value excluding contingency) If this is a Design & Build contract, please state and provide full details | £4,659,800,000 | Construction Estimate - this is the estimated cost for the design & construction of the Works by the Contractor. |
| | | B1c | Lotting structure If this requirement is divided into lots, state the value of each lot and explain your approach | Lot 1: £- Lot 2: £- | N/A |
| | | B1d | Fees - please provide a breakdown of all fees (e.g. QSs, in-house design fees, external fees) | | Explanation: |
| | | | Capital Delivery Service fees | £189,200 | As per Commissioning Brief & Fee Proposal: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Gateway 1-2 Fee- £17,400 Project Management Fee- £55,000 Building Technical Assistant- £2,000 Structural Designer- £2,300 Architectural Design- £2,300 CCM & Procurement Fee- £54,000 Clerk of Works Fee- £26,200 Survey Allowances- £30,000 |
| | | | Delivery Partner fees (Turner and Townsend) fees | - | Although no fees may be specifically allocated to the Delivery Partner at this stage, CDS reserves the right to engage the Delivery Partner in accordance with its 'Core & Flex' model. |
| | | | Commercial Services | £1,000 | Fixed fee of £1k to cover all commercial / procurement costs |
| | | | External fees (please state how the external consultant is to be procured or, if a waiver request, include full justification) | - | N/A |
| | | Other fees (please specify) | - | N/A | |
| | | B1e | Client costs capital - any client side costs that are recharged directly to this project | £280,000 | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> £225,000 furniture and equipment, and ICT Provision. This is based on £500 per pupil with 450 additional pupils being catered for. £10,000 Planning Fees £30,000 Asbestos Removal £15,000 for Decant Removals. See section C8 below for procurement routes for these ancillary items. |

| | | | | | | |
|-----------|---|--|--------------------|----------|-----|--|
| | | B1f | Contingency | £470,000 | 10% | Not included within Construction Costs. Nominal Allowance. |
| B2 | REVENUE COST IMPLICATIONS | N/A | | | | |
| B3 | EXTERNAL FUNDING (E.G. GRANTS / ERDF) Please specify grant, value and how key grant conditions will be complied with | None, funded by Basic Need Fund; Finance have been informed. | | | | |

SECTION C OUR COMMERCIAL STRATEGY

| | | | | | | |
|-----------|--|--|--|----------------------|--------|--|
| C1 | PROPOSED TENDER ROUTE | Justification for proposed tender route / explanation why other options discounted | | | | |
| | Framework contract (e.g. YORhub / EN Procure / Scape – please specify) | Yes | <p>This scheme will be procured by way of a mini-competition through a Framework (YORbuild2) for the following reasons:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Removes the requirement to prequalify component operators as they have already been selected to gain a place on the framework. Minimises procurement timescales and associated resource costs. High quality, competent contractors who are well experienced at delivering these types of schemes are on the framework. This will minimise risk of time and cost overruns on site. Minimises risk of procurement challenge as framework contractors are already approved. Contractors on the Frameworks have experience of cost-led procurement so all are comfortable with its concept. <p>A mini competition will be conducted from the ten contractors in Lot 5 (Works between £3.5m- £10m, south and west region). We are not appointing by rotation as we believe a competition will provide best demonstrable VFM.</p> <p>Should insufficient interest be gained from the YORbuild2 Framework, alternative frameworks (such as Pagabo) will be used.</p> <p>The EFA Framework isn't being used because:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> the EFA contract does not permit Sheffield City Council's standard contract clauses such as living wage, bribery and corruption or social value to be included (as contractors have not priced on this basis) there is no facility to deliver social value (including employment and skills) within the EFA contract there is a small range of contractors meaning competition is more limited than YORbuild2 tender returns on EFA framework projects is often poor as, anecdotally, contractors do not receive sufficient returns through the framework Sheffield City Council Education Projects have a bespoke specification that is higher than the EFA Specification. Variations over and above the EFA standard specification are discouraged by EFA and would attract a higher premium than they would under other frameworks, as these are a deviation from the EFA standard specification which contractors have priced on. We would therefore receive a 'double whammy' of additional costs. | Framework access fee | £7,832 | |
| | Full competitive tender process (please specify procedure to be used) | No | Requires additional time and resource cost to generate a tender list. Has the potential risk of challenge at PQQ stage. Is likely to generate the same shortlisted contractors as are already on the YORbuild2 framework. | | | |
| | In-house provider (please confirm they have been asked to price first) | No | N/A | | | |
| | Existing contract (please confirm it can be varied to deliver this project) | No | N/A | | | |
| | Single source tender (please provide your evidence for this) | No | N/A | | | |
| | Waiver of Council Standing Orders (please provide full justification) | No | N/A | | | |
| | Other options considered (please provide details) | N/A | | | | |
| | Who are our potential contractors and how will we maximise responses? | There are numerous contractors in the market with the facility to undertake works of this nature. It is recommended to utilise the YORbuild2 framework in order to obtain of shortlist of tenderers of a suitable capacity and experience. There are 10 contractors on the relevant lot of the YORbuild2 framework and it is expected that a good response will be achieved. We will maximise responses by providing a detailed Project Information Template to the contractors to ensure they have full information on which to make a decision. We will follow this up with proactive telephone calls if required. | | | | |
| | Above or below OJEU threshold? | Above the OJEU threshold. YORbuild2 is an OJEU compliant framework. | | | | |
| C2 | PROPOSED PROCUREMENT ROUTE Please state proposed procurement route e.g. design and build, together with commercial reasons for this choice | | | | | |
| | <p>THIS SCHEME will BE PROCURED BY MEANS OF A SINGLE STAGE DESIGN & BUILD COST-LED TENDER PROCESS TO A TENDER LIST OBTAINED VIA A CONSTRUCTION FRAMEWORK (YORBUILD2) USING THE NEC OPTION A CONTRACT.</p> <p>The reasons for this choice are broken down below:</p> <p>Framework Contract - Removes the requirement to prequalify component operators as they have already been selected to gain a place on the framework. Minimises procurement timescales and associated resource costs. High quality, competent contractors who are well experienced at delivering these types of schemes are on the framework. This will minimise risk of time and cost overruns on site. Minimises risk of procurement challenge as framework contractors are already approved. Contractors on the Frameworks have experience of cost-led procurement so all are comfortable with its concept.</p> <p>Single Stage Procurement - This is a relatively straightforward scheme to design (expected to be a simple square/rectangular school block building); therefore we do not require early contractor involvement. Other previous schemes – e.g. North East School – had significant site abnormalities which benefit from early contractor involvement.</p> <p>Design and Build – We want the detailed design to be undertaken by the contractor because they will then have the risk of developing the detailed design for construction. They will also bring their expertise on buildability and will be able to better co-ordinate design work packages.</p> <p>NEC Contract Option A - This contract has been selected over the JCT Design & Build Contract as the Project Manager has a wealth of experience using this Form of Contract. Switching to JCT would therefore deliver no discernible benefit. Option A is lump sum with activity schedule. We have considered using the NEC Target Cost form of contract (Option C), whereby the contractor is incentivised to deliver a scheme under budget and penalised for an over budget scheme. However, we have discounted this route because our priority is cost certainty, and ensuring we deliver maximum value for our budget.</p> | | | | | |

Cost-led procurement (CLP) – we are trialling this new, innovative procurement approach to drive the maximum value from our available budgets. CLP sets a target price, driving the contractor to provide the highest quality building for the available budget. Significant work will be undertaken, using SCC and EFA benchmarking information, to ensure that we arrive at a target price which represents sound value for money, but also does not dissuade contractors from tendering for the scheme. Our preliminary work has already resulted in the required construction budget being reduced by over £1m.

YORbuild has run a similar scheme and arrived at a cost of £1,785 per sq metre, which compares extremely favourably with a national cost benchmarking study (undertaken by Hampshire County Council, East Riding of Yorkshire Council and the Education Funding Agency) rate of £1,854 per sq metre – particularly bearing in mind Sheffield’s enhanced specification and challenging topography. We are currently seeking confirmation of the EFA Framework cost per square metre, as it is unclear from the information provided whether these average costs relate to the EFA framework, or merely average costs irrespective of procurement route.

There are currently 2 options being considered for how the Contract is to be evaluated. These are set out below. Further market research is to be undertaken in collaboration with other Local Authorities in order to finalise the solution. We hope this will be completed before the Capital and Growth Board.

OPTION 1- Fully Cost Led Procurement with 90% Quality and 10% Employment & Skills

Within this option the construction tender price is dictated to the Contractor by the Project Team. The construction tender price is set by benchmarking the project against historical data from Sheffield City Council projects, projects on the BCIS (Building Cost Information Service provided by the Royal Institution of the Chartered Surveyors) and the EFA Benchmark Rates. This enables the construction tender price to be set at a competitive figure, ensuring the Client is receiving good value for money.

The project will therefore be awarded on the Contractors Design and Quality Proposals that achieve the construction tender price – i.e. how much more can we get, over and above our minimum requirements, for £4.7m?

OPTION 2 – Partial Cost Led Procurement with 50% Quality, 40% Price and 10% Employment & Skills

The only difference between Options 1 and 2 is that Option 2 gives potential contractors the opportunity to submit a price which is either higher or lower than the estimated construction tender price. The advantages of this approach are that:

- We may secure a lower tender price; and
- In the event of our estimated tender price being too low, the market can submit higher prices. We therefore receive tenders, rather than conducting an abortive tender process.

However, the disadvantages are that:

- This is not truly cost-led procurement – it’s essentially a single stage design and build contract.
- Tender prices (which meet our specification) submitted below £4.7m merely indicate that our benchmarked estimated tender construction price was too generous, rather than it driving out increased VFM.

We are undertaking further work on these 2 options and will crystallise our strategy at the earliest possible opportunity. Finance & Procurement Group agreed that Option 1 would be recommended for approval at Capital & Growth Board – this recommendation was approved at Capital & Growth Board

LESSONS LEARNED FROM MEETING WITH EAST RIDING COUNCIL (ERC) WHO HAVE A COST-LED PROCUREMENT PROJECT CURRENTLY ON-SITE:

1. Pre-tender Contractor Meeting- This was used by ERC to assess the appetite of the construction market for this type of Procurement. It also enabled the Client team to fully brief the potential Contractors on their requirements.
2. It appeared that ERC established a budget figure which was subsequently reduced to ‘focus the mind of the Contractor’. This prompted the return of only 2 valid tenders from a shortlist of 8. In our opinion reducing the budget allowance further put added pressure on the tendering contractors and reduced the appetite of the market.
3. Realistic Budget- Ensure that proper benchmarking is undertaken to provide a budget that gives Contractors an actual realistic opportunity to meet the Client’s Requirements. If the budget is too low Contractors simply won’t have the interest in tendering.
4. Quality Criteria- Ensure that the Quality Criteria is fully defined to the Contractors. As the design is left fully to the devices of the Contractor it is essential to fully define the Client’s Requirements and parameters in order to minimise the level of subjectivity within the Quality Evaluation. This should mitigate the chances of any challenges to the evaluation process.
5. SCC intends to apply a 100% Quality Assessment as opposed to ERC who adopted a 70/30 Quality/Price split. It is considered that this is more appropriate as this approach mitigates the additional Contractor risk in the need to further review the pricing element.

| | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
|---|--|--|---|--------------------------------|---|---------------------|-------------------------------------|-----|--|--|--|--|--|---|--|----------------------------------|----|--------------------------|--|--|--------------------------|--|--------------|----|--------------------------|--|--|--------------------------|--|--|----|--------------------------|--|--|--------------------------|--|--|----|--------------------------|--|--|--------------------------|--|---|----|--------------------------|--|--|--------------------------|--|---|--|-------------------|---|--------------------------------|---|---------------------|
| C3 | PROPOSED FORM OF CONTRACT Please provide the proposed form of contract e.g. JCT / NEC with(out) quantities, Option A, B, C - together with an explanation of our commercial reasons for this choice | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| | <p>The proposed form of contract to be utilised is the 3rd Edition of the NEC utilising main option A – Lump Sum with Activity Schedule.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Programme control is integral to the NEC 3 forms of contract and will ensure that timescales are robustly monitored and programme maintained. • From both programming and costs perspectives, the NEC3 suite of contracts provides robust ‘early warning’ mechanisms which will maximise the chances of the scheme being delivered to time and budget. • Use of the NEC form of contract is consistent with central government guidelines on collaborative procurement, and the higher levels of project management required over the JCT forms are entirely justified for a project of this size and risk. • Option A offers the most cost certainty to the client up front, giving the most assurance of the final outturn cost meeting the budget. <p>Using a ‘target cost’ (Option C) form - rather than Option A - would be undesirable in this instance. As we are in a rising market, this may increase the cost risk to the client with regard to final supply chain costs. We have learnt from our Greystones School scheme, where the Council suffered increased costs. We therefore believe that Option A provides the greatest cost certainty for the client.</p> | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| C4 | <table border="1"> <tr> <td data-bbox="148 1354 816 1438">PROPOSED FORM OF PQQ (if applicable)</td> <td colspan="6" data-bbox="816 1354 2917 1438">The use of the standard Crown Commercial Services or PAS91 PQQs is preferred by the Government’s Crown Commercial Service and we must therefore demonstrate that we have considered which form of PQQ is most appropriate. We must also justify whether all or any additional questions are required.</td> </tr> <tr> <td data-bbox="148 1438 816 1501"></td> <td data-bbox="816 1438 934 1501"></td> <td colspan="3" data-bbox="934 1438 1914 1501">Reasons for using or not using each proposed document, or</td> <td colspan="2" data-bbox="1914 1438 2917 1501">Additional project-specific questions (please list here)</td> </tr> <tr> <td data-bbox="148 1501 816 1554">Crown Commercial Services</td> <td data-bbox="816 1501 934 1554">No</td> <td colspan="3" data-bbox="934 1501 1914 1554">N/A- YORbuild2 Framework</td> <td colspan="2" data-bbox="1914 1501 2917 1554">N/A- YORbuild2 Framework</td> </tr> <tr> <td data-bbox="148 1554 816 1606">PAS91</td> <td data-bbox="816 1554 934 1606">No</td> <td colspan="3" data-bbox="934 1554 1914 1606">N/A- YORbuild2 Framework</td> <td colspan="2" data-bbox="1914 1554 2917 1606">N/A- YORbuild2 Framework</td> </tr> <tr> <td data-bbox="148 1606 816 1659">SCC Works suitability assessment (contracts < £164k)</td> <td data-bbox="816 1606 934 1659">No</td> <td colspan="3" data-bbox="934 1606 1914 1659">N/A- YORbuild2 Framework</td> <td colspan="2" data-bbox="1914 1606 2917 1659">N/A- YORbuild2 Framework</td> </tr> <tr> <td data-bbox="148 1659 816 1711">SCC Works short form (contracts < £500k)</td> <td data-bbox="816 1659 934 1711">No</td> <td colspan="3" data-bbox="934 1659 1914 1711">N/A- YORbuild2 Framework</td> <td colspan="2" data-bbox="1914 1659 2917 1711">N/A- YORbuild2 Framework</td> </tr> <tr> <td data-bbox="148 1711 816 1774">SCC Works long form (contracts > £500k)</td> <td data-bbox="816 1711 934 1774">No</td> <td colspan="3" data-bbox="934 1711 1914 1774">N/A- YORbuild2 Framework</td> <td colspan="2" data-bbox="1914 1711 2917 1774">N/A- YORbuild2 Framework</td> </tr> <tr> <td data-bbox="148 1774 816 1827">Additional standard question modules for long form req’d? (please tick ✓)</td> <td data-bbox="816 1774 934 1827"></td> <td data-bbox="934 1774 1261 1827">References</td> <td data-bbox="1261 1774 1587 1827">-</td> <td data-bbox="1587 1774 1914 1827">Employment & skills</td> <td data-bbox="1914 1774 2240 1827">-</td> <td data-bbox="2240 1774 2917 1827">CDM Design -</td> </tr> </table> | PROPOSED FORM OF PQQ (if applicable) | The use of the standard Crown Commercial Services or PAS91 PQQs is preferred by the Government’s Crown Commercial Service and we must therefore demonstrate that we have considered which form of PQQ is most appropriate. We must also justify whether all or any additional questions are required. | | | | | | | | Reasons for using or not using each proposed document, or | | | Additional project-specific questions (please list here) | | Crown Commercial Services | No | N/A- YORbuild2 Framework | | | N/A- YORbuild2 Framework | | PAS91 | No | N/A- YORbuild2 Framework | | | N/A- YORbuild2 Framework | | SCC Works suitability assessment (contracts < £164k) | No | N/A- YORbuild2 Framework | | | N/A- YORbuild2 Framework | | SCC Works short form (contracts < £500k) | No | N/A- YORbuild2 Framework | | | N/A- YORbuild2 Framework | | SCC Works long form (contracts > £500k) | No | N/A- YORbuild2 Framework | | | N/A- YORbuild2 Framework | | Additional standard question modules for long form req’d? (please tick ✓) | | References | - | Employment & skills | - | CDM Design - |
| PROPOSED FORM OF PQQ (if applicable) | The use of the standard Crown Commercial Services or PAS91 PQQs is preferred by the Government’s Crown Commercial Service and we must therefore demonstrate that we have considered which form of PQQ is most appropriate. We must also justify whether all or any additional questions are required. | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| | | Reasons for using or not using each proposed document, or | | | Additional project-specific questions (please list here) | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| Crown Commercial Services | No | N/A- YORbuild2 Framework | | | N/A- YORbuild2 Framework | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| PAS91 | No | N/A- YORbuild2 Framework | | | N/A- YORbuild2 Framework | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| SCC Works suitability assessment (contracts < £164k) | No | N/A- YORbuild2 Framework | | | N/A- YORbuild2 Framework | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| SCC Works short form (contracts < £500k) | No | N/A- YORbuild2 Framework | | | N/A- YORbuild2 Framework | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| SCC Works long form (contracts > £500k) | No | N/A- YORbuild2 Framework | | | N/A- YORbuild2 Framework | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| Additional standard question modules for long form req’d? (please tick ✓) | | References | - | Employment & skills | - | CDM Design - | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| C5 | <table border="1"> <tr> <td data-bbox="148 1827 934 1921">TENDER EVALUATION CRITERIA</td> <td data-bbox="934 1827 1261 1921">Price /100</td> <td data-bbox="1261 1827 1587 1921">Option 1 -0%</td> <td data-bbox="1587 1827 1914 1921">Quality /100</td> <td data-bbox="1914 1827 2240 1921">Option 1 - 90%</td> <td data-bbox="2240 1827 2567 1921">Employment & skills /100</td> <td data-bbox="2567 1827 2917 1921">10%</td> </tr> </table> | TENDER EVALUATION CRITERIA | Price /100 | Option 1 -0% | Quality /100 | Option 1 - 90% | Employment & skills /100 | 10% | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| TENDER EVALUATION CRITERIA | Price /100 | Option 1 -0% | Quality /100 | Option 1 - 90% | Employment & skills /100 | 10% | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| C6 | TENDER QUALITY QUESTIONS | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |

| | |
|---|---|
| Please list your proposed tender quality questions / subjects here | <p>The tender quality questions will be developed in partnership with the Client, Capital Delivery Service and Commercial Services.</p> <p>We anticipate that questions are likely to cover programme, materials palette, site plan, traffic management plan, planning approvals and consultation, concept designs, collaborative design development, proposed project team (albeit with a low weighting) and working in a live school environment.</p> <p>Sustainability, health and safety and employment and skills have already been picked up through the tender process used to appoint contractors to the YORbuild2 framework, although we will consider whether any further questions are required.</p> |
|---|---|

| | | | | | | |
|--|--|--|---|------------|--|---|
| C7 KEY PROCUREMENT / BUDGETARY / COMMERCIAL RISKS | | | | | | |
| | Risk | | Mitigation | | Risk | Mitigation |
| C7a | Insufficient funding allowed for the whole scheme if only EFA benchmark rates used | | A contingency is included for any unforeseen risks There is no enhanced 'Sheffield Specification'. We are using the standard BB103 specification developed by EFA. The gross floor area averages 15% lower than that recommended in BB98 and around 6% lower than BB99. We are also developing models for further space reductions of 5% and 10%, so these can be modelled as part of value engineering. | C7b | Delay in starting construction work in time to complete the extension for the September 2018 completion | A robust Project Management plan is put in place to ensure the project is delivered on time and to budget Use the YORbuild2 framework to streamline the procurement process |
| C7c | Ground Conditions; site issues | | Site surveys and remediation reports to be obtained by SCC and to be included in tender document prior to works starting on site. | C7d | Attractiveness of lump sum single stage procurement to the market – potential lack of interest from framework participants | Ensure the estimated construction cost is realistic and attractive to the market Include wording in the tender documents to the effect that if the contractor views the budget as insufficient, to raise a clarification question with us (rather than withdrawing from the opportunity) |

| | | | | | | | | | | |
|--|-------------------------|------------------|--------------|--|--------------------------|--|-------------------------|----------------------------------|-------------------------|------------------|
| C8 OTHER CONTRACTS RELATING TO THE SAME SCHEME (e.g. professional services) Please add rows as required | | | | | | | | | | |
| C8a | Contract subject | Furniture & ICT | Value | £225,000 The split between furniture and ICT will be decided by the school. | Procurement route | We will give monies directly to the school for them to procure these items in accordance with their standing orders. | Form of contract | Funding agreement to be prepared | Date of approval | By this strategy |
| C8b | Contract subject | Decants | Value | £15,000 | Procurement route | We will give monies directly to the school for them to procure these items in accordance with their standing orders. | Form of contract | Funding agreement to be prepared | Date of approval | By this strategy |
| C8c | Contract subject | Asbestos Removal | Value | £30,000 | Procurement route | Corporate contract | Form of contract | SCC call off | Date of approval | By this strategy |

SECTION D PROJECT IMPACT AND IMPLICATIONS

| | | | | | | | | | | |
|-----------|--|----|---|--|--|--|--|--|--|--|
| D1 | TUPE | | | | | | | | | |
| | is this a Measured Term Contract? | No | Cost Manager to include the non-TUPE wording in tender documents. | | | | | | | |

| | | | | | | | | | | |
|--|--|-----------------|------------|------------------------------------|---|---|--|----|--|--|
| D2 EMPLOYMENT AND SKILLS BENCHMARKS | | | | | | | | | | |
| Please liaise with Lifelong Learning and Skills to ascertain benchmark requirements for all contracts over £164k. These should be approved by Lifelong Learning and Skills, the client and procurement professional. If using a framework procurement route – irrespective of value - please notify Futureworks and the relevant Framework Manager (as the framework may wish to require outputs for contracts below £164k). | | | | | | | | | | |
| D2a | Work experience (14-16 years) | 4 | D2b | Work experience (16+ years) | 4 | D2c | School workshops / site visits | 12 | | |
| D2d | Internships | - | D2f | Employment | 2 | D2g | Apprenticeships (project initiated) | 1 | | |
| D2h | Trainees (project initiated L4 and higher level skills) | - | D2i | Graduates | - | D2j | Other trainees | - | | |
| D2k | Apprenticeships (existing) | 40 person weeks | | | | | | | | |
| If no or only voluntary outputs are to be delivered, please state why and the date this was approved by Lifelong Learning and Skills | | | | | | As it is intended to procure this scheme via the YORbuild2 framework, E&S benchmark requirements will be generated by YORbuild2. Initial contact is being made with YORbuild2 and Kerry Moon (Lifelong Learning and Skills) following approval of this Commercial Strategy at Capital and Growth Board, and the benchmark requirements will be confirmed prior to the issue of tender documents (and recorded in the contract award). | | | | |

| | | | | | | | | | | |
|---|--|------------------|--|--|--|--|--|--|--|-----|
| D3 HEALTH AND SAFETY - CONSTRUCTION (DESIGN AND MANAGEMENT) REGULATIONS 2015 | | | | | | | | | | |
| Principal Designer (insert name) | | TBC (Contractor) | Notification to Health and Safety Executive required? (i.e. over 30 days construction period PLUS >20 workers on site or 500 person days) | | | | | | | Yes |

| | | | |
|---|--|---|--|
| D4 | HIGHWAYS IMPLICATIONS | | |
| | Will this project have any impacts on the highway? (N.B. this includes entrances to developments, landscaping works etc. – not just highways schemes) | | Yes |
| If 'yes', Cost Manager must ensure that the scheme is notified to SCC's New Works Team at NewWorks@sheffield.gov.uk so provisions such as highways inspections, commuted sums and other fees (such as Road Safety Audits – set out at C1d) are considered. | | | |
| D5 | STEEL IMPLICATIONS | | |
| | Is this project likely to have a requirement for steel exceeding c.£100k in value? | Yes – not possible to estimate value at this time as design unknown. | If 'yes', Commercial Services to update the Sheffield City Council Steel Forward Pipeline on the internet. |
| D6 | KEY PERFORMANCE INDICATORS | | |
| | What project KPIs are we using? | Both YORbuild2 and SCC standard KPIs will be used. These cover criteria such as Client satisfaction, defects and predictability of cost and time. | |

SECTION E INSURABLE RISKS

| | | | | | | | | |
|---|--|---|-----------------------------------|---|---------------------------------------|---|-------------------------------|---|
| E1 | INSURABLE RISKS | | | | | | | |
| | Please select the Insurable Risks that are relevant to this contract | | | | | | | |
| | E1a | Employee risk (relevant except for sole traders) | Employers' liability | Yes | E1b | Non-delegable duty of care risk | Public liability | No |
| | E1c | Physical injury risk to client employees | Public liability | Yes | E1d | Physical injury risk to service users (delegable) | Public liability | Yes |
| | E1e | Physical injury risk to other members of the public | Public liability | Yes | E1f | Material damage risk to client employees / organisation | Public liability | Yes |
| | E1g | Material damage risk to service users | Public liability | Yes | E1h | Material damage risk to other members of the public | Public liability | Yes |
| | E1i | Misuse or mismanagement of personal data risk to client organisation | Public liability | No | E1j | Misuse or mismanagement of personal data risk to service users | Public liability | No |
| | E1k | Misuse or mismanagement (infringement) of intellectual property risk | Public liability | No | E1l | Financial loss risk to client from professional services (consultants, architects) | Professional indemnity | Yes |
| | E1m | Medical or clinical negligence risk | Medical / clin. negligence | No | | | | |
| | E2 | INDEMNITY LEVELS | | | | | | |
| Please provide the indemnity levels selected for each relevant type of insurance identified | | | | | | | | |
| | | Insurance type | Indemnity level (£) | Each & Every (E) or In the Aggregate (A) | | Insurance type | Indemnity level (£) | Each & Every (E) or In the Aggregate (A) |
| E2a | | Employers' liability | £10,000,000 | E | E2c | Professional indemnity | £5,000,000 | A |
| E2b | Public liability | £20,000,000 | E | E2d | Medical or clinical negligence | N/A | | |

CONTRACT AWARD APPROVAL

SECTION F EXCEPTION REPORTING

| | | |
|-----------|--|-----------------|
| F1 | Exception reporting from Procurement Strategy | Not applicable. |
|-----------|--|-----------------|

SECTION G TENDER EVALUATION AND AWARD RECOMMENDATION

| | | | | | | | | | |
|-----------|--|---------------------------------|---------------------------------|---|---------------------------------------|---|--|-------------|-----------------|
| G1 | TENDER DETAILS – received and adjusted (please add rows as required). If using an in-house provider or have only engaged a single provider, please insert the price agreed. If a tenderer withdrew or did not return, please state in 'Comments' column | | | | | | | | |
| | | Tenderer | Original submitted price | Amended final price (if applicable) | Price score (if applicable) | Quality Score (if applicable) | Total score (price+ quality) | Rank | Comments |
| | G1a | Balfour Beatty Construction Ltd | £4,402,574.40 | £- | - | 88.44 | 88.44 | 1 | Received. |
| | G1b | Kier Construction Ltd | £4,402,574.40 | £- | - | 86.68 | 86.68 | 2 | Received. |
| | G1c | Interserve Construction Ltd | £4,402,574.40 | £- | - | 74.76 | 74.76 | 3 | Received. |
| | G1d | Geo Houlton Ltd | £4,402,574.40 | £- | - | 73.05 | 73.05 | 4 | Received. |

| | | | | | | | | |
|---|---|---------------|----|---|--|-------|---|-----------|
| G1e | ISG Construction Ltd | £4,402,574.40 | £- | - | 71.81 | 71.81 | 5 | Received. |
| <p>In accordance with the Procurement Strategy noted above, a detailed assessment of the Quality Criteria (see box G10) was undertaken and involved stakeholders from the School and CDS. Lifelong Learning & Skills marked the Employment & Skills section. The Quality Evaluation involved checking of the designs submitted by Technical Managers within CDS and their compliance with the Design Brief. Scores were then agreed with the school and officers from CDS in regards to the individual designs and the remaining questions.</p> | | | | | | | | |
| G2 | ARITHMETICAL CHECK | | | G3 | TECHNICAL CHECK | | | |
| <p>As the tender was a fixed price tender of £4,402,574.40 no arithmetical check was undertaken.</p> | | | | <p>A technical check of Balfour Beatty's design was undertaken by CDS and it was confirmed that this had complied with the Design Brief. Further clarification on numerous items was sought via the YORTender Portal. Balfour Beatty's response indicated that they had included what was required. CDS requested a meeting with Balfour Beatty which they attended on the 10th March 2017. They confirmed that their tender was a compliant bid and CDS were reassured in regards to this. They had confirmed their inclusions and assumptions and CDS were in agreement.</p> | | | | |
| G4 | TENDER QUALIFICATIONS AND CLARIFICATIONS | | | G5 | ADDENDA ISSUED DURING THE TENDER PERIOD | | | |
| <p>Balfour Beatty submitted numerous Tender Clarifications with their tender. These were mainly in regards to Contract Conditions and their specific wording. Officers from CDS have assessed these and are in agreement with the amendments that are required.</p> | | | | <p>2 Nr Tender Addendum were issued during the tender period. Balfour Beatty has confirmed both were included within their tender.</p> | | | | |
| G6 | PRELIMINARIES | | | G7 | PROVISIONAL SUMS and DAYWORKS | | | |
| <p>Due to the cost-led procurement method the Contractor has included their preliminaries costs within the tender sum of £4,652,574.40. Balfour Beatty has confirmed they have included for all obligations noted within the tender documents.</p> | | | | <p>There were no Provisional Sums noted within the tender. Following the meeting with Balfour Beatty on the 10th March 2017 it was agreed with them to include Provisional Sums for the Highway Works and Statutory Authorities Works. It is known these works are going to have to take place and in order to ensure these are included within the Contract Sum and their programme of works, a £250,000 sum has now been included. This amends their tender to £4,652,574.40.</p> | | | | |
| G8 | CONTINGENCIES (outside contract sum) | | | G9 | BOND / ULTIMATE HOLDING COMPANY GUARANTEE Please state if requiring and reasons for this decision | | | |
| <p>No contingency figures are noted within the tender. This is held by the client outside the tender sum. A sum of £477,225.60 is being held outside the Contract Sum for Contingencies.</p> | | | | <p>A Guarantee Bond won't be taken out with Balfour Beatty. An Ultimate Holding Company Guarantee will be taken out with Balfour Beatty. This is due to their Financial Check coming back identifying them as low risk so there isn't the need for additional expenditure on a Guarantee Bond.</p> | | | | |
| G10 | QUALITATIVE ASSESSMENT QUESTIONS | | | G11 | ASSESSMENT CRITERIA | | | |
| <p>Quality Criteria – 90% (Split Below) & Employment & Skills 10%</p> <p><u>Q1 - Delivery and Design Quality</u></p> <p>The project is to deliver a school building in Sheffield which brings with it design challenges, a constrained site and the refurbishment of areas within the existing school building.</p> <p>Q1.1 Concept Design - 25%</p> <p>Design Proposals are to be submitted based on the Works Information. They should consist of:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> A. Site Plan - General Arrangement (5%) B. First Floor Plan - General Arrangement (5%) C. Second Floor Plan - General Arrangement (5%) D. Building Elevations (5%) E. Artistic Impressions of the Building (5%) <p>Q1.2 Design & Specification - 25%</p> <p>Design Proposals related to the finishes and specification is to be developed and based on the Works Information. They should consist of:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> A. A pallet of proposed materials to be used in Construction (5%) B. Proposed internal finishes and fittings schedule (5%) C. List of proposals for the Building Elements and a commentary against the NBS Performance Specification noting confirmation of compliance or alternate proposals. Please see Performance Specification for minimum compliance requirements of Building. N.B – a full NBS Specification will be requested from the Contractor further on in the design process (10%) D. Proposals for External Landscaping (5%) <p><u>Q2 - Management of the Contract</u></p> <p>The team you will be using to deliver the project is of upmost importance to SCC, as the project will only be successful if the right skills and capabilities are provided.</p> | | | | <p>Quality: SCC 0-5 scoring system; failure to achieve 50% across a criterion disqualifies.</p> <p>The tender utilised a cost-led procurement method which gave the Contractor a fixed price. The Contract Award is based solely on Quality.</p> | | | | |

Q2.1 Project Team Collaboration (Max 2 sides of A4) - 5%

Please outline how you will work collaboratively with the Project Team and what strategies you will implement. This should include:

- A. Outline your team structure for the design and construction phases and what benefits each member of the project team will bring (2.5%)
- B. How you will ensure continuity of the Design Development and Site Phases of the project (2.5%)

Q2.2 Construction Methodology (Max 2 sides of A4) - 10%

- A. Please provide details on your proposed method of working (2.5%)
- B. Please provide site logistics and traffic management plans illustrating how you will safely implement the works throughout the construction period (2.5%)
- C. Please provide details of how you intend to manage the interface with the public/pupils (2.5%)
- D. Please provide details of how you will minimise disruption to residents in proximity to the site (2.5%)

Q3 – Planning Issues

The existing Ecclesall Infant School is within the heart of a residential area and adjacent to a substantial secondary school. By expanding the infant school into a primary school it will obviously require statutory approvals including a formal Planning Application.

Q3.1- Planning Strategy (Max 2 sides of A4) - 5%

Please provide your mitigation strategy for the important/sensitive elements of the Planning Application noted below. Please highlight your proposed mitigation strategy for each to ensure the Planning Application is approved. Please use the table below as a basis for the format of your answers:

Important/Sensitive Element Mitigation Strategy (500 words max. per element)

- A. Building Location in terms of Proximity to Housing (2.5%)
- B. Traffic/Access Issues in Surrounding Area following School Opening (2.5%)

Q3.2- Management of Planning (Max 2 sides of A4) - 5%

Please provide details of how you would approach the management of the planning application process to ensure timely delivery of the project.

Q4 - Programme

The project must proceed at pace in order to meet school intake deadlines. It is currently intended that you will fully develop the design to construction for a cost of £4,402,574.40. The Construction Programme is left open to the Contractor but all work must be completed by 31st July 2018. Through all stages, you will be expected to provide detailed advice as to how the Council can best deliver the project within programme and quality constraints. The Contractor must carefully consider the new build elements and internal refurbishment within the existing school whilst minimising disruption to the school.

Q4.1- Master Programme (Max 2 sides of A4 + GANTT Chart) - 15%

Please provide a commentary, including a detailed programme (GANTT Chart), to outline how you will approach the project, including key activities and durations, to be able to complete construction on time. Key Activities should include but aren't limited to:

- Completion of RIBA Stage 2 Design
- Review & Sign-off by SCC of RIBA Stage 2 Design
- Completion of RIBA Stage 3 Design
- Review & Sign-off by SCC of RIBA Stage 3 Design
- Planning Application Submission Date and Planning Period
- Completion of RIBA Stage 4 Design
- Review & Sign-off by SCC of RIBA Stage 4 Design
- Start On-site Date (New Build)
- Start On-site Date (Internal Refurbishment)
- Completion Date & Handover (New Build)
- Completion Date & Handover (Internal Refurbishment)

Your Programme should demonstrate the following:

- A critical path through the programme/logic links.
- Programme planning and review.
- Appreciation of the mobilisation and lead-in requirements and key interface risks between the individual sub-contractor packages.
- Phasing to tie in with access strategy/constraints plan.
- Appreciation of commissioning and handover activities, sequence and timetable.

| | | | | |
|------------|--|-----------------------------|--------------------------|---|
| | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Measures to manage risk through the programme. <p><u>Q5 – Risk Register</u></p> <p>The Contractor will be entirely responsible for the design and construction of this project therefore it is important they full understand the risks associate with the project.</p> <p>Q5.1- Risk Register - 10 %</p> <p>Please provide a completed Risk Register (using template provided) highlighting any potential risks to the project. This should include potential risks and mitigation strategies throughout the project lifecycle up to handover.</p> | | | |
| G12 | FINANCIAL STANDING OF PREFERRED TENDERER (do not complete if using an in-house provider) | | | |
| | Tenderer: | Balfour Beatty | Recommendation: | A Financial Check was undertaken on Balfour Beatty and they were noted as Low Risk. The advice given was to "Proceed". |
| | | | Date of approval: | 01/12/2016 |
| H1 | ACTUAL TOTAL PROJECT COSTS (see definitions at section C of the Procurement Strategy above) | | | |
| | | Procurement Strategy | Contract Award | Reasons for any differences |
| H1a | Total project budget | £5,600,000.00 | £5,600,000.00 | - |
| H1b | Construction cost | £4,659,800,00 | £4,652,574.40 | Following the Construction Estimate further benchmarking work was undertaken to firm up the cost for inclusion within the Tender. This resulted in a reduction in costs from the previous Construction Estimate. Balfour Beatty Tender £4,402,574.40. Following the meeting with Balfour Beatty on the 10 th March 2017 it was agreed with them to include Provisional Sums for the Highway Works and Statutory Authorities Works. It is known these works are going to have to take place and in order to ensure these are included within the Contract Sum and their programme of works, a £250,000 sum has now been included. This amends their tender to £4,652,574.40. |
| H1c | Fees | £190,200 | £190,200.00 | - |
| H1d | Client costs capital | £280,000 | £280,000.00 | - |
| H1e | Allowances for contingency | £470,000.00 | £477,225.60 | The reduction in Construction Cost made and due to this procurement method being new to SCC it makes sense to allocate any excess funds to the contingency allowance. Robust Project Management should keep contingency expenditure to a minimum. |
| H1f | Revenue cost implications | - | - | - |
| H1g | Estimated contract value for each contract (see section D8 above) | - | - | - |
| H2 | COMPARISON WITH PRE-TENDER ESTIMATE including reasons for differences | | | |
| | The procurement method involved providing Contractors a fixed tender cost of £4,402,574.40. No pre-tender estimate was undertaken due to this. | | | |
| H3 | RECONCILIATION TO BUDGET | | | |
| | Is the tender price greater than: | | | |
| H3a | Total project budget (see C1a above) | No | H3b | Construction cost (see B1b above) |
| | | | No | H3c |
| H3d | If so, how will you reconcile this? This could include altering scope or using contingency monies. If scope change, does it still fall within OJEU notice (if applicable) and is it covered by previous delegated authority? | | | No |
| | Not applicable. | | | |
| H4 | ESTIMATED CASH FLOW | | | |
| H4a | Date of contract start | 10 th April 2017 | H4b | Date of contract end |
| | | | 31st July 2018 | H4c |
| | | | | End dates of any contract extensions |
| | | | | Not applicable. |
| | ANTICIPATED CASH FLOW PROFILE | | | |
| | | 2017/18 £ | 2018/19 £ | 2019/20 £ |
| | | | | 2020 / 21 £ |
| | | | | 2021 / 22 £ |
| H4d | Contract delivery | 3,056,600.00 | 1,526,200.00 | - |
| | | | | - |
| H4e | Retention | - | - | 69,774.40 |
| | | | | - |
| | | | | 69,774.40 |

| | | | | | | | | | |
|-----------|--|--|------------------|------------------|------------------------------------|--------------------|----------------|--|----|
| | H4f | Total | 3,056,600.00 | 1,526,200.00 | 69,774.40 | - | - | 4,652,574.40 | |
| H5 | ACTUAL CONTRACT SAVINGS | | | | | | | | |
| | Summation of actual contract construction cost at contract award stage, versus anticipated costs at procurement strategy stage (annual breakdown of figures provided at H1b above) | | | | | | | | |
| | | 2017/18 £ | 2018/19 £ | 2019/20 £ | 2020 / 21 £ | 2021 / 22 £ | Total £ | | |
| | Savings | - | - | - | - | - | - | | |
| H6 | DETAILS OF ANY OTHER SAVINGS OR BENEFITS | | | | | | | | |
| | Not applicable. | | | | | | | | |
| I1 | EMPLOYMENT AND SKILLS OUTPUTS | | | | | | | | |
| | I1a | Work experience (14-16 years) | 4 | I1b | Work experience (16+ years) | 4 | I1c | School workshops / site visits | 14 |
| | I1d | Internships | - | I1f | Employment | 2 | I1g | Apprenticeships (project initiated) | 1 |
| | I1h | Trainees (project initiated L4 and higher level skills) | - | I1i | Graduates | - | I1j | Other trainees | - |
| | I1k | Apprenticeships (existing) | 43 person weeks | | | | | | |
| | If these differ from the benchmarks set in the Procurement Strategy, please state why here | | | | | | | | |
| I2 | Are there any TUPE implications which have not previously been identified or addressed? If yes, how are these now being addressed? | | | | | | | | |
| | Not Applicable. | | | | | | | | |
| I3 | Are there any legal implications which have not previously been identified or addressed? If yes, how are these now being addressed? | | | | | | | | |
| | - | | | | | | | | |
| I4 | Are there any lessons learned to inform future procurement strategies? | | | | | | | | |
| | <p>Include Statutory Authority Works as a Provisional Sum within Tender Price. Contractors appear reluctant to wholly include this element within fixed price due to inherent risks.</p> <p>A full review of this Cost-Led Procurement method is being undertaken. This appears to have been a very successful procurement exercise which has resulted in the highest possible quality with certainty of cost. We are producing a paper to compare this method of procurement against other methods used on recent similar schemes, benchmarking them against EFA rates.</p> | | | | | | | | |