

**EPPING FOREST DISTRICT COUNCIL
CIVIC BUILDING AND OFFICES TENDER REPORT
PAGABO REF: 1026-1**

29 April 2020

CONTENTS

1. Executive Summary	3
2. Introduction	5
3. Procurement Route & Tender Procedure	6
4. Tender Receipt and Evaluation	10
5. Recommendation & Next Steps	14
6. Mitigating the Risk of COVID-19	18

APPENDICES

- APPENDIX A:** Reforecast Budget
- APPENDIX B:** Evaluation Matrix
- APPENDIX C:** Technical Evaluation Scoresheets
- APPENDIX D:** Tender Analysis
- APPENDIX E:** Schedule of Pricing Qualifications & Queries

Issue Nr	Document	Date	Prepared by	Reviewed by
v1	Draft Version	14/04/2020	AM	-
v2	Draft Version	15/04/2020	AM	-
v3	Draft Version	21/04/2020	AM	RW
v4	Draft Version	23/04/2020	AM/RW	RW/CB
v5	Final Version	24/04/2020	AM/RW	CB
V6	Final Version	28/04/2020	AM	RW
v7	Final Version	29/04/2020	AM	RW

Authorised by (Partner) _____

1.0 EXECUTIVE SUMMARY

- 1.1 Following the review by the client team of the returned tenders; **it is the team's recommendation that the contract should be awarded to ISG Fit Out Ltd for a Contract Sum of £5,408,630.00 (excl. VAT).** This recommendation has been arrived at through the use of a balanced scoring matrix that included both a cost and technical evaluation, as detailed within Section 4 of the report.
- 1.2 Despite only one tender being returned the Project Team have undertaken a full evaluation of the tender return to ensure that it is fully compliant with the requirements of the Tender. On that basis, the Project Team believe that ISG Fit Out Ltd are fully capable of delivering the project successfully.
- 1.3 Furthermore, the report also considers residual risk items, as set-out within section 5.0. To mitigate the risk items, it is recommended that a Construction Contingency of £805,000.00 is retained against the Construction Project. This is an increased contingency level from previous Cost Plans and allows for the mitigation of residual risks, such as Covid-19 that were unforeseen at that time.
- 1.4 The main residual risks that have been identified that will require the project team to work closely with ISG Fit Out Ltd include:-
- Scope of additional Listed Building Consent Application.
 - Timely liaison and consultation with Planning Authority and Building Control.
 - Agreement of contract amendments.
 - Impact on programme from current Government policy on COVID-19.
 - Potential enhanced conditions put in place by Government on COVID-19.
 - Co-ordination of client-led packages.

Further details towards each of the residual risks are included under Section 5.0 and 6.0 of the report.

- 1.5 Placing an order with ISG in the value of £5,408,630.00 (excl. VAT) and retaining a Contingency of £805,000.00 results in an underspend of £279,240.00 against the approved budget of £6,875,000.00. Owing to the ongoing situation regarding COVID-19 we recommend that the underspend is retained as a client reserve as a further contingency to cover construction risks that are not considered within the Construction Contingency. Please see Appendix A for a full breakdown.

1.6 In summary, these next steps are required to take the project forward.

Action	Required by
Epping District Forest Council to consider Tender Recommendation report and confirm whether basis of initial Tender Offer is acceptable.	W/C 04/05/2020
ISG to prepare alternative Tender Offer, one taking into consideration the current Government Protocols related to COVID-19	Monday 04/05/2020
Presentation to Epping Forest District Council by ISG	Tuesday 05/05/2020
G&T to assess alternative Tender Offer upon receipt and provide updated recommendation to Epping.	Tuesday 12/05/2020
In parallel to the above, Epping Forest District Council to review with legal representatives and agree upon ISG Contract qualifications.	Tuesday 12/05/2020
Recommendation presented to Cabinet and a decision is to be made on whether Project is to proceed at Council Meeting.	Monday 01/06/2020

2.0 INTRODUCTION

- 2.1 The aim of this tender report is to summarise the process of procuring a Principal Contractor to undertake the design and construction of works entitled 'Civic Building and Offices', on behalf of Epping Forest District Council. The report will review the tender process, the analysis of tender return and the subsequent evaluation by the project team, which has led to an appointment recommendation.
- 2.2 The report refers to a project being undertaken at the Epping Forest District Council Civic Offices and on behalf of Epping Forest District Council. The works comprise the following elements:
- The refurbishment of an existing grade II listed Civic Building and the adjacent 323 House which is connected via a link bridge. Works include strip out of existing mechanical and electrical equipment with replacement of new, the replacement of glazed roof lights and light touch decoration to the interior whilst renewing listed elements such as polychromatic brickwork and white ash timber panelling.
- 2.3 The Project Team include:
- Core Team
 - Architect, Lead Consultant, Designer – Bisset Adams*.
 - Services Engineers – BWB Consulting*.
 - Quantity Surveyor – Gardiner & Theobald*.
 - Project Manager (Procurement Phase – Ark Consultancy*.
 - CDM Adviser – SJN Enviro*.
 - Client Representative / Programme Manager (Internal) – Epping Forest District Council*.
 - Other Consultants
 - Structural Engineers – BWB Consulting.
 - Building Control – Epping Forest District Council.

The above disciplines asterisked were involved in the evaluation of the Tender Submissions.

3.0 PROCUREMENT ROUTE & TENDER PROCEDURE

- 3.1 As the project was subject to public procurement rules and in order to meet a project completion of December 2020, the Pagabo Framework was selected to tender the project. The framework has pre-qualified Contractors that are divided into geographical regions which made the framework a suitable choice to meet the requirement from Epping Forest District Council that Contractors employ a local supply chain, have a proven track record in the public sector.
- 3.2 To arrive at a shortlist of Contractors to be considered for the tender process, , an Expression of Interest (Eoi) was issued to Contractors on Lot 3 of the Refit and Refurbish Framework for the East of England on 9th January 2020 via Pagabo. The Eoi explained the project scope and estimated construction cost. From this Contractors declare whether they would be interested in the opportunity to tender for the project.
- 3.3 Of the 9 Contractors on the Framework, 6 confirmed they would be interested. The 6 Contractors were as follows:-
- Engie Regeneration
 - ISG Fit Out
 - RG Carter
 - Styles and Wood
 - Vinci Construction
 - Wilmott Dixon Interiors
- 3.4 In advance of preparing the tender documentation, the contents and structure of the tender document was agreed by the Project Team following a review of a number of draft versions of the documentation. This included key aspects of the tender such as sectional completion, the aspiration for completion by Christmas 2020 and the logistics of maintaining fire egress from the Conder Building. The final content of the tender document was also reviewed and accepted by Epping's Procurement and Contract Development Manager, prior to the Invitation to Tender (ITT) being issued.
- 3.5 Through discussion with the project team, the key success criteria of the project were identified and scoring criteria agreed, that would ensure that the Contractors had

appropriately considered and expanded upon the key aspects of the project as part of their submission. Tenders scoring would be weighted 70% quality and 30% cost.

3.6 The following scoring criteria were subsequently adopted within the tender.

#	Quality Capability	Total Marks	Sub-Weighting (%)
1	Experience of Proposed Team/ Approach to Delivery		
1.1	Organisation Chart	10	5%
1.2	CV's of Proposed Delivery Team	10	5%
1.3	Management/ Coordination of Design	10	10%
2	Site Logistics & Methodology	10	30%
3	Critical Path/ Programming/ Phasing	10	30%
4	Risk Management	10	10%
5	Health & Safety	10	10%
	TOTAL	70	100%

3.7 It was agreed by the Project Team that technical questions would be evaluated by all members of the team listed under item 2.3 of this report, however some members would only evaluate questions relevant to their discipline. Further information can be found in section 4.5.

3.8 The Invitation to Tender (ITT) was issued to all tenderers on Monday 24th February 2020, via Epping's Delta Sourcing portal system, with a return date stipulated of Friday 27th March 2020 (Noon).

3.9 The tender programme set-out within the ITT was as follows:-

Activity	Date
Issue of ITT on Epping District Council Portal	Monday 24 th February 2020
Site Visit	Friday 28 th February 2020
Mid-Tender Workshop / Q&A Session	Tuesday 3 rd March 2020
Closing date for receipt of ITT queries	Wednesday 18 th March 2020
Closing date for return of ITT	Friday 27 th March 2020

Evaluation of ITT	Monday 30 th March 2020 to Friday 17 th April 2020
Post Tender Interviews (details to be circulated by no later than Friday 3 rd April 2020)	w/c Monday 13 th April 2020
Client requested standstill period (see 3.10)	Monday 20 th April 2020 to Friday 29 th May 2020
Notification of Award.	Monday 8 th June 2020 (Anticipated)
Anticipated site possession	Monday 15 th June 2020 (Anticipated)

3.10 A Client standstill period was requested by Epping Forest District Council to allow Cabinet members time to consider the papers prior to the Council Meeting on 1st June 2020. A standstill period, post approval has been advised by Epping Forest District Council as 5 days.

3.11 Upon receipt of the tender documentation a number of Contractors declined to tender. Below sets out their reason for declining and the date this was received;

Contractor	Reason for Declined	Date
Engie Regeneration	Risk involved in M&E package and Listed Building status	26/02/2020
RG Carter	Recently won two new projects so no longer have required resources	28/02/2020
Styles and Wood	Insufficient resources	26/02/2020
Vinci Construction	Insufficient resources	26/02/2020
Wilmott Dixon Interiors	Insufficient resources	02/03/2020

3.12 After receiving the declination to tender from Contractors, G&T liaised with Pagabo to formulate a plan of action. Contractors who declined the EoI were approached and asked to reconsider tendering on the basis of being informed of the reduced competition. However, none were willing to submit a tender.

3.13 Following this, it was confirmed by Epping Forest District Council's Procurement team that progressing with a single tenderer complied with standing orders. ISG was informed they were 1 of 3 remaining contractors to ensure they remained interested, but still returned a competitive tender.

-
- 3.14 For the purposes of informing the tender return, a site visit was held on Friday 28th February 2020. This was attended by G&T and representatives from Epping and allowed the Contractor the opportunity to visit the site and query the scope of the project.
- 3.15 Following this, a mid-tender workshop was held on Tuesday 3rd March 2020. This was hosted at G&T's offices and attended by the Design Team, members from Epping and the Contractor, allowing the latter to ask questions and raise any queries. The queries were collated into a log and circulated to the Contractor via the Delta Source Portal.
- 3.16 On Thursday 12th March 2020, The Contractor visited site again with their supply chain. This was attended by G&T and members of Epping's Building Management team who answered queries and relayed key information to the Contractor.
- 3.17 During the tender period there was also a need for additional information to be issued to the tenderers. The information was issued under the cover of 3 Tender Addenda. All documents were formally acknowledged by each of the tenderers during the tender period.
- 3.18 Before the end of the tendering period, a request for an extension to the tendering period was made by the remaining Contractor, requesting that the tender period be extended by two weeks. Following consideration of the request, it was agreed by the Project Team, in conjunction with Epping that the tender period would be extended by one week. This meant that the Tender Return Date was revised to Friday 3rd April 2020. This extension was notified to the Contractor via the Delta Source portal.
- 3.19 In advance of receipt of the tenders, Gardiner & Theobald LLP prepared and issued a Cost Plan/ Pre-Tender Estimate envisaging a Total Construction Cost of £6,324,000.00. This was based on scope that reflected the tender documents including the roof resurfacing works, relocation of PV panels from the Conder Building and structured cabling for IT and AV installations along with queries raised and closed during the tender period.

4.0 TENDER RECEIPT AND EVALUATION

4.1 A single Tender was received via the Delta portal from ISG, by the deadline of Friday 3rd April (Noon). The Tender Box was opened by Shane McNamara of Epping Forest District Council and the ISG Tender was subsequently made available to G&T to download and distributed to the Project Team listed under Section 2.3 of the report to allow them to commence their evaluation of each Tender Return.

4.2 The opened, unaltered tender returns were as follows:-

Tendering Contractor	Tender Value
ISG Fit Out Ltd	£5,186,134.00
Gardiner & Theobald LLP	£6,324,000.00

4.3 Upon receipt all tenders were arithmetically checked and no errors were identified.

4.4 Whilst only one Tender was anticipated, it was agreed that the Tender would still be evaluated in the same manner it would be if there were multiple to ensure proper scrutiny of the return.

4.5 It was agreed in advance of the Tender Return that every member of the Project Team would be responsible for evaluating the technical section of the Tender Return. However, whilst G&T, Ark, Bisset Adams and BWB would evaluate all sections (1-5), SJN Enviro would only evaluate Sections (2, 4 and 5) from a Health and Safety perspective and a representative of Epping would evaluate Sections 2 and 3 to ensure compliance with their needs. To ensure a consistent approach to scoring was adopted by the Project Team they were each provided with a tender scoresheet and the scoring definitions adopted within the ITT documentation were reiterated. As part of the scoresheets, the Project Team also ensured that a detailed narrative would accompany their scoring, to justify the reasoning behind each score.

4.6 In conjunction with the above, initial scoring of the technical criteria was provided by each member of the Project Team on/by Wednesday 8th April 2020. A copy of each scoresheet is appended as Appendix C of this report.

4.7 Below is a summary of the technical scoring from the team that was recorded for the Contractor, based on an averaging of the Project Team scoring:-

Technical Criteria	Total Available %	ISG %
Organogram/ Team Structure	5.00%	3.80%
CV's of Proposed Delivery Team	5.00%	3.00%
Approach to Design Coordination & Management	10.00%	7.60%
Site Logistics & Methodology	30.00%	17.00%
Critical Path/ Programme	30.00%	21.60%
Risk Identification & Management	10.00%	7.60%
Health & Safety	10.00%	6.00%
Technical Subtotal	100.00%	66.60%
Weighted against 60.00%	60.00%	39.96%

4.8 In parallel to the technical analysis set-out above, Gardiner & Theobald LLP also undertook a detailed review of the cost breakdown, to ensure that a compliant bid had been submitted by each tenderer. During this exercise, the following activities were undertaken and concluded:-

- All pricing qualifications were reviewed and responded to;
- Where non-compliant items and/ or irregularities were identified within each cost submission, queries were raised with the tendering contractors to clarify upon and, where applicable, correct the cost submission accordingly;
- All cost submissions were arithmetically checked and, where applicable, errors were identified and corrected.
-

Where further information was required, further information was requested from tendering contractors.

4.9 We summarise the key observations made against initial cost breakdowns for each Contractor:-

ISG

- The figure included for the glazed roof light package which included removal of the existing and a significant amount of temporary works seemed too inadequate to be compliant based on market testing undertaken by G&T prior to the tender. Following review and discussion with the Contractor it was confirmed the costs

were accurate, but removal and temporary works were allowed for elsewhere within their costs.

- MEP was below the pre-tender estimate. These costs were reviewed and where costs had been excluded and were non-compliant, the Contractor was asked to price. This resulted in a sum of £121K being added to their tender offer. The Contractor also confirmed the names of their proposed supply-chain, namely AVA and Farr for electrical and mechanical elements respectively.
- Multiple provisional sums were included within the cost breakdown. Each of these were addressed directly and challenged with the Contractor. Where possible, ISG reconsidered their position on these sums and reverted to a firm figure.
- Design Fees were also seen as being low which raised concerns over the resource being allocated. This resulted in the Contractor increasing their design fees by £10K to allow sufficient resource to complete the job, whilst £7.5K was added for a structural engineer to undertake calculations for the new glazed roof lights and a further £5K for managing discharging the conditions of the Listed Building Consent.
- OH&P and Risk allowances were low for the nature of the project. This was queried with the Contractor who gave assurances the level of OH&P and Risk were at sufficient levels and within the range allowed by the Pagabo Framework.
- Overall and in response to G&T's queries £222,496.00 was added to the value of their initial tender offer.

4.10 Cost queries and qualifications, not limited to those identified under item 4.8, were addressed with each Contractor and responded to as part of the tender reconciliation exercise. To document the transition of all qualification and query correspondences, a schedule was collated by Gardiner & Theobald for each tendering contractor. These schedules are appended to the report as Appendix E.

4.11 In light of comments made under section 4.8, further cost discussions were conducted with ISG between Tuesday 7th April 2020 and Thursday 9th April 2020 prior to the Easter Bank Holiday weekend. The discussions were aimed at addressing non-compliant items and to coordinate a full reconciliation of tender values to ensure they were fully compliant with the Employer's Requirements set-out within the Tender Documents. Following the conclusion of the reconciliation exercise, the tender values were altered as follows:-

Tendering Contractor	Tender Value
ISG Fit Out Ltd	£5,408,630.00
Gardiner & Theobald LLP	£6,324,000.00

4.12 Despite the detailed reconciliation exercise, there was still a difference between the reconciled Tender Values and G&T's Pre-Tender Estimate. A detailed tender analysis is appended as Appendix D, which indicates where the differences lie; however in summary we note the key differences below:-

- Roof – during the cost planning stages of the project a market testing exercise was undertaken by G&T to substantiate an appropriate budget for these elements. This was undertaken in a non-competitive environment and by sub-contractors, one of whom was originally engaged by Epping Forest District Council in 2017, the figure included within the G&T cost plan was c£368k. The tender return value received was c£152k for this element of works and was one of the main differentiators from G&T's cost plan.
- M&E Package – The G&T pre-tender estimate included a figure of £3,903,099 for the MEPH package. The tender return value of this element of works was £3,608,660. Adjustments amounting to c£121K were added, but this still left a difference of c£173K
- Design Fees – G&T allowed for design fees consistent with taking the project from RIBA Stage 3+ level through to Stage 5. The fees included by the Contractor were much lower than expected.
- OHP and Risk Profile – Due to the nature of the project and the RIBA Stage 3+ level of design information, G&T allowed for standard industry levels of OHP and risk with 5% allowed for the former plus an additional cost for the using the Pagabo Framework. The Contractor return allows 3.4% for both

4.13 Because there was only one return, formal Post Tender Interviews were not appropriate. Instead a conference call was held on 16th April 2020 between G&T, Ark, representatives of Epping and ISG to close out any queries and discuss next steps due to the ongoing COVID-19 restrictions and its impact on construction.

4.14 A conference call is to be scheduled in May for senior members of Epping Forest District Council and ISG to discuss their tender return and the next steps.

5.0 RECOMMENDATION AND NEXT STEPS

5.1 On the basis of the evaluation matrix, as set-out within section 4 of the report, it is the recommendation of the project team that **ISG Fit Out Ltd** should be appointed for a Contract Sum of **£5,408,630.00, excluding VAT**.

5.2 **ISG** demonstrated a keen interest in the project throughout the duration of the tender period, notably being very proactive in querying the Employers Requirements, whilst also visiting the site multiple times with their supply-chain, to fully understand and truly reflect the requirements within the Tender Offer. The main positives from the technical scoring is:-

- Compliant team structure identified with key roles being fully utilised on the project at key programme milestones.
- Utilising a local supply chain as desired by Epping Forest District Council with 96% of their selected supply chain members being located within 15 miles of the site
- Appropriate methodology for site logistics with regard to keeping fire egress routes clear and minimizing noise and disruption to Epping staff. Key construction activities also well considered with requirement to discharge Listed Building conditions noted and an understanding of the importance of the glazed roof light replacement.
- Processes are in place to progress the design whilst working remotely and the inclusion of a design responsibility matrix and information release schedule is included.
- Well considered programme defining pre-commencement and construction phase activities whilst critical path was flagged as well as sectional completion dates
- Detailed cost submission, outlining their qualifications and allowing team to address and reconcile during tender period; thus greater assurances now held against compliance of their cost offer.
- Problem solving methodologies, in lieu of only identifying potential issues with detailed consideration for the ongoing COVID-19 situation and how this can be mitigated.

5.3 Overall, given the complexities of the project with relation to design, planning and programme and requirement for a quick and timely commencement on their obligations as part of this project, ISG methodologies gave the project team the most confidence that they had the best capabilities to deliver a successful project, through a collaborative, non-adversarial approach to finalising design and were already thinking ahead by considering

residual risk as part of their offer and how to effectively manage and mitigate those risks in their construction delivery.

- 5.4 In conjunction with the above recommendation, Epping Forest District Council need to also consider a number of known residual risks/ issues related to this project, which will need to be mitigated in collaboration with ISG should they be awarded the Building Contract. These risks are outlined as follows:-

Scope of additional Listed Building Consent – At the time of this report feedback from Historic England and the Senior Conservation Officer from Epping Forest District Council on the second planning consent to recover the entire Civic Building roof with a Sika Liquid Plastic Decothane has proposed that the covering is limited only to where the PV panels are being located. They have asked that the remaining should be left as they are visible from the public highway and should be omitted. The change of scope of the works should this be confirmed needs to be considered.

Timely liaison and consultation with Planning Authority and Building Control – In addition to fulfilling the obligations set-out within the planning award, there is a requirement to liaise with Epping Forest District Council's Planning Department to have finishes approved before installation on site, whilst Building Control sign off is also required..

Agreement of contract amendments – At the time of this report, the Contract amendments have not been agreed between ISG and Epping Forest District Council's legal team. Epping Forest District Council have confirmed that they have sought legal advice. There remains a risk that there could be a delay in a Contract being in place to enable start on site.

Impact on programme from Current Government policy on COVID-19 – The programme submitted by ISG assumes appointment on 8th June 2020 to deliver the desired completion date of Christmas 2020, however, despite referencing the COVID-19 impact on construction within their tender, their current offer does not allow for the impact COVID-19 may have on their ability to deliver the project to programme.

With the ongoing COVID-19 protocols in place with regard to social distancing and working remotely where possible, there remains a risk that the programme in ISG's offer is unachievable.

In addition, COVID-19 is having an impact on Epping Forest District Council's planned decant of the Civic Building. There remains a risk that the current social distancing restrictions mean the scheduled decant by Epping from the Civic Building is not complete

in-line with the programme. At the time of this report it is anticipated that the decant and separation works being carried out by Epping Forest District Council will be complete before the end of June.

To mitigate the impact of COVID-19, two options have been discussed as part of the post tender process with G&T, Ark and Epping's Programme Manager holding a conference call with ISG on 16th April 2020 to discuss. These options are outlined in Section 6.

Enhanced conditions put in place by Government regarding COVID-19 – There also remains a risk that government policy towards COVID-19 could change between the time of this report and the start of the project on site with stricter conditions put in place that may impact the Contractor's ability to fulfil its obligations. This could be mitigated with a termination clause in the contract that allows for mutual termination by either party should COVID-19 make it impossible for the project to proceed.

Co-ordination of client led packages – The AV and Furniture packages are being led by Epping Forest District Council directly. Nevertheless, these designs will need to be co-ordinated with the Contractor's design post contract and could have an impact on cost and programme. However, it should be re-iterated that these packages do not form part of the contract and thus the Construction Contingency makes no allowances to cover additional costs stemming from these packages such as an overspend.

- 5.5 Given that this is a Contract that will follow a Design and Build Procurement route, a large proportion of the risk resides with the Contractor, rather than the Client for such actions as sign off of the conditions of the Listed Building Consent and co-ordination of the glazed roof replacement. However to mitigate residual risk (including risk over and above those listed under item 5.3), we recommend that the Construction Contingency set-out within Appendix A of the report, a value of £805,000.00, is fully retained against this Construction Project. It is recommended that this figure be retained against the Project Budget until a full reconciliation of ISG's current Tender Offer has been concluded to consider implications of COVID-19 protocols.
- 5.6 Owing to the uncertainty of COVID-19 and the potential unforeseen impact it may have on the project, we also recommend that the underspend of £279,240.00 is retained as an additional Client Reserve.

-
- 5.7 The Construction Contingency and recommended Client Reserve can be reforecast when notable programme milestones are reached such as completion of the Asbestos survey and strip-out, completion of the drainage and completion of the new glazed roof lights. Whilst contingencies can also be reforecast to reflect changes in working practices stemming from the ongoing COVID-19 pandemic.

6.0 MITIGATING THE RISK OF COVID-19

- 6.1 Whilst the reconciled tender from ISG detailed in this report is compliant with the tender documentation issued on 24th February 2020, the rapid impact COVID-19 has had on construction and the risk it poses to the project needs to be considered. At the time of this report, the UK government has extended the 'lockdown' period for at least another three weeks until the first week of May and currently there is no information on when the lockdown protocols may be relaxed.
- 6.2 Acknowledging this risk, G&T arranged a conference call with ISG along with Ark Consultancy and the Programme Manager for Epping Forest District Council to discuss how the project can be progressed to mitigate the impact of prolonged COVID-19 protocols put in place by the Government. From these discussions, two options were proposed.
- 6.3 Option 1 is ISG provide a revised programme and cost for completing the project under COVID-19 conditions. ISG have already begun work on a revised programme and site logistics for progressing the project whilst obeying the social distancing protocols in place. This included, but is not limited to;
- Changing the site setup to allow for larger changing facilities and break rooms so social distancing can be followed
 - Resequencing works to reduce the number of operatives on site
 - Staggered working hours and break times
 - Working out of hours and on weekends
 - Utilising the Basement car park for storage of materials
 - Managing the flow of people by having separate entrance and exits from the building and separate stairs for moving up and down through the building
- 6.4 In order to reduce the prolongation of the programme, ISG noted that if the requirement to keep the link building as a fire egress route was removed, perhaps by providing external access to the Conder Building then the programme could be reduced. However, upon exploring this option, ISG confirmed that the impact would be negligible.
- 6.5 Option 2 is to engage ISG under a Pre-Construction Services Agreement (PCSA) to undertake a limited scope of early works. This could involve the following activities;

-
- Progressing the design from RIBA Stage 3+ to RIBA Stage 5
 - Undertaking early procurement of long lead items
 - Undertaking surveys of elements such as the wood panelling
 - Strip-out of the existing accommodation

6.6 It is G&T's view that Option 1 is preferable. A revised tender offer from ISG that fully considers the impact of COVID-19 in both cost and programme mitigates the risk of COVID-19 with the Contractor responsible for delivering the project. It is also our view that legal advice should be sought to insert an amended termination clause into the contract to allow for mutual termination should the COVID-19 situation worsen.

6.7 In the event that Epping Forest District Council decide Option 2 is preferable, there is likely to be cost and programme implications should they wish to continue with the rest of the works upon completion of the early works undertaken under the PCSA.

6.8 In order to enable Epping Forest District Council to make an informed decision, ISG are currently revising their tender to fully consider COVID-19 and the cost and programme impact of progressing the project under the current Government restrictions. This will be complete at the beginning of May with a conference call held with Epping to discuss their tender and the best way forward.

APPENDIX A: REFORECAST BUDGET

**EPPING FOREST DISTRICT COUNCIL
CIVIC BUILDING AND OFFICES**

APPENDIX A - REFORECAST BUDGET

REF	DESCRIPTION	PRE-TENDER ESTIMATE	ISG TENDER	DIFF.
		£	£	£
1	Construction Value	6,324,000.00	5,408,630.00	(915,370.00)
2	Construction Contingency	500,100.00	805,000.00	304,900.00
3	Professional Fees (i)	276,950.00	332,130.00	55,180.00
4	Direct Orders	50,000.00	50,000.00	£0.00
5	Loose FFE (ii)	Excluded	Excluded	-
6	Decanting	Excluded	Excluded	-
7	AV / IT	Incl. in Ref 1	Incl. in Ref 1	-
8	VAT	Excluded	Excluded	-
9	TOTAL	7,151,050.00	6,595,760.00	(555,290.00)

NOTES

- i) Professional Fees figure as advised by Ark Consultancy
- ii) Fees exclude additional requirement for building sign off and those relating to planned café strategy
- iii) Allowance of £12,600 for additional planning fees and tree consultant
- iv) FFE cost previously advised as £800,000 were included in the PTE. This has now been excluded as requested by Epping Forest District Council and will be managed directly by them.

**EPPING FOREST DISTRICT COUNCIL
CIVIC BUILDING AND OFFICES**

APPENDIX A - REFORECAST BUDGET

REF	DESCRIPTION	APPROVED BUDGET	ISG TENDER	DIFF.
		£	£	£
1	Service Accomodation	6,660,000.00	6,595,760.00	(64,240.00)
2	Roof Works	165,000.00	Included	(165,000.00)
3	FFE	Excluded	Excluded	Excluded
4	Separation Works	Excluded	Excluded	Excluded
5	CCTV	50,000.00	Included	(50,000.00)
6	IT Cabling	Excluded	Included	Included
7	Underspend / Client Reserve	0.00	279,240.00	279,240.00
8	TOTAL	6,875,000.00	6,875,000.00	£0.00

NOTES

- i) Budget as advised by Epping Forest District Council on 9th April 2020 and clarified on 24th April 2020
- ii) FFE cost previously advised as £800,000 were included in the PTE. This has now been excluded as requested by Epping Forest District Council and will be managed directly by them.

APPENDIX B: EVALUATION MATRIX

		COST		TECHNICAL												COST	TECHNICAL	TOTAL SCORE	TOTAL RANKING	
		RECONCILED TENDER VALUE (£)		EXPERIENCE/ DELIVERY (ORGANOGRAM)	EXPERIENCE/ DELIVERY (CV'S)	EXPERIENCE/ DELIVERY (MANAGEMENT / DESIGN COORDINATION)	SITE LOGISTICS & METHODOLOGY	CRITICAL PATH/ PROGRAMME/ PHASING	RISK MANAGEMENT	HEALTH & SAFETY										
Max. Score Weighted %		100.00%		10.00	5.00%	10.00	5.00%	10.00	10.00%	10.00	30.00%	10.00	30.00%	10.00	10.00%	10.00	10.00%	40.00%	60.00%	100.00%
	Scorers	Value	%	Sc.	%	Sc.	%	Sc.		Sc.	%	Sc.	%	Sc.	%	Sc.	%	%	%	%
ISG	G&T	5,186,134.00	100.00%	8.00		6.00		8.00		6.00		6.00		8.00		6.00				
	Epping Council			8.00		4.00		6.00		4.00		8.00				6.00				
	Ark			8.00		6.00		8.00		6.00		8.00		8.00		6.00				
	BA			8.00		6.00		8.00		6.00		6.00		8.00		6.00				
	BWB			6.00		8.00		8.00		6.00		8.00		8.00		6.00				
	SJN															6.00				
																6.00				
Av. Total			100.00%	7.60	3.80%	6.00	3.00%	7.60	7.60%	5.67	17.00%	7.20	21.60%	7.60	7.60%	6.00	6.00%	40.00%	39.96%	79.96%

1

APPENDIX C: TECHNICAL EVALUATION SCORESHEETS

EPPING FOREST DISTRICT COUNCIL
CIVIC BUILDING AND OFFICES
TECHNICAL CRITERIA - SCORESHEETS

BISSET ADAMS
ZOE LAWRENCE

QUESTION	TOTAL SCORE AVAILABLE	ISG	
		SCORE	NARRATIVE / QUERIES / COMMENTS / AREAS OF NON-COMPLIANCE
1.1 -Provide an Organisation Chart in A3 highlighting your proposed staff and design team responsible for delivery of all phases, clearly illustrating roles / responsibilities, as well as utilisation on the project.	10 - Excellent 8 - Good 6- Satisfactory 4 - Below Expectations 2 - Poor 0 - Unacceptable	8	Overall organisation chart clear. Project specific ornanogram a little basic.
1.2 - Provide CV's for your proposed delivery team, including your proposed design team. CV's to include two relevant listed building project references and why they those experiences support their inclusion within the delivery team of this project. Please advise how you intend to procure the works to the Grade II Listed building whilst acknowledging the Client's aspiration to use a local supply chain. How will you ensure the calibre of your supply-chain will appreciate to undertake works, such as cleaning the polychromatic striped walls whilst protecting the reception murals? How will you manage the listed packages to ensure quality of workmanship for the restoration of elements of heritage value such as the reception desk and related joinery?	10 - Excellent 8 - Good 6- Satisfactory 4 - Below Expectations 2 - Poor 0 - Unacceptable	6	CV's general good. Lots of office experience, 2 of which are Listed building/ Heritage although not necessarily to the CV's. They have noted some other examples of Listed/ Conservation work which is good to see particulrly different building eras too. There are some general quality & procurement statements however not very many specific references to the actual project/ listed building reference or specific items of the listing, for example the polycrammatic wall.
1.3 - Highlight the approach, processes and procedures that you will employ with relation to coordinating and concluding the design. What procedures for Design Approval / Sign-Off will be adopted and how will you ensure design quality, inter-disciplinary coordination and final liaison with Epping District Council Stakeholders is achieved within your designated programme	10 - Excellent 8 - Good 6- Satisfactory 4 - Below Expectations 2 - Poor 0 - Unacceptable	8	Fairly coherent but general guidance to process and procedures. Would have like dto see something a little more project specific.
2 - Describe and outline your proposals towards construction logistics, site setup, access, fire egress and delivery plans and outline a methodology to be adopted for the duration of the project. Particular consideration needs to be given to; • The contractors' site access, deliveries and how disruption to the occupied adjacent buildings will be minimised. • Providing maintenance access for Epping Forest District Council's personnel to identified service rooms in the basement and ground floors. • Methodologies and sequencing of: a) Phased Possession and Sectional Completion obligations. b) Works outside of project demise. c) Works to Conder and Civic Centre roof areas, minimising impact upon progression of fit-out works within Civic Centre and continued operation of Conder Building.	10 - Excellent 8 - Good 6- Satisfactory 4 - Below Expectations 2 - Poor 0 - Unacceptable	6	Information provided within tender return including information on keeping EFDC separate whilst works being carried out. Consideration has been given to various
3 - All tenderers are to provide, using proprietary programming software, a detailed project programme. Please explain the critical path, highlight key milestones for information issue, design development, approvals and appointments to demonstrate the interdependencies and to substantiate the earliest Completion Date that can be met. It is imperative that the specified dates for phased possession and sectional completion are adhered to, as outlined within Volume 2 Prelim Clause A12:28A .	10 - Excellent 8 - Good 6- Satisfactory 4 - Below Expectations 2 - Poor 0 - Unacceptable	8	They have taken the current COVID 19 situation into account and provided an alternative programme for discussion.
4 - Please identify what you interpret to be the top 5 risks associated with this project, and how you plan to mitigate them throughout the project.	10 - Excellent 8 - Good 6- Satisfactory 4 - Below Expectations 2 - Poor 0 - Unacceptable	6	The current Covid 19 situation has factored heavily in the document, which is understandable however the situation could be different once the project starts. There seems to be some errors in their contents page. Project risk register is fairly general, more a hazard register and not necessarily in relation to the project.
5 - Please outline how you propose to undertake the following: • Principal Designer role including liaison with the client, specialist designers and preparing and issuing the project's Health and Safety File. • Principal Contractor role and ongoing contractor liaison. • Maintaining the safety of Epping Forest District Council personnel, their deliveries, maintenance staff/ contractors, and the public throughout the works. • Fire and emergency arrangements. • Approach to asbestos management. • Production of the building manual incorporating the O & M manuals and the HSF. Please provide details of any improvement notices or prohibition notices served on the company by the HSE within the last three years. Explain what actions have been taken and how company policies have been revised and updated. Please provide details of your accident statistics over the last three years and, for any notifiable or reportable incidents identify cause and any lessons learnt	10 - Excellent 8 - Good 6- Satisfactory 4 - Below Expectations 2 - Poor 0 - Unacceptable	8	Again a lot of general content but sets out the general processes- Elsepth to provide more detailed comments in respect of H&S.

TECHNICAL CRITERIA - SCORESHEETS

JERRY GILBERT
ARK CONSULTANCY

QUESTION	TOTAL SCORE AVAILABLE	ISG	
		SCORE	NARRATIVE / QUERIES / COMMENTS / AREAS OF NON-COMPLIANCE
1.1 -Provide an Organisation Chart in A3 highlighting your proposed staff and design team responsible for delivery of all phases, clearly illustrating roles / responsibilities, as well as utilisation on the project.	10 - Excellent 8 - Good 6- Satisfactory 4 - Below Expectations 2 - Poor 0 - Unacceptable	8	They have provided an organisation chart which illustrates the roles , responsibilities and which are grouped under technical, commercial, site team and, importantly, both internal and external design teams. The operating and resilience plan they have put in place for dealing with Covid 19 appear to be robust. Although there is an indication of who will be site based and who "visiting" the utilisation is not cleaf
1.2 - Provide CV's for your proposed delivery team, including your proposed design team. CV's to include two relevant listed building project references and why they those experiences support their inclusion within the delivery team of this project. Please advise how you intend to procure the works to the Grade II Listed building whilst acknowledging the Client's aspiration to use a local supply chain. How will you ensure the calibre of your supply-chain will appreciate to undertake works, such as cleaning the polychromatic striped walls whilst protecting the reception murals? How will you manage the listed packages to ensure quality of workmanship for the restoration of elements of heritage value such as the reception desk and related joinery?	10 - Excellent 8 - Good 6- Satisfactory 4 - Below Expectations 2 - Poor 0 - Unacceptable	6	The CVs provided for the project team were brief but supplemented by informatioun provided via the QR codes. The examples of working on Grade 2 listed buildings were scattered throughout the submission, they have clearly worked on listed building but have not specifically provided the two case studies and explained why such experiences support the work in Epping (there are four cases described but not fully explored in relation to their relevance to Epping) . There were general references to the fact they have a well established supply chain but I could not find any specific reference to the use of local labour other tha in the case studies where a commitment to 10% within the Borough and 20% from surrounding Boroughs was proposed, there was no indication that this target would be applied to Epping.nor was there a specific response to how they ensure the supply chain are qualified to address the heritage issues.They have gone into some detail about the logistics anfd the management of noise, dust etc but again these are standard statements not related specifically to the issues raised in the question.. The responses to the various selements of the question vary, Whilst overall the question has been scored as satisfactory, there are some elements where the responses are weak.
1.3 - Highlight the approach, processes and procedures that you will employ with relation to coordinating and concluding the design. What procedures for Design Approval / Sign-Off will be adopted and how will you ensure design quality, inter-disciplinary coordination and final liaison with Epping District Council Stakeholders is achieved within your designated programme	10 - Excellent 8 - Good 6- Satisfactory 4 - Below Expectations 2 - Poor 0 - Unacceptable	8	They dedicated a chapter to this and have both an internal and external design teams, the sign off protocols are robust and will be refined with Epping. They have allowed five weeks for the design actiity which, given the amount of work already defined by the Heritage requirements and the extent to which the M&E works have already been taken beyond stage 3 this time is considered adequate, thye have allocated a leader to the design process but it is not entirely clear how the design/specification of the MEP element is to be coordinated.
2 - Describe and outline your proposals towards construction logistics, site setup, access, fire egress and delivery plans and outline a methodology to be adopted for the duration of the project. Particular consideration needs to be given to; • The contractors' site access, deliveries and how disruption to the occupied adjacent buildings will be minimised. • Providing maintenance access for Epping Forest District Council's personnel to identified service rooms in the basement and ground floors. • Methodologies and sequencing of: a) Phased Possession and Sectional Completion obligations. b) Works outside of project demise. c) Works to Conder and Civic Centre roof areas, minimising impact upon progression of fit-out works within Civic Centre and continued operation of Conder Building.	10 - Excellent 8 - Good 6- Satisfactory 4 - Below Expectations 2 - Poor 0 - Unacceptable	6	There is a lot of standard stuff in this response, albeit if it translates into the operation on the ground will lead to effective site management. They have crearly reviewed the building and provided a floor by floor schematic of how they intend to conduct and phase the works and the means by which they intend to to access and egress the building (their assumption is that both the site office and welfare facilities will be provided within the basement area of the buiding) The descriptions of how they intend to maintain access could be expanded. The request to consider specific issues around access to adjacent buildings etc have not been directly answered albeit some can be deduced and are referenced spcificlly as risk areas.
3 - All tenderers are to provide, using proprietary programming software, a detailed project programme. Please explain the critical path, highlight key milestones for information issue, design development, approvals and appointments to demonstrate the interdependencies and to substantiate the earliest Completion Date that can be met. It is imperative that the specified dates for phased possession and sectional completion are adhered to, as outlined within Volume 2 Prelim Clause A12:28A .	10 - Excellent 8 - Good 6- Satisfactory 4 - Below Expectations 2 - Poor 0 - Unacceptable	8	Detailed programme is provided clearly defining pre commencement and construction phase activities. The relationship and critical path are flagged on the programme as are the sectional completion dates but more specific descriptive information would have been helpful. Overall the programme, given their current appreciation of the requirement is sufficiently detailed to monitor progress. The sectional completion was referenced but not is not as clear as it could be despite being spdifically highlighted as an issue in the question
4 - Please identify what you interpret to be the top 5 risks associated with this project, and how you plan to mitigate them throughout the project.	10 - Excellent 8 - Good 6- Satisfactory 4 - Below Expectations 2 - Poor 0 - Unacceptable	8	Understandably the top risk is Covid 19 with the remainder reflecting areas that were highlighted to in the ITT, namely Access for staff, Asbestos , heritage issues and the glazed atrium roof. The mitigation are considered reasonable. Generally they answered what was asked of them
5 - Please outline how you propose to undertake the following: • Principal Designer role including liaison with the client, specialist designers and preparing and issuing the project's Health and Safety File. • Principal Contractor role and ongoing contractor liaison. • Maintaining the safety of Epping Forest District Council personnel, their deliveries, maintenance staff/ contractors, and the public throughout the works. • Fire and emergency arrangements. • Approach to asbestos management. • Production of the building manual incorporating the O & M manuals and the HSF. Please provide details of any improvement notices or prohibition notices served on the company by the HSE within the last three years. Explain what actions have been taken and how company policies have been revised and updated. Please provide details of your accident statistics over the last three years and, for any notifiable or reportable incidents identify cause and any lessons learnt	10 - Excellent 8 - Good 6- Satisfactory 4 - Below Expectations 2 - Poor 0 - Unacceptable	6	ISGs approach to their role as principal designer (interestingly the chapeter refers to <u>where</u> we are appointed), how they address H&S (they have nominated an H&S manager for the project) they have also explained how they address fire safety and asbestos issues.There is also futher reference to these issues in the appendix Again this is an articulation of their general approach which is satisfactory, but relating it more specifically to the Epping situation would have enhanced the response

TECHNICAL CRITERIA - SCORESHEETS

LEON MADDISON
BWB CONSULTING

QUESTION	TOTAL SCORE AVAILABLE	ISG	
		SCORE	NARRATIVE / QUERIES / COMMENTS / AREAS OF NON-COMPLIANCE
1.1 - Provide an Organisation Chart in A3 highlighting your proposed staff and design team responsible for delivery of all phases, clearly illustrating roles / responsibilities, as well as utilisation on the project.	10 - Excellent 8 - Good 6- Satisfactory 4 - Below Expectations 2 - Poor 0 - Unacceptable	6	It would be good to understand who ISG's proposed MEP sub-contractors are likely to be, or if these are intended to be one single company. In addition, would the MEP sub-contractor undertake their own design / drawings, or would this be sub-contracted to a specialist design consultant.
1.2 - Provide CV's for your proposed delivery team, including your proposed design team. CV's to include two relevant listed building project references and why they those experiences support their inclusion within the delivery team of this project. Please advise how you intend to procure the works to the Grade II Listed building whilst acknowledging the Client's aspiration to use a local supply chain. How will you ensure the calibre of your supply-chain will appreciate to undertake works, such as cleaning the polychromatic striped walls whilst protecting the reception murals? How will you manage the listed packages to ensure quality of workmanship for the restoration of elements of heritage value such as the reception desk and related joinery?	10 - Excellent 8 - Good 6- Satisfactory 4 - Below Expectations 2 - Poor 0 - Unacceptable	8	As above, although good to note there is a dedicated technical services manager employed by ISG to oversee third party design and technical elements.
1.3 - Highlight the approach, processes and procedures that you will employ with relation to coordinating and concluding the design. What procedures for Design Approval / Sign-Off will be adopted and how will you ensure design quality, inter-disciplinary coordination and final liaison with Epping District Council Stakeholders is achieved within your designated programme	10 - Excellent 8 - Good 6- Satisfactory 4 - Below Expectations 2 - Poor 0 - Unacceptable	8	Covered well in the Technical Submission document
2 - Describe and outline your proposals towards construction logistics, site setup, access, fire egress and delivery plans and outline a methodology to be adopted for the duration of the project. Particular consideration needs to be given to; • The contractors' site access, deliveries and how disruption to the occupied adjacent buildings will be minimised. • Providing maintenance access for Epping Forest District Council's personnel to identified service rooms in the basement and ground floors. • Methodologies and sequencing of: a) Phased Possession and Sectional Completion obligations. b) Works outside of project demise. c) Works to Conder and Civic Centre roof areas, minimising impact upon progression of fit-out works within Civic Centre and continued operation of Conder Building.	10 - Excellent 8 - Good 6- Satisfactory 4 - Below Expectations 2 - Poor 0 - Unacceptable	6	The proposals appear to be well thought through and identified. No mention of the required electrical pre-start enabling works?
3 - All tenderers are to provide, using proprietary programming software, a detailed project programme. Please explain the critical path, highlight key milestones for information issue, design development, approvals and appointments to demonstrate the interdependencies and to substantiate the earliest Completion Date that can be met. It is imperative that the specified dates for phased possession and sectional completion are adhered to, as outlined within Volume 2 Prelim Clause A12:28A .	10 - Excellent 8 - Good 6- Satisfactory 4 - Below Expectations 2 - Poor 0 - Unacceptable	8	Detailed program received. Risks highlighted to major plant item procurement also noted - including how these can be mitigated.
4 - Please identify what you interpret to be the top 5 risks associated with this project, and how you plan to mitigate them throughout the project.	10 - Excellent 8 - Good 6- Satisfactory 4 - Below Expectations 2 - Poor 0 - Unacceptable	8	As above, plant procurement risks (identifying each specific item) noted
5 - Please outline how you propose to undertake the following: • Principal Designer role including liaison with the client, specialist designers and preparing and issuing the project's Health and Safety File. • Principal Contractor role and ongoing contractor liaison. • Maintaining the safety of Epping Forest District Council personnel, their deliveries, maintenance staff/ contractors, and the public throughout the works. • Fire and emergency arrangements. • Approach to asbestos management. • Production of the building manual incorporating the O & M manuals and the HSF. Please provide details of any improvement notices or prohibition notices served on the company by the HSE within the last three years. Explain what actions have been taken and how company policies have been revised and updated. Please provide details of your accident statistics over the last three years and, for any notifiable or reportable incidents identify cause and any lessons learnt	10 - Excellent 8 - Good 6- Satisfactory 4 - Below Expectations 2 - Poor 0 - Unacceptable	6	Noted and reviewed. I note there is no cost in the Tender break-down for employing the serices of a structural engineer to check and verify structural implications of the proposed works - is this required?

EPPING FOREST DISTRICT COUNCIL
CIVIC BUILDING AND OFFICES

TECHNICAL CRITERIA - SCORESHEETS

Victoria Wright, Stuart Mitchell, Richard Spencer, Alison Girdiefski
Epping Forest District Council

QUESTION	TOTAL SCORE AVAILABLE	SCORE	ISG NARRATIVE / QUERIES / COMMENTS / AREAS OF NON-COMPLIANCE
1.1 -Provide an Organisation Chart in A3 highlighting your proposed staff and design team responsible for delivery of all phases, clearly illustrating roles / responsibilities, as well as utilisation on the project.	10 - Excellent 8 - Good 6- Satisfactory 4 - Below Expectations 2 - Poor 0 - Unacceptable	8	Require details on utilisation for visiting and site based staff Proposed Team seems knowledgable and personal videos were a nice touch especially in these times when meeting everyone face to face is impossible
1.2 - Provide CV's for your proposed delivery team, including your proposed design team. CV's to include two relevant listed building project references and why they those experiences support their inclusion within the delivery team of this project. Please advise how you intend to procure the works to the Grade II Listed building whilst acknowledging the Client's aspiration to use a local supply chain. How will you ensure the calibre of your supply-chain will appreciate to undertake works, such as cleaning the polychromatic striped walls whilst protecting the reception murals? How will you manage the listed packages to ensure quality of workmanship for the restoration of elements of heritage value such as the reception desk and related joinery?	10 - Excellent 8 - Good 6- Satisfactory 4 - Below Expectations 2 - Poor 0 - Unacceptable	4	Proposed Team seems knowledgable and personal videos were a nice touch especially in these times when meeting everyone face to face is impossible There is no listed building experience shown from the team members who will be delivering our programme. We would prefer for some key roles e.g. the on site Project Manager and the Designer Manager to have recent expereience with listed buildings, protection of listed elements and understanding of the planning and heritage constraints. There is not enough detail on how the listed elements in our building will be protected during refurbishment. What is the preferred method of resourcing and operting on site from page 20 due to Covid-19? We will need to discuss this in more detail as we have limitations on onsite working hours set by Planning. We would like more detail how you manage business continuity risks in a love environemtn especilly around power and data / IT infrastructure.
1.3 - Highlight the approach, processes and procedures that you will employ with relation to coordinating and concluding the design. What procedures for Design Approval / Sign-Off will be adopted and how will you ensure design quality, inter-disciplinary coordination and final liaison with Epping District Council Stakeholders is achieved within your designated programme	10 - Excellent 8 - Good 6- Satisfactory 4 - Below Expectations 2 - Poor 0 - Unacceptable	6	There is enough informtation to describe how the design will evolve to final for signoff
2 - Describe and outline your proposals towards construction logistics, site setup, access, fire egress and delivery plans and outline a methodology to be adopted for the duration of the project. Particular consideration needs to be given to; • The contractors' site access, deliveries and how disruption to the occupied adjacent buildings will be minimised. • Providing maintenance access for Epping Forest District Council's personnel to identified service rooms in the basement and ground floors. • Methodologies and sequencing of: a) Phased Possession and Sectional Completion obligations. b) Works outside of project demise. c) Works to Conder and Civic Centre roof areas, minimising impact upon progression of fit-out works within Civic Centre and continued operation of Conder Building.	10 - Excellent 8 - Good 6- Satisfactory 4 - Below Expectations 2 - Poor 0 - Unacceptable	4	Limited information on access on to the site, for deliveries or how disruption to occupied adjacent buildings will be minimised. What external car park area will be taken up by the contractor for operative parking, deliveries/delivery vehicle routes, waste storage or additional compound (especially as the site entrance and material entrance into the building both discharge into the car park area as shown on page 50 and 51)? Nothing marked on a plan. This is also relevant to staff working in homefield house. COnfirm if only the basement car park will be used and if these spaces are enough. Very limited information on access to the site within p6 of the construction phase plan. No traffic management and logistics plan in Appendix 6 and no fire plan in Appendix 7 of the construction phase plan. Unable to find any information on providing maintenance access for EFDC personnel to identified service rooms in the basement and ground floors. Limited information on works outside of the project demise. Limited information on works to roof areas. P48 shows the basement may be used for some staff parking for as long as possible. Will there be temporary services kept live in this area to permit safe use? How can the GF, 1F and 2F staff kitchens in the "link" areas be constructed ahead of occupation of the main building, when the corridor routes in that "link" need to be maintained as fire exits from the conder building and the GF needs to continue as a temporary reception? (the programme shows link kitchens completion date of 06/10/20 but the main building as not complete until 17/11/20) How will the first floor of 323 house be accessed by operatives? (the GF access is shown as via the old front door). Link staircase - no mention of management of any contractor movements on the link staircase as this forms part of the fire escape strategy for EFDC staff remaining in the Conder building. P61 references another site RE: crane location.
3 - All tenderers are to provide, using proprietary programming software, a detailed project programme. Please explain the critical path, highlight key milestones for information issue, design development, approvals and appointments to demonstrate the interdependencies and to substantiate the earliest Completion Date that can be met. It is imperative that the specified dates for phased possession and sectional completion are adhered to, as outlined within Volume 2 Prelim Clause A12:28A .	10 - Excellent 8 - Good 6- Satisfactory 4 - Below Expectations 2 - Poor 0 - Unacceptable	8	Review of Items on Pager 77: Works completed by others > Item 7 – This temporary supply is to be provided by the main contractor > Item 11 – This temporary supply is to be provided by the main contractor We confirm all other items are to be carried out by EFDC
4 - Please identify what you interpret to be the top 5 risks associated with this project, and how you plan to mitigate them throughout the project.	10 - Excellent 8 - Good 6- Satisfactory 4 - Below Expectations 2 - Poor 0 - Unacceptable		

TECHNICAL CRITERIA - SCORESHEETS

Victoria Wright, Stuart Mitchell, Richard Spencer, Alison Girdiefski
Epping Forest District Council

QUESTION	TOTAL SCORE AVAILABLE	SCORE	ISG NARRATIVE / QUERIES / COMMENTS / AREAS OF NON-COMPLIANCE
5 - Please outline how you propose to undertake the following: • Principal Designer role including liaison with the client, specialist designers and preparing and issuing the project’s Health and Safety File. • Principal Contractor role and ongoing contractor liaison. • Maintaining the safety of Epping Forest District Council personnel, their deliveries, maintenance staff/ contractors, and the public throughout the works. • Fire and emergency arrangements. • Approach to asbestos management. • Production of the building manual incorporating the O & M manuals and the HSF. Please provide details of any improvement notices or prohibition notices served on the company by the HSE within the last three years. Explain what actions have been taken and how company policies have been revised and updated. Please provide details of your accident statistics over the last three years and, for any notifiable or reportable incidents identify cause and any lessons learnt	10 - Excellent 8 - Good 6- Satisfactory 4 - Below Expectations 2 - Poor 0 - Unacceptable	6	What is the contingency in the programme to manage results from surveys e.g. Asbestos?

TECHNICAL CRITERIA - SCORESHEETS

ANDREW MUIR / ROSS WESTWOOD
GARDINER AND THEOBALD LLP

QUESTION	TOTAL SCORE AVAILABLE	ISG	
		SCORE	NARRATIVE / QUERIES / COMMENTS / AREAS OF NON-COMPLIANCE
1.1 - Provide an Organisation Chart in A3 highlighting your proposed staff and design team responsible for delivery of all phases, clearly illustrating roles / responsibilities, as well as utilisation on the project.	10 - Excellent 8 - Good 6- Satisfactory 4 - Below Expectations 2 - Poor 0 - Unacceptable	8	+ Good detail to answer with organogram provided clearly indicating roles and relationships; + Outlines roles and responsibilities; - Doesn't show utilisation for staff, though it states who is on site and who is visiting; - Doesn't seem to show a consultant for MEP design;
1.2 - Provide CV's for your proposed delivery team, including your proposed design team. CV's to include two relevant listed building project references and why they those experiences support their inclusion within the delivery team of this project. Please advise how you intend to procure the works to the Grade II Listed building whilst acknowledging the Client's aspiration to use a local supply chain. How will you ensure the calibre of your supply-chain will appreciate to undertake works, such as cleaning the polychromatic striped walls whilst protecting the reception murals? How will you manage the listed packages to ensure quality of workmanship for the restoration of elements of heritage value such as the reception desk and related joinery?	10 - Excellent 8 - Good 6- Satisfactory 4 - Below Expectations 2 - Poor 0 - Unacceptable	6	+/- Good experience across the team for office refurbishment; - Not a significant amount of Listed Building experience across the team. ISG will be responsible for discharging consent and it is important they understand the requirements; - Key people on site have no Listed Building experience in their profiles (PM, Services Manager etc.); - Very generic responses, team seems suited to Office fit-out more than Grade II listed, though consent is not too onerous; + Good consideration of covid-19 and impact on supply chain and measures to mitigate; + / - Vague references to local supply chain with direct references or examples of where local supply chain has been utilised; + Relevant case studies for working in Listed Buildings, though not necessarily by the team used here; - No specific reference to how listed elements such as the polychromatic walls will be dealt with;
1.3 - Highlight the approach, processes and procedures that you will employ with relation to coordinating and concluding the design. What procedures for Design Approval / Sign-Off will be adopted and how will you ensure design quality, inter-disciplinary coordination and final liaison with Epping District Council Stakeholders is achieved within your designated programme	10 - Excellent 8 - Good 6- Satisfactory 4 - Below Expectations 2 - Poor 0 - Unacceptable	8	+ Processes in place to undertake design remotely + DRM and IRS in place and linked to programme + Reference to Listed Building Consent and requirement to discharge conditions + DTM and understanding that design information needs resolution - Fairly generic, no references to particular elements of Epping that need co-ordination
2 - Describe and outline your proposals towards construction logistics, site setup, access, fire egress and delivery plans and outline a methodology to be adopted for the duration of the project. Particular consideration needs to be given to; • The contractors' site access, deliveries and how disruption to the occupied adjacent buildings will be minimised. • Providing maintenance access for Epping Forest District Council's personnel to identified service rooms in the basement and ground floors. • Methodologies and sequencing of: a) Phased Possession and Sectional Completion obligations. b) Works outside of project demise. c) Works to Conder and Civic Centre roof areas, minimising impact upon progression of fit-out works within Civic Centre and continued operation of Conder Building.	10 - Excellent 8 - Good 6- Satisfactory 4 - Below Expectations 2 - Poor 0 - Unacceptable	6	+ Good consideration for the environment they are working in and site setup in the Basement seems sensible which allows minimum disruption to Epping workers and car park + Plans for noise reduction and strategies to protect Epping Staff + Good understanding of the need to keep fire egress routes from Conder with clear marked up plans + Delivery booking system + / - Logistic plan shows Council Chambers and references smoke head works, but no real information on how they will achieve these works - No specific plan mentioned for PV panel relocation from Conder + / - No information regarding safe access for maintenance staff within the Civic Building. Generic safe access information provided. More information provided in HSE section
3 - All tenderers are to provide, using proprietary programming software, a detailed project programme. Please explain the critical path, highlight key milestones for information issue, design development, approvals and appointments to demonstrate the interdependencies and to substantiate the earliest Completion Date that can be met. It is imperative that the specified dates for phased possession and sectional completion are adhered to, as outlined within Volume 2 Prelim Clause A12:28A .	10 - Excellent 8 - Good 6- Satisfactory 4 - Below Expectations 2 - Poor 0 - Unacceptable	6	Six weeks for completion of Stage 4 Design activities. IS that sufficient, especially given procurement activities overlap from Day-1? How will the placing of early orders and completion of design be managed/ coordinated? Can we have a clear, concise date for each trade package #'s 17-33 for when a design is frozen and order is placed. Currently unclear. Especially important to know for key procurement items. Roof glazing, what is the proposals for this element? New roof replacement or glazing panels only? If non-compliant and we ask that roof is replaced in totality how does this impact programme? #36 states 'works completed by others' and shows elements that are not stated in prelims as by 'client/ others', so what does this mean and is this non-compliant. Section 3 is shown as commencing earlier than Section 2 completing? IS this possible? My interpretation was that scope of Section 3 remained live, operational space until the new fit-out had completed in full? Can this be queried with both ISg and Epping? #39 eight weeks to install lifts is tight? Has this been discussed with Essex lifts, is this achievable? Section 2 has handed over before work to roof are shown to be completed, how will this work? Can this be clarified? Assume activity surpassing Section 2 completion is resurfacing works but can we ask the question? Small durations given to T&C and snagging. Are the Project Team happy with these durations and are they compliant with their specifications? No indication of timescales for design team validation and review of proposed design information? Can this be clarified, design team need two weeks from receipt, is this considered? Also dates for information release would be useful to see. Small durations given for client install activities, loose FFE and AV/IT. FFE install is also phased/ staggered at different times, are Epping happy with this? Does their provider assume his as part of their quotation? I would assume not. Presumably if programme start date was pushed out, the entire programme would move out in accordance with the delayed start? Is that a correct assumption? Validation activities and surveys are overlapped with completion of Stage 4 design. Surely this doesn't work, as Stage 4 will need to consider the result of the surveys. This is their risk but we should query this as it is not going to work in my opinion. No asbestos removal considered in programme. This is non-compliant.
4 - Please identify what you interpret to be the top 5 risks associated with this project, and how you plan to mitigate them throughout the project.	10 - Excellent 8 - Good 6- Satisfactory 4 - Below Expectations 2 - Poor 0 - Unacceptable	8	+ Covid-19 naturally referenced and a section dedicated it mitigation strategies + / - Asbestos risk and live environments a bit generic, but still valid risks. + Rooflight importance stated and survey to be undertaken + Listed Building Consent mentioned and a plan to meet with conservation to action discharging conditions

TECHNICAL CRITERIA - SCORESHEETS

ANDREW MUIR / ROSS WESTWOOD
GARDINER AND THEOBALD LLP

QUESTION	TOTAL SCORE AVAILABLE	ISG	
		SCORE	NARRATIVE / QUERIES / COMMENTS / AREAS OF NON-COMPLIANCE
<p>5 - Please outline how you propose to undertake the following:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none">• Principal Designer role including liaison with the client, specialist designers and preparing and issuing the project’s Health and Safety File.• Principal Contractor role and ongoing contractor liaison.• Maintaining the safety of Epping Forest District Council personnel, their deliveries, maintenance staff/ contractors, and the public throughout the works.• Fire and emergency arrangements.• Approach to asbestos management.• Production of the building manual incorporating the O & M manuals and the HSF. <p>Please provide details of any improvement notices or prohibition notices served on the company by the HSE within the last three years. Explain what actions have been taken and how company policies have been revised and updated.</p> <p>Please provide details of your accident statistics over the last three years and, for any notifiable or reportable incidents identify cause and any lessons learnt</p>	<p>10 - Excellent 8 - Good 6- Satisfactory 4 - Below Expectations 2 - Poor 0 - Unacceptable</p>	6	<p>+ Good information on being Principle Contractor + Safety of staff, operatives and deliveries addressed well + / - Some more generic HSE information provided, not Epping specific, but good information on Mental Health and their initiatives + ISG to undertake own Asbestos R&D survey and measures taken to protect workers - CPP has information on HSF, O&Ms, but not much detail provided</p>

TECHNICAL CRITERIA - SCORESHEETS

Elsbeth Nottage
SN Enviro Ltd, Principal Designer Adviser (to Bisset Adams)

Responding to sections 2, 4 & 5

QUESTION	TOTAL SCORE AVAILABLE	ISG	
		SCORE	NARRATIVE / QUERIES / COMMENTS / AREAS OF NON-COMPLIANCE
1.1 -Provide an Organisation Chart in A3 highlighting your proposed staff and design team responsible for delivery of all phases, clearly illustrating roles / responsibilities, as well as utilisation on the project.	10 - Excellent 8 - Good 6- Satisfactory 4 - Below Expectations 2 - Poor 0 - Unacceptable	N/A	
1.2 - Provide CV's for your proposed delivery team, including your proposed design team. CV's to include two relevant listed building project references and why they those experiences support their inclusion within the delivery team of this project. Please advise how you intend to procure the works to the Grade II Listed building whilst acknowledging the Client's aspiration to use a local supply chain. How will you ensure the calibre of your supply-chain will appreciate to undertake works, such as cleaning the polychromatic striped walls whilst protecting the reception murals? How will you manage the listed packages to ensure quality of workmanship for the restoration of elements of heritage value such as the reception desk and related joinery?	10 - Excellent 8 - Good 6- Satisfactory 4 - Below Expectations 2 - Poor 0 - Unacceptable		
1.3 - Highlight the approach, processes and procedures that you will employ with relation to coordinating and concluding the design. What procedures for Design Approval / Sign-Off will be adopted and how will you ensure design quality, inter-disciplinary coordination and final liaison with Epping District Council Stakeholders is achieved within your designated programme	10 - Excellent 8 - Good 6- Satisfactory 4 - Below Expectations 2 - Poor 0 - Unacceptable		
2 - Describe and outline your proposals towards construction logistics, site setup, access, fire egress and delivery plans and outline a methodology to be adopted for the duration of the project. Particular consideration needs to be given to; • The contractors' site access, deliveries and how disruption to the occupied adjacent buildings will be minimised. • Providing maintenance access for Epping Forest District Council's personnel to identified service rooms in the basement and ground floors. • Methodologies and sequencing of: a) Phased Possession and Sectional Completion obligations. b) Works outside of project demise. c) Works to Conder and Civic Centre roof areas, minimising impact upon progression of fit-out works within Civic Centre and continued operation of Conder Building.	10 - Excellent 8 - Good 6- Satisfactory 4 - Below Expectations 2 - Poor 0 - Unacceptable	6	Site layout plans have been provided (pages 48 to 53). Construction programme identifies a methodology for the project delivery. First bullet point: information on deliveries is included in the ISG response, for example page 48: "All deliveries are to reverse in with banks-man", ISG document refers to a site activity planner & a "delivery booking system" - ISG to confirm who populates & manages these. There is no specific statement about minimising disruption to the adjacent occupied buildings, although segregation of site from adjacent occupied buildings is mentioned as a requirement to comply with legislation and is identified on the site layout plans. Second bullet point: Maintenance access for EFDC personnel to service rooms in basement and ground floor - no statement in ISG's returned information; although basement plantroom indicated in their site layout plans; ground floor room is not identified. Please can ISG acknowledge that the client maintenance staff require access to service rooms in the basement and ground floors and that their plan of works will allow this? Third bullet point: methodology & sequencing: a) Phased possession & sectional completion - identified in construction programme b) Works outside of project demise: no statement on methodology identified. c) Works to Conder & Civic Centre roof areas - reference to "beam hoist" under key considerations on page 48. (Realistically, the detail for client maintenance access & ISG's work methodologies / sequencing will come out of planning and phasing of the works once the principal contractor is appointed.)
3 - All tenderers are to provide, using proprietary programming software, a detailed project programme. Please explain the critical path, highlight key milestones for information issue, design development, approvals and appointments to demonstrate the interdependencies and to substantiate the earliest Completion Date that can be met. It is imperative that the specified dates for phased possession and sectional completion are adhered to, as outlined within Volume 2 Prelim Clause A12:28A .	10 - Excellent 8 - Good 6- Satisfactory 4 - Below Expectations 2 - Poor 0 - Unacceptable		
4 - Please identify what you interpret to be the top 5 risks associated with this project, and how you plan to mitigate them throughout the project.	10 - Excellent 8 - Good 6- Satisfactory 4 - Below Expectations 2 - Poor 0 - Unacceptable	6	ISG have provided information on their top five risks on page 142 of their technical submittal. These relate to both project & CDM risks. They repeat information about Covid-19 at regular intervals throughout their response and their statements identify that they are endeavouring to carry out works whilst keeping their operatives /contractors safe by complying with changing Government recommendations. A project risk assessment is included in Appendix 3 on page 201. Several items on this are generic & not specific to EFDC offices.

TECHNICAL CRITERIA - SCORESHEETS

Elspeth Nottage			
SUN Enviro Ltd, Principal Designer Adviser (to Bisset Adams)			
Responding to sections 2, 4 & 5			
QUESTION	TOTAL SCORE AVAILABLE	ISG	
		SCORE	NARRATIVE / QUERIES / COMMENTS / AREAS OF NON-COMPLIANCE
<p>5 - Please outline how you propose to undertake the following:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none">• Principal Designer role including liaison with the client, specialist designers and preparing and issuing the project’s Health and Safety File.• Principal Contractor role and ongoing contractor liaison.• Maintaining the safety of Epping Forest District Council personnel, their deliveries, maintenance staff/ contractors, and the public throughout the works.• Fire and emergency arrangements.• Approach to asbestos management.• Production of the building manual incorporating the O & M manuals and the HSF. <p>Please provide details of any improvement notices or prohibition notices served on the company by the HSE within the last three years. Explain what actions have been taken and how company policies have been revised and updated.</p> <p>Please provide details of your accident statistics over the last three years and, for any notifiable or reportable incidents identify cause and any lessons learnt</p>	<p>10 - Excellent 8 - Good 6- Satisfactory 4 - Below Expectations 2 - Poor 0 - Unacceptable</p>	6	<p>PD role: Page 135 of the response states that the team will be led by a "Principal Designer lead" but the statement does not identify whether this will be an internal person or 3rd party from ISG's supply chain. The response does refer to "competency checks in accordance with CDM 2015" and "compliance with the duties under the regulations". Specific reference is made to the health and safety file contents, citing appendix 4 of CDM 2015 in their response.</p> <p>The ISG document refers to Bisset Adams (BA) as the Principal Designer (pages 145, 148, & 154). BA have been the PD during RIBA stage 3 up to the tender documentation issue.</p> <p>Pages 148, 153, & 158 ISG suggests the works will not commence until the construction phase plan has been completed to a satisfactory standard and deemed to be suitable by the PD. This is incorrect; under CDM 2015, this check is the responsibility of the client representative, not the Principal Designer, although the client can appoint an adviser to assist.</p> <p>Asbestos management - ISG state they will look at work areas & review against R&D survey information. Evidence of good practice.</p> <p>Page 109 refers to practical completion & preparation of both the O&Ms & HSF. Please will ISG acknowledge the requirements for O&M Manuals / HSF in the PCI document section 7 and appendix 4. Appendix 4 sets out the requirement for an O&M Manual tracker & format for each manual & confirm that their costs allow for compliance with the descriptions in the PCI?</p> <p>Accident Incident Rate included on page 137. Please will ISG provide further information about the 4 major incidents in Apr 18 - Mar 19 (type, region , any lessons learnt, etc.)?</p> <p>No reference to HSE interventions have been found in either the Technical or Commercial submissions. Please can ISG provide a statement - evenif it is to confirm that they have had no HSE interventions in the past 3 years?</p>

APPENDIX D: TENDER ANALYSIS

**CIVIC BUILDING AND OFFICES, EPPING FOREST DISTRICT COUNCIL
TENDER ANALYSIS**

ELEMENT		G&T	ISG FITOUT		DIFF
			INITIAL £	ADJUSTMENT £	£
1.0	Civic Building and Offices				
1.1	Demolition / Enabling / Temporary Works	149,652.00	113,543.89	32,228.00	-3,880.11
1.2	Substructure	11,000.00	31,707.32	10,000.00	30,707.32
1.3	Frame & Upper Floors	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00
1.4	Roof	459,638.00	143,890.73	0.00	-315,747.27
1.5	Stairs	5,000.00	13,993.63	0.00	8,993.63
1.6	External Walls, Windows & Doors	43,680.00	6,932.68	0.00	-36,747.32
1.7	Internal Walls, Partitions & Doors	215,890.00	180,479.40	9,930.80	-25,479.80
1.8	Wall Finishes	84,695.00	125,319.30	17,245.01	57,869.31
1.9	Floor Finishes	243,170.00	236,391.22	0.00	-6,778.78
2.10	Ceiling Finishes	112,248.00	85,283.25	0.00	-26,964.75
2.11	Fixtures, Fittings & Equipment	117,937.00	87,252.77	1,750.00	-28,934.23
2.12	MEPH	3,903,099.00	3,608,659.83	121,342.05	-173,097.12
2.13	External Works	15,000.00	345.78	7,500.00	-7,154.22
MEASURED WORKS SUB-TOTAL		5,361,009.00	4,633,800.00	199,996.00	-527,213.00
4.0	Main Contractor Preliminaries				
4.1	Site Accomodation and Records	375,000.00	26,012.00		
4.2	Management and Staff	Incl. above	163,149.00		
4.3	Temporary Services	Incl. above	15,865.00		
4.4	Security	Incl. above	7,794.00		
4.5	Safety and Environmental Protection	Incl. above	5,333.40		
4.6	Control & Protection	Incl. above	11,659.00		
4.7	Mechanical Plant	Incl. above	575.00		
4.8	Temporary Works	Incl. above	72,890.00		
4.9	Site Records	Incl. above	350.00		
4.10	Completion & Post Completion Requirements	Incl. above	Incl.		
4.11	Cleaning	Incl. above	22,899.00		
4.12	Fees & Charges	Incl. above	1,250.80		
4.13	Site Services	Incl. above	23,020.00		
4.14	Insurance, Bonds and Guarantees	Incl. above	Not Incl.		
5.00	Main Contractor Design Fee(s) and Risk	286,800.00	39,000.00	22,500.00	-225,300.00
6.00	Provisional Sums & Dayworks	0.00	Incl.		
7.00	Main Contractor OHP @ 2.5%	301,140.45	162,537.00	Incl.	-138,603.45
8.00	Pagabo Fee @ 0.90%	Incl.	Incl.	Incl.	
SUB-TOTAL			5,186,134.00	222,496.00	
RECONCILED TENDER RETURN TOTAL		6,324,000.00	5,408,630.00		

APPENDIX E: SCHEDULE OF PRICING QUALIFICATIONS & QUERIES

ISG								
#	CLIENT TEAM QUERY	RESPONSE FROM CONTRACTOR	RESPONSE FROM CLIENT TEAM	Comments from Conf Call dated 9 April 2020	FURTHER RESPONSE FROM ISG	FURTHER RESPONSE FROM CLIENT TEAM	FURTHER RESPONSE FROM ISG	Add/Omit
	ARCHITECTURAL							
1	A - Demolition and Alteration Item 1.1. Quant for demo seems high, please confirm area is correct	This is to remove all existing floor finishes across the project (excluding the retained stone flooring).		No further action needed		Noted		
2	A - Demolition and Alteration Item 1.6 Quant for internal doors seems low. Please confirm number	Any doors within the existing partitioning being removed will be included under the removal of partitions. These are doors sitting in retained partitions only.		No further action needed		Noted		
3	A - Demolition and Alteration Item 1.7. Removal of planters and fixed joinery excluded. Please provide cost or confirm these can remain in situ and will be adequately protected and works can be completed without removal	Confirmed		No further action needed		Noted		
4	A - Demolition and Alteration Item 1.8 Please confirm your cost covers removal of all furniture left on site as per discussion during site visits. EFDC to remove and store all retained furniture prior to site possession by Contractor	Confirmed.		No further action needed		Noted		
5	B - Substructure Item 1.1 Please provide your understanding of extent of below ground drainage required and rationale for prov sum number	Further review being undertaken as details unclear. Provisional sum included for potential basement car Park soffit level services rearrangement works.		G+T have requested that ISG confirm the following The extent of the works (if any) as they understand it. To confirm the extent of the programme period included for these works To confirm a suitable Prov Sum and what that sum is based on.	Further review being undertaken as details unclear. Provisional sum included for potential basement car Park soffit level services rearrangement works.	When will further information be provided on programme durations and proposed prov sum?	Proposed Prov Sum of £10,000 previously added. We cannot comment on programme durations until we know the scope of works.	10,000.00 Noted
6	D - Roof item 1, 2 and 3 Cost for roof seems insufficient. Please confirm these costs allow for the removal and complete replacement of the glazed roof lights with a like for like solution and all temporary works are included and they are compliant with the requirement of keeping an active fire exit route for Condor Building	These costs include for new rooflights only, we have included the temporary works, removal and logistics elsewhere.		G+T concerned that the value of this item is 3 times less than the quotes they recieved ISG confirmed quote but that they would review and confirm by next week Scope of service being provided to be issued to G&T	These costs include for new rooflights only, we have included the temporary works, removal and logistics elsewhere.	Noted		
7	D - Roof item 5 Cost for relocation of PV panels included. Please confirm scope covers removal of the PV panels from Condor Building and relocation and installation to Civic Building roof	We can confirm this is included.		No further action needed		Please confirm you are confident you've allowed sufficient time to remove and relocate the solar panels and to coat the roof below the panels?	We can confirm we have allowed sufficeint time to remove and relocate the panels. We have allowed to make good where the existing panels have been removed and for new roofing as shown on the tender drawings.	Noted
8	F - External Windows Please confirm costs include painting / making good window reveals and soffits etc.	We have made no allowance for any works externally to the windows. We have been advised these are new and no works are required during our site visits. We have included to paint the internal reveals and soffits to the windows.		no works to external windows. Confirmed by G&T		Noted		
9	G - Internal Doors Item 2.2 Please confirm quants for Door Type A, 850x2050, Schedule shows more than 1nr. 8nr shown?	Apologies for the error. Please amend to 9nr @ £1449.62 each Total £13,046.58. Please omit £1,449.62.		No further action needed		Noted		11,596.96
10	G - Internal Doors Item 2.3 Please confirm quants for Door Type A, 800x2050, Schedule shows less than 14nr. 6 shown?	Apologies for the error. Please amend to 6nr @ £1472.97 each Total £8,837.82. Please omit £20,621.58.		No further action needed		Noted		-11,783.76
11	G - Internal Doors Item 2.4 When can a compliant quote be supplied	We are working on this and aim to get a fixed price to you as expediantly as possible.		Agreed that the Prov Sum will be increased, from £7,500 to £10,000. Tamara to contunue to chase quotes. Andrew Muir to forward quote recived by G+T	We are working on this and aim to get a fixed price to you as expediantly as possible. As agreed at meeting P.Sum to be uplifted from 7.5k to 10k	Noted		2,500.00
12	H - Wall Finishes - Item 4 WT-02 Confirm quant. Seems low	Following a check on the measures I can confirm we have missed the following from our quantities; add 43m2 to Ground floor add 40m2 to Second floor Total add 83m2 x £132.47 = £10,995.01		No further action needed		Noted		10,995.01
13	H - Wall Finishes - Item 5 Can you provide a firm cost for undertaking the works / provide rationale for the prov sum amount	Following the initial site visit and advice from a specialist, they can not guarantee any areas that require new or reused veneer will match in colour to the existing. The cost to French polishing the existing would be; 124 lin m x £25 = £3,100.00 The cost to replace damaged panels would be:: £280 m2 x 33m2 (10% of total area) = £9,240.00 (subject to benchmarking). Please omit £30,000 provisional sum and add £12,340.00. ISG would like to provide a survey service (included in our tender) which will provide a full schedule of works to be agreed with the design team in advance of the contract sum agreement.		Agreed that this item will remain as a Prov Sum at 30k. Agreed that this will be a Defined Prov Sum but that an early survey is to be tabled to agree the costs	Adjustment made to reinstate 30k Prov Sum	This is to be a defined prov sum as discussed. Please confirm acceptance	Confirmed accepted	Noted
14	I - Floor Finishes generally Please confirm quants. Total floor finishes including making good terrazzo (incl. stairs) c5,200mm2	We are happy to stand by our quantities.		No further action needed		Noted		
15	M - External Works generally Have you allowed for removal of the diesel tank adjacent to the pyramid building	The removal of the Diesel Tank has not been included. Confirm a Prov Sum of 7.5k to be included		G+T require the answer to this query and also the level of contaminants that may arise as a result of this tiem.	The removal of the Diesel Tank has not been included. Confirm a Prov Sum of 7.5k to be included	Noted		7,500.00
	MEP							
16	Sanitaryware generally Please provide cost uplift for new sanitaryware to existing WCs	Breakdown of sanitaryware to existing WC's below;						

ISG								
#	CLIENT TEAM QUERY	RESPONSE FROM CONTRACTOR	RESPONSE FROM CLIENT TEAM	Comments from Conf Call dated 9 April 2020	FURTHER RESPONSE FROM ISG	FURTHER RESPONSE FROM CLIENT TEAM	FURTHER RESPONSE FROM ISG	Add/Omit
		N13 300 - Ideal Standard Jasper Morrison back to wall toilet E6221 with E6214 toilet seat and cover, white, E2125 concealed cistern and E4465 operating control (13nr x £396.11)		No further action needed		Noted		5,149.43
		N13 312 - Ideal Standard Doc M sensorflow wall mounted left hand pack, stainless steel grabrail and clothes hook (2nr x £1,824.80)		No further action needed		Noted		3,649.60
		N13 335 - Vitra 7070B003-0921 600mm, white shift compact basin with BC340(AA) Calista mixer tap (14nr x £161.98)		No further action needed		Noted		2,267.72
		N13 429 - Dolphin Solutions BC402 stainless steel coat hook (13nr x £18.77)		No further action needed		Noted		244.01
		N13 438 - Mirrors to WCs (6nr x £230.00)		No further action needed		Noted		1,380.00
		N13 442 - Dolphin Solutions DP3104 prestige paper towel dispenser, stainless steel (6nr x £241.64)		No further action needed		Noted		1,449.84
		N13 458 - Dolphin Solutions BC924SS satin stainless steel soap dispensers (8nr x £85.23)		No further action needed		Noted		681.84
		N13 462 - Dolphin Solutions BC 266 toilet paper holders (13nr x £23.32)		No further action needed		Noted		303.16
		Cleaners Sink (4nr x £402.50)		No further action needed		Noted		1,610.00
		Installation of Sanitaryware		No further action needed		Noted		6,040.00
17	Item 3.1 Please confirm work allowed for. Cost seems high	ISG confirm as Fixed Price				Noted		
18	4.13 and 4.14 Please provide details of the work allowed for softened water system	This is an error and shouldn't have been included in our tender.		No further action needed		Noted		
19	7.1 Please provide details of the work allowed for smoke ventilation fans	Allowance includes for replacing of roof attenuators and the new compressor in the absement. Existing containment is to be reused. No allowance has been made for the existing connecting sytem; as not part of the ERs		Discussion held. G+T confirmed that there is currently 85k allocated to this item within the ISG submison. ISG to confirm what this allowance includes for. In particular G+T require confirmation around the smoke ventilation (as within this system is the AOV's, vents and compressor)	Allowance includes for replacing of roof attenuators and the new compressor in the absement. Existing containment is to be reused. No allowance has been made for the existing connecting sytem; as not part of the ERs	Noted		
20	8.11 Please provide cost for UPS to IT room	This response conflicts with query number 31 on the post tender qualifications, where it is stated that the existing UPS is being retained. Please clarify what is required.		Existing UPS to remain		Noted		
21	10.4 Please advise the details of lift beneficial use (which lifts, durations, replacement of lift components after beneficial use, protections, etc)	Beneficial Use Prior to Beneficial use <ul style="list-style-type: none">• Client inspection of the lift on completion of installation & prior to commencement of beneficial use.• Protection of the lift car interior as far as is practicable.• A permanent, dedicated telephone line will need to be made available in order to facilitate use of the emergency communication system during beneficial use. – or GSM unit can be provided at additional cost of £495.00 During Beneficial Use Period <ul style="list-style-type: none">• Interim maintenance contract to cover servicing & callouts* Post Beneficial Use <ul style="list-style-type: none">• Others to strip out car protection or SLL if Fitted by them• Client inspection of the lift in order to determine any damages caused to the lift during beneficial use. Any repairs required will be subject to extra to contract charges.• Full clean down & service inspection.• Re-commissioning of the lift.		No further action needed		Noted		
22	11.2 Please provide cost for stripout of redundant fire hose reel	Additional cost for strip out of hose reel system is £3,500.		No further action needed		Noted		3,500.00
23	11.7 Please provide cost for fire curtains to atrium	Please confirm this is required as the RFI's during the tender states 'There is no requirement to replace fire curtains and shutters as part of the tender documentation.' We have based our tender on this response.		Agreed to include a Prov Sum for this item. G&T to send through a quote they received from from Coopers and basis of the quote will form the basis of the Prov Sum. ISG to review quote and confrim any issues etc.	Assume this response is superseded by line 81 where £11,087.88 has been added for fire curtains. Please confirm	Agreed		Noted
24	12.13 Please provide cost for WiFi	We can confirm this is included in our original tender.		No further action needed		Noted		
25	Pricing Schedule Rev B, item A3.2 on line 51 of the Preliminaries sheet. Can ISG confirm that the maintenance they refer to is routine PPM, which I would not expect to form part of the defects liability period, and not Reactive works i.e. plant/component failure which would normally be considered a defect within the 12month period.					Confirmed		Noted
	General							
25	3 Nr Tender Addendum were issued. Please sign and return acknowledgment cover sheet for Addendum #3	Please find attached signed acknowledgement for Addendum 3.				Noted		

#	CLIENT TEAM QUERY	RESPONSE FROM CONTRACTOR	RESPONSE FROM CLIENT TEAM	Comments from Conf Call dated 9 April 2020	FURTHER RESPONSE FROM ISG	FURTHER RESPONSE FROM CLIENT TEAM	FURTHER RESPONSE FROM ISG	Add/Omit	FURTHER RESPONSE FROM CLIENT TEAM
26	Design fees seem low. Please confirm resource allocation and ability to take design on from Stage 3, through to Stage 5	<p>Our fees include for the completion of the design and services scheduled, brief scope below.</p> <p>We have included for creating new drawings and re-draw/re-badge of Bissett drawings. Included to lead early design meetings with client to gain all sign-offs. Presenting samples for sign off. All roof drawings/design are by the specialist contractor with involvement for some remedial works/abutments associated with new roof work). We have made an allowance for client design meetings. Sub-contractor meetings/ site inspections and site sketches/advice.</p> <p>Our Project team would provide support and work on construction drawings once the design is signed-off along with our internal design management.</p> <p>Our MEPH subcontractors have included for the design requirements within their price and are fully capable of providing this service.</p>			Following further discussion and review with Fee providers, an additional 10k sum has been included to ensure all design work and PD fees are covered	Noted		10,000.00	
27	OHP and Risk Levels. Please confirm you have sufficient risk levels to take on the project and deliver successfully whilst maintaining a margin of profit	Within our tender submission we have considered the risk levels based on the tender information and the conditions of the contract and have allowed sufficient levels of risk accordingly. Our OHP is as highlighted and within the framework range.		No further action needed		Noted			
28	No Schedule of MEP rates has been provided. Please issue	All supply chain submissions have requested SOR, these will be forwarded upon receipt.		Discussion held and DMH confirmed that this is being followed up on but that it is likely this will not be received until the releavant SC has been confirmed. G+T require this and currently it is showing as non compliant.	SOR's expected to be received this week and will forward on	Noted and we await receipt	Please see attached QSoR's		Noted
29	Please confirm you have allowed programme and cost for the asbestos as advised in the report and any remediation works	We have allowed for an asbestos survey to be carried out on the areas not accessible in the report issued. The areas identified in the report have been included (3 gaskets as non-notifiable items), however any remediation works and the effects of these works as a result of the survey will be treated as a variation. We suggest an 'undefined' prov sum should be included for these works.		No further action needed		Noted			
30	Who is responsible for the MEPH design as no consultant is shown in organogram or costs	The MEPH subcontractor is a full d&b subcontract agreement.		No further action needed		Noted			
31	Please confirm who is overseeing the co-ordination between MEPH and Architectural. Are you comfortable you have enough resource to manage this?	We have included within the management structure for a TSM to manage this coordination. This role is in addition to the general project management role who has overall responsibility for all coordination.		No further action needed		Noted			
32	Organogram doesn't show utilisation of staff. Site based assumed 100%. Please confirm assumption and provide utilisation for visiting staff	Site based staff assumption is correct at 100% non site based staff utilisation is not based on a pure % across the project, but is allocated proportionally in relation to the management required throughout the various stages of the project. We can confirm that the structure and allocations are at the required levels in order to deliver the project works.		No further action needed		Noted			
33	Can you give examples of where a local supply chain has been utilised in your offer	With 96% of our selected supply chain members being located within 15 miles of the EFDC Civic Buildings we have specifically procured with the local spend as a major priority. This 96% is further broken down into 10% within 5 miles, 45% within 10 miles and 41% within 15 miles.		No further action needed		Noted			
34	It would be good to understand who ISG's proposed MEP sub- contractors are likely to be, or if these are intended to be one single company. In addition, would the MEP sub contractor undertake their own design / drawings, or would this be sub-contracted to a specialist design consultant.	As part of our submission we have a comprehensive set of MEPH submissions from the Supply Chain. Whilst we haven't determined the final allocation it is likely to be a separate Mechanical and Electrical procurement but importantly we have tendered this package with SC members who have worked together on a repeat basis and therefore are confident of whichever final choice is made it will be a very collaborative one. All SC members have a mix of internal design capabilities and external consultant usage		DMH confirmed that the SC are still in competition which was recognised by G+T. DMH confirmed the likely SC to be awarded as Farr (Mech) and AVA (elec).		Noted			
35	Have you considered the required electrical pre-start enabling works?	Yes, each of our SC Member submissions are required to include a detailed approach to the logistics and scope of works. This information is reviewed and integrated into our Main Contract approach to the delivery to ensure a 'One Team' approach to the project works.		No further action needed		Noted			

ISG								
#	CLIENT TEAM QUERY	RESPONSE FROM CONTRACTOR	RESPONSE FROM CLIENT TEAM	Comments from Conf Call dated 9 April 2020	FURTHER RESPONSE FROM ISG	FURTHER RESPONSE FROM CLIENT TEAM	FURTHER RESPONSE FROM ISG	Add/Omit
36	I note there is no cost in the Tender break-down for employing the services of a structural engineer to check and verify structural implications of the proposed works is this required?	This Item relates to a previous clarification re the Rooflight structural reliance. As noted within the response to that clarification, currently we have not allowed any fees for a full structural review of the integrity of the existing structure in relation to the proposed works. We noted that specific areas such as the Rooflight housings and the Sliding folding wall areas should be reviewed. If this is required to be undertaken by ISG we would require to include a fee for this service.		Agreed that ISG will provide a fee for the Structural Engineer fees for providing a survey and calculations for the Rooflight areas and the sliding folding wall areas. ISG confirmed that the risk for any resultant issues with the existing structure remains with the Employer which was agreed.	Please add £7,500 for the Structural Fees.	Noted		7,500.00
37	Please clarify how the design/specification of the MEP element is to be coordinated.	The Subcontract will be a full D&B responsibility, with either the M or the E being appointed as Lead MEPH designer. Importantly ISG TSM and management will be responsible for ensuring the design and coordination process is undertaken in line with the ISG management processes and essentially the required upstream approvals / TQ responses.		No further action needed		Noted		
38	Please clarify how the listed elements in our building will be protected during refurbishment.	It is our intention to undertake a full survey (including photographic dilapidation survey) of all 'listed / important items'. From this it will be agreed with EFDC whether items should be removed from the site work face / protected. From that the correct level of protection for each item will be decided, installed and maintained.		No further action needed		Noted		
39	Epping would prefer for some key roles e.g. the on site Project Manager and the Designer Manager to have recent experience with listed buildings, protection of listed elements and understanding of the planning and heritage constraints. Can you confirm the proposed team have this experience.	The team have been selected on their experience of this type of project. In addition to the experiences included within the Technical Submission a pack of case studies etc will be provided. Projects to be issued are Confidential Client - 40 Argyll Street L4- PC September 2018 - 25,000 sq ft Cat B fitout Confidential Client - 40 Argyll Street L2 - PC March 2020 - 15,000 sq ft Cat B fitout Department of International Development - Cat B fitout		Case study pack required	The team have been selected on their experience of this type of project. In addition to the experiences included within the Technical Submission a pack of case studies etc will be provided. Projects to be issued are Confidential Client - 40 Argyll Street L4- PC September 2018 - 25,000 sq ft Cat B fitout Confidential Client - 40 Argyll Street L2 - PC March 2020 - 15,000 sq ft Cat B fitout Department of International Development - Cat B fitout	Noted and we await receipt	Case Study Pack attached	Noted
40	What is the preferred method of resourcing and operating on site from page 20 due to Covid-19? We will need to discuss this in more detail as we have limitations on onsite working hours set by Planning.	It would be the intention to discuss as a team the most effective route for this project. It is difficult to decide the best route until you have that collaborative discussion with all parties and specifically the SC Member MD's. Extended working hours mon - fri are an effective method as it is important for the delivery team to have the correct downtime and work/life balance etc		To be discussed at Con Call with Client on Thursday		Noted		
41	Please provide detail how you manage business continuity risks in a live environment especially around power and data / IT infrastructure.	To be discussed at Con Call with Client on Thursday		To be discussed at Con Call with Client on Thursday		Noted		
42	What external car park area will be taken up by the contractor for operative parking, deliveries/delivery vehicle routes, waste storage or additional compound (especially as the site entrance and material entrance into the building both discharge into the car park area as shown on page 50 and 51)? Nothing marked on a plan. This is also relevant to staff working in homefield house. Confirm if only the basement car park will be used and if these spaces are enough.	It is the intention to utilise the half of the car park as originally advised, to herras fence or as required segregate this area with the correct directional and safety signage for the EFDC staff. This are will be used for off loading and materials removal etc, with the basement are being the office and welfare spaces.		No further action needed		Noted		
43	No traffic management and logistics plan in Appendix 6 and no fire plan in Appendix 7 of the construction phase plan. Can these be provided	To be completed in collaboration with client's new strategy during the precommencement period.		To be completed in collaboration with client's new strategy during the precommencement period.		Noted		
44	Please clarify how you will provide maintenance access for EFDC personnel to identified service rooms in the basement and ground floors.	We operate a weekly look ahead process where we will meet with the relevant stakeholders and understand what works / access is required by each party for that week. In addition to this access as required can be accommodated through the liaison on site between the EFDC staff and our Site point of contact.		No further action needed		Noted		
45	P48 shows the basement may be used for some staff parking for as long as possible. Will there be temporary services kept live in this area to permit safe use?	Yes		No further action needed		Noted		
46	How can the GF, 1F and 2F staff kitchens in the "link" areas be constructed ahead of occupation of the main building, when the corridor routes in that "link" need to be maintained as fire exits from the conder building and the GF needs to continue as a temporary reception? (the programme shows link kitchens completion date of 06/10/20 but the main building as not complete until 17/11/20)	This was revised to be compliant in the Rev 1 programme			This was revised to be compliant in the Rev 1 programme	Rev 2 programme provided. Assume this is the programme you refer to?	Agreed	Noted
47	How will the first floor of 323 house be accessed by operatives? (the GF access is shown as via the old front door).	The only access to the 1st floor of 323 House is via the link bridge, see attached drawing. Accesses to the ground floors is via the existing front door. Within the logistics plan full access/egress strategie will be included and updated through out the project.		The only access to the 1st floor of 323 House is via the link bridge, see attached drawing. Accesses to the ground floors is via the existing front door. Within the logistics plan full access/egress strategie will be included and updated through out the project.	The only access to the 1st floor of 323 House is via the link bridge, see attached drawing. Accesses to the ground floors is via the existing front door. Within the logistics plan full access/egress strategie will be included and updated through out the project.	Noted		
48	Link staircase - no mention of management of any contractor movements on the link staircase as this forms part of the fire escape strategy for EFDC staff remaining in the Conder building.	Minor works are required to the Link Staircase. Re-decoration, clean Terrazzo floor, replace 1no radiator, Smoke detectors. These have been phased with Section 3. These works are to be carried out OOH.			Minor works are required to the Link Staircase. Re-decoration, clean Terrazzo floor, replace 1no radiator, Smoke detectors. These have been phased with Section 3. These works are to be carried out OOH.	Noted		
49	Page 77 works by others, Items 7 and 11 by Contractor. Please confirm cost	We have included the costs for these items.		We have included the costs for these items.		Noted		
50	ISG document refers to a site activity planner & a "delivery booking system" - Please confirm who populates & manages these.	ISG Site management team manage this system with each potential delivering partner having access to the system to 'log' their deliveries. From this the site activity planner is constructed so as daily and weekly deliveries are managed		No further action needed		Noted		

ISG								
#	CLIENT TEAM QUERY	RESPONSE FROM CONTRACTOR	RESPONSE FROM CLIENT TEAM	Comments from Conf Call dated 9 April 2020	FURTHER RESPONSE FROM ISG	FURTHER RESPONSE FROM CLIENT TEAM	FURTHER RESPONSE FROM ISG	Add/Omit
51	Page 109 refers to practical completion & preparation of both the O&Ms & HSF. Please will ISG acknowledge the requirements for O&M Manuals / HSF in the PCI document section 7 and appendix 4. Appendix 4 sets out the requirement for an O&M Manual tracker & format for each manual & confirm that their costs allow for compliance with the descriptions in the PCI?	Confirmed		No further action needed		Cost for O&Ms £350, which seems light for the work involved. Can you confirm your proposed arrangements in terms of who is undertaking the work and there is sufficient time in the programme to allow for the production of good quality O&Ms and HSF	Our Document Controllers collate and manage the O & M's and the resource has taken this into consideration. The £350 is for printing and stationary required for formatting	Noted
52	Accident Incident Rate included on page 137. Please will ISG provide further information about the 4 major incidents in Apr 18 - Mar 19 (type, region , any lessons learnt, etc.)?	Please refer to the separate attachment.		Please refer to the separate attachment.		Noted		
53	No reference to HSE interventions have been found in either the Technical or Commercial submissions. Please can ISG provide a statement - even if it is to confirm that they have had no HSE interventions in the past 3 years?	ISG have not been issued any Improvement or Prohibition Notices within the last 3 years.			ISG have not been issued any Improvement or Prohibition Notices within the last 3 years.	Noted		
54	As per the tender documentation, ISG are required to hold their offer open for a period of 120 days. Please confirm you have read this clause in the prelims and in the ITT and are happy to accept this					Noted		
	Description	ISG Tender	G&T PTE	Comments				
	1.0 Sanitaryware	Only allowed to new WCs	Includes replacement of existing	ISG asked to price replacement of existing – ALREADY COMPLETE		Included above. Noted		
	7.1 Fire smoke duty / standby extract fans 7.5 and 7.15 Automatic opening Vent (AOVs) / Refurbish smoke control vents to Atrium (pneumatic automatic smoke vent)	£85,206.95	Includes for AOVs and replacement of compressor / accumulator	Query with ISG what has been priced. BWB spec states 'The mechanical contractor shall employ a smoke ventilation specialist to fully design install and provide all necessary equipment and wiring to the replacement smoke vents at the head of the atrium. This will typically include the replacement of the pneumatic compressor and accumulator, along with all controls. The installation shall be in full coordination with the new roof-light replacement works.'	Answered above in item 19	Noted		
	7.16 Lift shaft ventilation (provision)	Excluded	Included	BWB spec says as per lift manufacturer's spec / ISG to price confirm this has been allowed for in lift costs	No allowance made for lift shaft ventilation as not included within ER specification, if this is required suggest a provisional sum.	Suggest prov sum of £2,000.00	Please allow £2000 prov sum as advised.	2,000.00 Noted
	11.2 Removal and strip-out of redundant fire hose reel	Excluded	Included	ISG to price - £3,500 uplift priced		Duplicate of item 22 (line 41) above. £3,500 to be added for removal of redudant hose reel.	Cost for this included in item 22.	Noted
	11.7 Fire curtains	Excluded	Priced in Architectural	Please Add £11,087.88 for the Coopers Quote, including extra over cost options and allowances for builderswork associated with the removal of existing and installation of new.		Also referred to above, item 23 (line 42). £11,087.88 to be added for fire curtains to Atrium	Agreed	11,087.88 Noted
	12.13 WLAN / Wifi	Excluded	Included	ISG to price via updated copy of Worm Purple quote USED WORM PURPLES REV A BID IN ORIGINAL SUBMISSION		Noted		
	12.26 Lift redcare	Excluded	Included	ISG to price	Currently the Lift costs include for the preparation for contacts, the system is by others	Contradicts Qualifications where Redcare is priced?	Please accept our apologies, this can be removed and refer to Qualifications.	Noted
	13.17 Roof light compressor replacement	Excluded	Included in ventilation costs 7.15	Confirmed included.		Noted		
	16.8 Existing services diversion	Excluded	Included	Please allow a provisional sum of £15,000.		Noted		15,000.00
	16.11 Building mounted external lighting (retain existing but includes cleaning, relamping with LED and reinstated)	Excluded	Included	Please allow a provisional sum of £3,000.		Suggest £5,000.00	Please allow £5000 prov sum as advised.	5,000.00 Noted
	16.12 Column mounted external lighting (retain existing but includes cleaning, relamping with LED and reinstated)	Excluded	Included	Please allow a provisional sum of £5,000.		Suggest £10,000.00	Please allow £10000 prov sum as advised.	10,000.00 Noted

#	QUALIFICATION WITHIN TENDER RETURN	RESPONSE FROM CLIENT TEAM	RESPONSE FROM CONTRACTOR	RESPONSE FROM CLIENT TEAM	RESPONSE FROM CONTRACTOR	Add/Omit	RESPONSE FROM CLIENT TEAM	RESPONSE FROM CONTRACTOR
	<i>Carried forward</i>					117,671.69		
	<i>General</i>							
1	We have made no allowance for any cost and programme implications resulting from the UK's planned withdrawal from the European Union. Our tender may be subject to supplemental agreement and cost changes. This includes, but is not limited to any taxes, duties, protective tariffs and other charges and restrictions imposed on non-UK companies, goods and personnel.	Contractual comments sit with EFDC currently. To be discussed during conference call 16/3	Noted				Epping confirmed feedback from legal advice expected week commencing 20th April 2020	Noted
2	Whilst our tender makes no specific allowances for the effects/or implications of the ongoing public health issue, Covid-19 or Coronavirus, we have recognised within our technical submission that this is an ongoing situation that may affect the productivity of the project programme and it is on this basis that we suggest a collaborative discussion is required to be held and that it is likely that a sum of monies should be included as part of the Project Risk Register and held by the Employer to be utilised and instructed as required in order that additional measures can be introduced throughout the project. We would suggest this process is managed under the Change Control process within the main contract.	Contractual comments sit with EFDC currently. To be discussed during conference call 16/3	Noted				Epping confirmed feedback from legal advice expected week commencing 20th April 2020	Noted
3	We have made no allowance for Electrical and water consumption charges and assumed these are by the client	This is deemed compliant, however please note the following from the prelims; Water use on site is to be monitored by the Contractor via water metering. The Site Manager is to keep records and review water consumption figures regularly; including at possession and completion. Costs to be contra-charged to the Contractor if usage is deemed by the Employer to be excessive. Please confirm you agree	Understanding of 'excessive' is required. Our bid does not include for any costs.	Noted. Contractor to monitor water and should use best endeavours to ensure water consumption is reasonable. No taps / hoses left running etc.	Agreed and confirmed		Noted	
4	We have assumed that listed building consent and approval will be obtained by others.	Listed Building consent application is by EFDC. Responsibility for discharging requirements such as the sign off of finishes is by the Contractor. Information for all conditions needs to be provided by the contractor and submitted to EFDC for discharge. Please confirm you understand and agree	Confirmed that contractor is required to issue information to enable discharge however responsibility for sign off remains with EFDC.	Responsibility for discharging Listed Building Consent application is Contractor's responsibility and they should manage and co-ordinate the process. This risk should be considered within your costs. Please confirm and advise any uplift	Revised Fees being sought, and confirmation to follow.	5,000.00	Please confirm and close out ASAP. It is our opinion that the conditions are not onerous, and largely involve getting sign off of finishes	Noted, have included an additional fee for these works
	<i>Architectural</i>							
1	We have made no allowance for spare finishes.	Just a note, the Client has confirmed they wish to have 5 boxes of 20 tiles for maintenance / patch repairs.	Please add £250 for a box of spare tiles.	Client wants 5 boxes, so £1,250.00 to be added for spares	Uplift amended.	1,250.00	Noted	
2	For the SC-02 timber panelling finish, we have included a provisional sum to make good existing via French polishing only subject to site survey. No allowance has been made for new.	Any existing timber, whether that be the reception desk or panelling will require an allowance for repair and finish as required. A condition survey will determine the extent of this. This will be by a specialist subcontractor and appropriate to Listed Buildings	Refer to item 13 in Queries.					
3	We have included a provisional sum for the fire rated glazed sliding door pending receipt of a compliant quote.	Please provide firm price for the glazed sliding door	Refer to item 11 in Queries.					
4	We have assumed the structural calcs for the Rooflight and Sliding Folding Walls have been carried out and the building can carry these loads.	No survey has been done to the rooflights. Contractor to undertake necessary steps to ensure solution proposed is suitable. This was relayed at site visits and mid-tender and pinpointed as a critical path item. Tender Addendum #3 issued as built information on existing rooflights. Please allow for structural input to inform your design. Contractor will be responsible for delivering this element of work	Please allow fees of £4,750.00 for the appointment of a structural engineer to undertake a survey/calculations of existing structural integrity of the rooflight housing area.	£7,500.00 added for structural fees under #36 of queries. Confirm this supersedes the £4,750 and is not £4,750.00 + £7,500.00	Please remove £4,750 as this appears to be a duplication to item 36 of Queries.		Noted	
5	We have assumed the existing raised floor can be reused in its entirety and have not included for any replacement pedestals or tiles.	Noted						
6	We have not made any allowance for acoustic barriers to the floor void, should these be required, this would be at an additional cost.	Noted						
7	Should underlay and adhesive need removing following strip out of the existing floor finishes, this would be an extra over cost of £7/m2	Pricing document refers stripout to allow for underlay and adhesive. Please confirm cost for all inclusive scope.	Please add 4604m2 x £7/m2 = £32,228.00	Noted		32,228.00		
8	Should the strip out need to be carried out outside normal working hours, this would be an additional cost of £44,282.44.	Prelims provide working hours as set by Listed Building consent. Contractor to allow sufficient time in programme for stripout. Please confirm	We can carry out all strip out works during normal working hours 8am-6pm Monday - Friday and 8am-1pm Saturday.	Noted				
9	The specification for the partitions is based on; 70 C Stud including 25mm insulation, 1 x 12.5mm Plasterboard each side, tape and Joint both sides. Allowed average 3m height as floor heights vary	Partitions should be as specified: Gypframe 48 S 50 'C' stud 2 Layers of 12.5mm Gyproc Soundbloc on both sides 25mm Isover Acoustic Partition Roll (APR 1200). Please confirm rate for compliant partitions	Please add £7,617.60 to allow for this specification for the drywall.			7,617.60		
10	Making good existing walls is based on a provisional quantity subject to survey following the strip out. The rate included is for minor repairs only ie filling holes and minor spot replacements.	Noted						
11	The specification for the suspended plasterboard ceiling is based on; MF, 1 x 12.5mm Plasterboard, tape and joint. Access panels by Profab 600 x 600	New plasterboard ceiling is to match existing in accordance with listed building consent.	Noted.	Noted				
12	The extra over for 6mm ply substrate to vinyl floor finishes is £17/m2. This is not included within the tender.	Noted						
13	The extra over for 12mm ply substrate to timber floor finishes is £25/m2. This is not included within the tender.	Noted						
14	The extra over for waterproofing to the wall tiling is listed below. This is not included within the tender.	This is deemed compliant. Waterproofing is not required	Should waterproofing be required, please refer to the provided schedule of items and costs.	Noted				
15	We have not included for decorations to the existing radiators, pipework, window cills etc.	Please provide cost uplift for these works	Window cills are french polished therefore we believe no paint finish is required. The radiators are all being replaced for new, please confirm that paint is required. We would like to add a further £1,750 to allow for painting all visible new/existing pipework.	Noted		1,750.00		
16	The atrium cannot be cleaned using a nebulous spray as described on the drawing. As the location is internal, water discharge is not containable. We have therefore allowed for a mixture of steam and hand clean to the areas, using a mild alkaline detergent.	Providing the area is protected there should be no issue with the Nebulous approach. The approach you suggest does not sound appropriate for a listed building and we would therefore want to see verification by a specialist that this will not damage the fabric of the building at all. It is likely that this will also need to be approved by the conservation officer.	Noted. We have investigated this system and based on the requirement to protect the listed joinery elements within this area, still consider the Nebulous system not advisable. We are happy to bring our specialist to a quality workshop to discuss a way forward that meets your requirements.	ISG need to ensure they are using a cleaning system appropriate for the listed building. In my experience there are generally 2 options for listed buildings; Nebulous or Steam cleaning as these are both non evasive. We will review if there are any other appropriate methods but suggest one of these are cited for the moment. We propose that a workshop / demonstration is provided to show the proposed solution is suitable. Should this not be the case, ISG are responsible for providing the nebulous approach as per the ERs	Noted and agreed, re workshop. If the nebulous system is required then a revised cost will be provided. Suggest a small Prov sum for this in the interim? Say 5k	5,000.00	Noted and agreed	

#	QUALIFICATION WITHIN TENDER RETURN	RESPONSE FROM CLIENT TEAM	RESPONSE FROM CONTRACTOR	RESPONSE FROM CLIENT TEAM	RESPONSE FROM CONTRACTOR	Add/Omit	RESPONSE FROM CLIENT TEAM	RESPONSE FROM CONTRACTOR
17	The two external terraces can be cleaned using a high-pressure jet. A nebulous spray as described on the drawings is not appropriate on these areas and will be disproportionate cost as requiring then a hand scrub.	We would need to see confirmation that this would not damage the existing building fabric.	Noted. We have investigated this system and based on the requirement to protect the listed joinery elements within this area, still consider the Nebulous system not advisable. We are happy to bring our specialist to a quality workshop to discuss a way forward that meets your requirements.	ISG need to ensure they are using a cleaning system appropriate for the listed building. In my experience there are generally 2 options for listed buildings; Nebulous or Steam cleaning as these are both non evasive. We will review if there are any other appropriate methods but suggest one of these are cited for the moment. We propose that a workshop / demonstration is provided to show the proposed solution is suitable. Should this not be the case, ISG are responsible for providing the nebulous approach as per the ERs	Noted and agreed, re workshop. If the nebulous system is required then a revised cost will be provided. Suggest a small Prov sum for this in the interim? Say 5k	0.00	Noted and agreed. Prov sum included in above item	
18	Allowed for new sanitaryware to new WC's only on the Ground and Second floor. Should any new sanitary fittings be required to existing WC's these would be at an additional cost.	Please provide uplift for new sanitaryware to existing WCs	Refer to item 16 in Queries.	Noted				
	<i>Mechanical and Electrical</i>							
1	We have made no allowance for any BIM Modelling.	This is not required and thus compliant	Noted.	Noted				
2	We have allowed all cabling to lighting and power to be in Twin & Earth cable	This is deemed compliant	Noted.	Noted				
3	No fire rate cable allowed other than the fire alarm system.	Noted, although LSF cable specification (as specified) to be utilised. Please confirm you have allowed for the specified cable	Confirmed included.	Noted				
4	No containment allowed below raised floor, assumed we will clip direct to the slab.	Existing below floor trunking and basket to be utilised	Noted. No additional costs.	Noted				
5	All containment in the walls to be in PVC.	Wall recessed PVC conduit acceptable.	Noted.	Noted				
6	No under desk or desk top modules allowed, assume furniture installer will supply and install and will PAT test these upon completion.	This is deemed compliant	Noted.	Noted				
7	Lighting control system is not interfaced to BMS or static inverter.	Interface with the Trend not specifically required, but remote access control and monitoring as specified required. Please confirm you have	We can confirm we have allowed for this.	Noted				
8	Luminaires B or B2 were not in the luminaire schedule, so prices have been based upon B1 only.	B2 is a 950mm diameter variation of the B1 and is likely to be more expensive. Please confirm you are happy to hold rate or confirm new rate	We can confirm we are happy to hold previous rate.	Noted				
9	Our costs for luminaires N1, N2 and N3 are provisional as Dextra missed these off their quotation.	Please provide firm rate	Dextra have updated their quotation for the project and the additional uplift would be £34,864.61.	Noted		34,864.61		
10	Audio/Visual & TV assumed by others.	ISG should include allowance for containment, power supply and data. ISG tender allows £4.9K, ISG to advise the extent of allowance (ie which rooms)?	Our allowance of £4,900.00 includes for power and containment associated with the Audio Visual installation as per drawings.	Noted				
11	We have not allowed for any floor mounted lamps.	This is deemed compliant	Noted.					
12	We have not allowed for any electronic sound masking.	Noted	Noted.					
13	We have not allowed for any downtime accumulated by Asbestos findings.	Please confirm you have allowed programme and cost for the asbestos	Refer to item 29 in Queries.	Noted				
14	There are no sprinkler works detailed in the spec or drawings, therefore we have excluded any works.	This is deemed compliant	Noted.					
15	We have not allowed for any utility services or diversions.	Have you priced for the utility works as shown in drwg BWD-00-XX-DR-	No works required. Existing Utility services are being retained.	Noted				
16	Whilst we have allowed for validations, we can take no responsibility for any existing systems which are to be reutilised, any defects discovered will be reported and costed where necessary.	Noted	Noted.					
17	We have based our offer on the basis that retained plant and equipment and shell and core infrastructure has the capacity to deliver the performance criteria within the specification and drawings.	Noted	Noted.					
18	We have not allowed for any upgrade for any of the existing services in our offer.	Please clarify which services you refer to?	We have assumed all existing services that are to be utilised in the new scheme are in good working order and are sized sufficiently to accommodate the new works. No allowance made to upgrade existing plant etc.	Noted				
19	No allowances have been made to employ an acoustician to review services in noise sensitive areas.	Noted, however noise levels as specified in the Performance Specification shall not be exceeded. Please confirm your acceptance	We can confirm we will accept this.					
20	We have made no allowances to supply or install any external acoustic plant enclosures.	As above, the Contractor is responsible for meeting the noise levels as specified in the performance spec. Please confirm your acceptance	We confirm our acceptance.					
21	On the mechanical package, we had no response from any named suppliers, so we have used our trusted supply chain.	Please confirm in writing what alternatives you refer to, as many of the specified equipment and suppliers has been agreed with the client.	We have included for all named suppliers in the MEP specification. This clarification relates to where we have deviated from the named subcontractors for Fire Alarm and Security etc.	Noted. See other responses				
22	We have not allowed any special finishes.	Noted	Noted.					
23	No allowances have been made to carry out any Mechanical fire safety works as there was not enough information. This element shall be developed during the design period.	ISG to advise and allow for a provisional allowance?	We assume this is relating to gas suppression to the comms room? If this is the case please allow a provisional sum of £25,000.00 to cover this. All sprinkler works are currently excluded.	BWB advise that existing comms room gas suppression systems are to be retained as existing	If this is the case please remove the £25,000 prov sum allowance for this.		Noted	
	Security / Access Control / CCTV							
24	The named CCTV specialist RVTV have refused to price so we have used our own trusted supply chain.	This will need to be reviewed as RVTV are the client nominated specialist and have access to the council and police dept' rules and standards that were not issued as part of the Tender.	Noted. We await your response.	RVTV are to be the sub-contractor for this element of work. EFDC are liaising with RVTV to progress detailed design to be complete by the end of May. A budget cost for RVTV is to be provided. This will be a defined prov sum CCTV remains in the scope of works and ISG are expected to manage and co-ordinate the works. Please confirm acceptance	Based on received quote from G+T received via email from A. Muir dated 16.04.20 for RVTV Security	9,640.00	Please note that RVTV quote excludes containment. RVTV expect costs to reduce upon finalised design. Suggest £25,000 prov sum to cover excluded items	Daryl Hardy email 21'4'20 confirms omission of existing cost of CCTV at £15,360

#	QUALIFICATION WITHIN TENDER RETURN	RESPONSE FROM CLIENT TEAM	RESPONSE FROM CONTRACTOR	RESPONSE FROM CLIENT TEAM	RESPONSE FROM CONTRACTOR	Add/Omit	RESPONSE FROM CLIENT TEAM	RESPONSE FROM CONTRACTOR
25	We have not allowed for any monitoring.	Please clarify	Previously not included see below costs for monitoring. BT Redcare secure GPRS Grade 2 Supply, Installation & Connection Charge: £240. Monitoring Charge (Domestic Premises): £280 per annum Monitoring Charge (Commercial Premises): £310 per annum BT Redcare secure GPRS Grade 3 Supply, Installation & Connection Charge: £240. Monitoring Charge (Domestic Premises): £320 per annum Monitoring Charge (Commercial Premises): £370 per annum Police Unique Reference Number (URN Application Fee) Intruder Alarm Police Response Cost: £43.49 Panic Alarm Police Response Cost: £43.49	Cost for Domestic and Commerical monitoring included. Presumably only latter is required and either Grade 2 or Grade 3? Inconsistent with respons to item 29 below	Commercial Monitoring Grade 3 cost is £696.98 Police Unique Reference Number (URN Application Fee) Intruder Alarm Police Response Cost: £43.49 Panic Alarm Police Response Cost: £43.49 TOTAL REVISED COST = £783.96	783.96	Noted	
26	We have used our own trusted supply chain for the intruder/access control system. The uplift to use Mitie would be £45,000.00.	Which sub-contractor have you used? Mitie are specifically specified by the client as they look after the whole of Epping Council's estate - any alternative would need to work with Mitie and adpt their standards and work with the Mitie access control software - to be reviewed.	Noted. We await your response.	ISG can use another sub-contractor, instead of Mitie, for access/intruder control but they must be Grosvenor Technology Ltd approved. We use Grosvenor's "Sateon" system at the civic offices and oakwood hill depot. They only allow approved partners to install their system. Please confirm your proposed sub-contractor is an approved installer	We can confirm WLS are an approved Grosvenor Sateon systems installer. Uplift removed.			
	Fire Alarm							
27	Audibility Tests - Until the building is completed and includes the furnishings and internal decoration, the acoustic properties of each room will be unknow. It is for this reason that we reserve the right to submit additional costs for any additional devices required, therefore, on completion audibility level tests will be conducted. Results of these tests recorded and any non-compliant sound pressure levels reported.	This is not compliant and should be covered as part of the costs. Please confirm cost	We cannot provide costs until the layout of each room is provided or audible tests are completed.	Please assume each room requires its own sounder to achieve dB levels for fire alarm	Based in this assumption we can confirm no additional costs for this.		Noted	
28	No Void detection has been allowed for as none shown on drawings.	Please confirm that the main roof void has been covered / allowed.	This has not been allowed for as nothing was shown on the layout drawings. Please provide details.	Please refer to Tender drawing EDC-BWB-00-RF-DR-E-2004 as a basis of requirements	There is nothing shown for void detection. We suggest 30no. Detectors to cover the area at a cost of £5850	5,850.00	Confirmed sufficient by BWB on 21'4'20	
29	We have not allowed for any monitoring.	The ability for off site monitoring (Redcare or similar) shall be provided. Please provide cost	Redcare: Supply, Installation & Connection Charge: £445 Monitoring charge: £395 per annum	Item 25 also provides different costs. Confirm £840 to be added to tender to allow for Redcare	We can confirm £840 is the correct cost for this.	840.00	Noted	
30	We have used our own trusted supply chain for the Fire Alarm System. The uplift to use Mitie would be £55,000.00.	Which sub-contractor have you used?	We have utilised WLS Ltd for the Fire alarm works.	It is acceptable to use an alternative fire alarm sub-contractor	Noted, Uplift removed.		Noted	
31	Data Installation Worm Purple the incumbent specialist have excluded the following works from their tender – a. Strip out works b. Enabling works c. Incoming Services d. CW1308 Voice link cables e. Patching or jumpering of voice circuits f. PABX equipment, telephone handsets, servers and PCs g. Active switching h. UPS units i. Wireless Access Devices	31A – ISG should allow for strip out cost for redundant IT cabling. ISG to withdraw this clarification or advise a cost uplift. 31H - Existing UPS to be retained. 31I - Worm Purple quotation we have on file includes for Wifi AP's - please request a copy of their current quotation and confirm cost.	31A - We can confirm this is included elsewhere. 31H - Noted 31I - This is an error, we can confirm Wifi Ap's are included.	Noted				
	Programme							
1	Six weeks for completion of Stage 4 Design activities. IS that sufficient, especially given procurement activities overlap from Day-1? How will the placing of early orders and completion of design be managed/ coordinated?		The six weeks design completion period is sufficient in our view based on our review of the competition works required. The procurement strategy is based on a progressive delivery and indeed early engagement of the key supply chain and early validation of existing design and services.	Noted				
2	Can we have a clear, concise date for each trade package #'s 17-33 for when a design is frozen and order is placed. Currently unclear. Especially important to know for key procurement items.		This is shown in the Pre Construction programme that was included in the tender submission. The dates are also included in the attached document - EFDC Schedule of design & approval dates	Noted				
3	#36 states 'works completed by others' and shows elements that are not stated in prelims as by 'client/ others', what activities does this cover?		The decant scope has been attached that is mentioned in the clarifications. On the programme I have included a milestone as this is clearly a client activity to be undertaken prior to possession of site. The list is as per the attached document. The only reason I can see confusion is because they are looking at the Strategic programme which shows the detail rolled up, the next items on the Strategic Programme are our activities also rolled up.	Noted				
4	Q4 - #36 states 'works completed by others' and shows elements that are not stated in prelims as by 'client/ others', so what does this mean and is this non-compliant.		Refer to item 3 above	Noted				
5	Section 3 is shown as commencing earlier than Section 2 completing? IS this possible? My interpretation was that scope of Section 3 remained live, operational space until the new fit-out had completed in full?		See revised programme rev 1 attached which shows Section 3 after Section 2 fit out. The PC date is not changed. There are examples of areas that have to remain live throughout like the Comms room etc, this has been allowed for with the provision of a temporary power supply etc. The only area that requires Public Access is the temp reception in the Ground Floor of Section 3. This starts after Section 2 completes so a provision could be allowed in the newly refurbished reception whilst we carry out the works in Section 3. The requirements are shown in the Pre-Construction Link and site plan attached to your email.	Rev 02 attached. Assume this is the correct programme?	Confirmed		Noted	
6	#39 eight weeks to install lifts is tight? Has this been discussed with Essex lifts, is this achievable?		The duration is acceptable this has been agreed with our preferred supplier.	Noted				

#	QUALIFICATION WITHIN TENDER RETURN	RESPONSE FROM CLIENT TEAM	RESPONSE FROM CONTRACTOR	RESPONSE FROM CLIENT TEAM	RESPONSE FROM CONTRACTOR	Add/Omit	RESPONSE FROM CLIENT TEAM	RESPONSE FROM CONTRACTOR
7	Section 2 has handed over before work to roof are shown to be completed, how will this work? Can this be clarified?		The roof Glazing, part of Section 2, runs 2 weeks past the completion of the fit out works in section 2. The roof dates have been coordinated with the Supply Chain so as to ensure they are compliant.	Noted				
8	No indication of timescales for design team validation and review of proposed design information? Can this be clarified, design team need two weeks from receipt, is this considered? Also dates for information release would be useful to see.		This is shown in the Pre Construction programme that was included in the tender submission. The dates are also included in the attached document - EFDC Schedule of design & approval dates	Noted				
9	If programme start date was pushed out, the entire programme would move out in accordance with the delayed start? Is this a correct assumption?		In its current form yes the programme would be required to be time shifted, however discussions are being held around what could be achieved in order to accommodate a later constrction start, these would include the development of the design / key package placement/ validations and surveys etc so as the programme can be de risked and achive a speedier delivery.	Noted				
10	Validation activities and surveys are overlapped with completion of Stage 4 design. Surely this doesn't work, as Stage 4 will need to consider the result of the surveys?		The pre commencement stage is designed to be progressive and in order to achieve early delivery surety the periods overlap, but importantly are considered in their approach. We have attached a separate schedule of these dates	Noted				
11	No asbestos removal considered in programme. This is non-compliant. An asbestos survey was included in the tender documents and cost and programme should consider the results		Refer to item 29 in Queries.	Noted				

	222,495.86
Original Tender	5,186,133.54
Revised Tender	5,408,629.40

GARDINER & THEOBALD LLP

Independent Construction and Property Consultancy
10 South Crescent, London, WC1E 7BD

gardiner.com