

Q&A RECEIVED:

Note – redaction has been undertaken to ensure commercial sensitivity

Q: The existing scope is too broad for us to submit a tender as it stands. It is not clear if you would accept a tender solely for output 1, part 3 to provide an access audit and recommendations for making the town more inclusive for all and for part of 5 stakeholder engagement where it relates to part 3?

A: In the original Request for Quotation (RFQ) on contract finder, the project was promulgated in its entirety and it was not anticipated to be broken into different sections. However, the final decision(s) regarding the RFQ fall to the council's Finance and General Purposes Committee and not officers, and I shall be forwarding your request/question to that group for their consideration. This committee does have the power to amend the tender process as they see fit.

Q: I am currently reviewing the documentation for the above tender as we are considering submitting a tender response. In reviewing the documentation, I have noted the following, on page 4 of the RFQ the table is provided with an indication of scoring for each of the quality questions.

However, on page 51 only sections B-E are listed and the following page returns to numbering of page 1 and has a question on safeguarding.

Could you please confirm the other questions F, G, H & I?

A: The F – Safeguarding, as identified on the page after, page 51, is highly unlikely to be part of the selection process but fulfils the council's commitment to promote the safeguarding of children and vulnerable adults. This particular tender document is based on a template which, unlike in the case of the Safer Greener Streets Project, could cover work in schools, libraries, leisure centres etc where there may be risk to children or vulnerable adults. We anticipate that organisations that submit bids are likely to record their safeguarding submission as 'not applicable'. This is why, as you say, it seems to be 'misplaced'

To clarify Criteria F, G H and I on page 4:

These sections are peculiar to this project and not therefore part of the usual tender document. In retrospect, it would have been prudent to have clarified this, especially regarding nomenclature. With regards to criteria highlighted on page 4 (F, G H and I) it will be helpful to the panel if submissions referred to these aspects of the project with similar word count to other sections.

Criterion F – Locality Context:

Launceston Town Council is keen to ensure that any recommendations and future developments are sympathetically suggested and introduced. The infrastructure of the town began towards the end of the Middle Ages and whilst the lives of Launceston's current residents are impacted by developments such as the climate emergency, out-of-town shopping and the internet, it is hoped that developments would not destroy historic and iconic infrastructure, as was so common in British post-war urban development. In some respects, this criterion (i.e., F on page 4), augments what is highlighted in Section E, Environmental Responsibility, on page 51.

Criterion G – Timescale:

This simply refers to an organisation's anticipated timeline of the work-flow to be undertaken.

Criterion H – Identified Milestones:

This refers to anticipated 'intra-project' outcomes linked to criterion G. With monthly calendar reporting, the milestones would help quantify progress towards final outcomes.

Criterion I – Identified Outcomes:

The outputs stated on pages 8 and 9 of the RFQ document are those agreed by Cornwall Council as the funding source. Criteria I, (on page 4) refers to an organisation's final submission statements and how they meet/interface with the stated outcomes on pages 8 and 9 of the document.

Just as Criterion F (on page 4) augments the statements relating to Section E on page 51, Criteria G, H and I, (also on page 4) undertake a similar function to Section D on page 51.