**EU First Level Controller for Sustainable and Resilient Coastal Cities (SARCC), PlastiCity & EMPOWER**

**Tender Specification**

1. **Introduction**

Southend on Sea Borough Council (SBC) is a dynamic and forward thinking Unitary Local Authority in South Essex, located in the Thames Gateway Growth Area, on the north side of the Thames Estuary, 40 miles east from Central London.

Sustainable Energy Investments are embedded in the corporate strategy through Southend Borough Council’s 2015-2020 Low Carbon Energy & Sustainability Strategy (LCESS), an annual Sustainability Report that publishes the Council’s yearly progress on energy reduction. Senior Management is also bound to report on the Council’s carbon emissions of qualifying buildings under the UK Government’s Carbon Reduction Commitment Scheme. In addition, a section in the Council’s annual Corporate Report is dedicated to highlighting energy and sustainability achievements.

To achieve its objectives, SBC is participating as a Partner and Lead Partner in a number of EU funded projects. In accordance with EU procurement regulations, SBC is required to procure a First Level Controller (FLC) through open competition to conduct an audit of all EU financial expenditure in accordance with specific EU funding programme rules.

1. **The work**

We are inviting bid submissions to provide FLC audit services for the below listed SBC EU funded project claims set out in Table 1. Audit requirements will vary between different projects and programmes and the number of project claims may vary from one year to the next. The successful bidder will need to verify that the expenditure incurred to implement the projects complied with the relevant EU, national, regional, institutional and programme rules as well as with the provisions of the subsidy contracts and the project application forms.

**Table 1**

|  |  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| **Project name** | **Fund** | **Programme** | **Project Start Date** | **Claim frequency** | **SBC project budget** |
| Sustainable and Resilient Coastal Cities (SARCC) | ERDF (60% funding) | Interreg 2 Seas Mers Zeeën | 25/01/2019 | 6 months | €1,193,340.15\* |
| PlastiCity | ERDF (60% funding) | Interreg 2 Seas Mers Zeeën | 01/01/2019 | 6 months | €1,239,544.50 |
| EMPOWER | ERDF (50% funding) | Interreg VB North Sea Region | 12/12/2018 | 6 months | €647.144 |

\* SBC is the Lead Partner for the SARCC project and there may be additional FLC checks required for the consolidated submission however each partner is responsible for appointing their own FLC for their individual claims.

1. **Additional information**

In order to assist in the preparation of a quote, we would make the following points:

* 1. SBC currently uses Unit4 Business World as its accounting software, which is used to generate reports for project claims.
	2. Claims are generally made on a six-monthly basis, within a prescribed deadline of approximately 4-6 weeks from the end of claim date.
	3. Each project has a Project Manager responsible for output and progress reporting requirements.

For more information on the projects, please visit the project websites:

SARCC – <https://www.interreg2seas.eu/en/sustainable-and-resilient-coastal-cities>

PlastCity – <https://www.interreg2seas.eu/en/PlastiCity>

EMPOWER - <https://northsearegion.eu/empower-20/output-library/>

1. **Contract dates**

The contract term will run from May 2019 to December 2022.

1. **Enquires and quotation submission**

Providers should note that all clarification questions must be made via e-mail only. The Council at their discretion reserves the right to circulate any response to all providers.

All clarification questions must be clearly marked CLARIFICATION with the question and provider details clearly set out. Any clarification questions from the provider to the Council should be sent to stephanieli@southend.gov.uk

To allow information to be circulated in time, the deadline for receiving clarification questions is 12:00 12th April 2019.

The quotation return deadline is at 10:00 on 23rd April 2019. Quotations should be submitted by email to stephanieli@southend.gov.uk (you are recommended to request confirmation of receipt).

1. **Evaluation of Quotations**

All quotations will be subject to a thorough evaluation. The Council will examine quotations for completeness and may seek clarification were necessary a quotation determined to be incomplete or not substantially fulfilling the conditions or requirements in this document will be rejected.

1. **Award Criteria**

The Council does not bind itself to accept the lowest priced quotation, or any quotation for this service. The Council will have no obligation to Providers arising from this quotation unless and until it enters into a formal contract with the successful Provider for the provision of the goods and/or services that are subject to this Quotation document. Any contract awarded will be to the Provider whose proposal is determined to be the most economically advantageous.

The evaluation criteria for this project is:

* Price 40%
* Previous experience and knowledge of EU financial control processes 40%
* Previous experience of working with local authorities 20%.

**(Please note: Bidders must have provided ‘acceptable’ responses to each of the Technical Questions to be considered for the contract).**

# 40% Price Allocation

To be detailed within this written quotation submission, by the Provider. The Quotation is accepted on a “Fixed Price” basis and the Provider will not be entitled to claim any additional payments or expenses including but not limited to any increase in the price of the service and / or cost of, or incidental to, the employment of labour. The prices included in the Quotation shall be the maximum payable by the Council for the duration of the contract.

If the Provider considers that there has been a material change in the undertaking of the Services, for which a variation should be issued; the Provider, before proceeding with any service affected by such an event, shall request immediately in writing that the Council issue a variation as specified in the Terms and Conditions.

Pricing Evaluation (40%) – Using the Prices submitted by Providers a percentage will be allocated to the total cost as follows:

Score = (Lowest Price Quotation / Your Price) \* 40%

* The Table below gives an example of how the methodology works when applied to contract prices. The prices used here are examples of the pricing methodology and do not reflect any expectation of this contract in relation to any aspect of the pricing.

|  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
|  | Bid A | Bid B | Bid C | Bid D |
| Price | £500 | £300 | £450 | £600 |
| Points Score | 9% | 15% | 10% | 7.5% |

The scores awarded in the example table to Bid B and Bid D calculated as follows:

* Bid B with the lowest price in relation to the other bids is awarded the score of 15 giving a calculation as follows: (£300 / £300) x 40% = 40.00%
* Bid D with the highest contract price in relation to the other bids is therefore the lowest scoring bid in the pricing section, awarded 20%. The applied methodology arrives at this score through a calculation as follows: (£300/ £600) x 40% = 20%.

# 60% Quality Allocation

60% Quality Evaluation Technical evaluations will be conducted based on the below.

To be detailed within this written quotation submission, by the Provider, in Section A (Technical Questionnaire). Your quote in response to this brief should consider and provide the following:

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
| **SECTION** | **SECTION WEIGHTING** |
| Please detail previous experience and knowledge of EU financial control processes | 40% |
| 1. Please detail previous experience of working with local authorities
 | 20% |

Evaluation of Responses will be carried out on an individual question basis. Each question will be scored out of 5. ***(Please note: scores of an ‘acceptable’ standard must be achieved on all technical questions in order for your submission to be considered further).***

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
| **SCORING MATRIX** | **SCORE** |
| **Unacceptable / not answered** | Question not answered – and / or – Response to the question significantly deficient – and / or - raises fundamental concerns regarding the organisation’s ability to successfully deliver the Contract. Answer does not provide satisfactory evidence as to the organisation’s capability to deliver the contract successfully. | 0 |
| **Poor** | A response that is inadequate or only partially addresses the question. Response provides only limited evidence as to the organisation’s capabilities to deliver the contract successfully. Raises a large number of concerns and/or includes a large number of informational deficiencies. Does not raise any fundamental concerns regarding the organisation’s ability. | 1 |
| **Acceptable** | An acceptable response submitted in terms of the level of detail, accuracy and relevance. Answer provides an average level of evidence as to the organisation’s capability. The response raises some concerns and/or includes a significant number of informational deficiencies. Does not raise any fundamental concerns regarding the organisation’s ability. | 2 |
| **Good** | A good response in terms of the level of detail, accuracy and relevance. The information provides good evidence of the ability of the organisation to deliver the Contract successfully; but does raise minor concerns and/or includes deficiencies around some of the information provided in the response.Does not raise any fundamental concerns regarding the organisation’s ability. | 3 |
| **Very Good** | A very good response in terms of the level of detail, accuracy and relevance. The information submitted provides significant evidence of the ability of the organisation to deliver the Contract successfully. However, the response lacks a level of detail needed for full marks. The response raises no fundamental concerns regarding the organisation’s ability. | 4 |
| **Excellent** | An excellent response in terms of the level of detail, accuracy and relevance. The level of information provided is comprehensive and evidences strongly an assurance as to the organisation’s capability to deliver the contract successfully.The response raises no concerns and has no information deficiencies. | 5 |

# Section A- Basic Contact Details & Technical Questionnaire

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
| Contact name for enquiries about this bid: |  |
| Address:Post Code: |  |
| Telephone Number: |  |
| Email Address: |  |
| Company Registration Number (if this applies): |  |
| VAT Registration number: (if this applies): |  |
| Have you ever been employed by this Council? (if yes please provide details) | Yes No |
| Please state if you have a relative(s) who is employed by the Council at a senior level or who is a Councilor? (if yes please provide details) | Yes No |

**PROSPECTIVE PROVIDER RESPONSE FORM TECHNICAL QUESTIONNAIRE**

Please note that page limits are on the basis of font Arial 11 and also include charts, diagrams, tables etc. Additional appendices are not permitted and will not be evaluated.

|  |
| --- |
| 1. Please detail previous experience and knowledge of EU financial control processes

Page limit is 2 side of A4. Weighting = 40% |
|  |
| 1. Please detail previous experience of working with local authorities

Page limit is 2 side of A4.Weighting = 20% |
|  |

# PROSPECTIVE PROVIDER RESPONSE FORM COMMERCIAL QUESTIONNAIRE

|  |
| --- |
| For a consistent base, please use the table to provide a quote for performing a single FLC audit for each of SBC’s current projects, providing an explanation for any variation between projects (Weighting = 40%) |
| **Project name** | **Fund** | **Programme** | **Project Start Date** | **Claim frequency** | **SBC project budget** | **Quote per claim** |
| Sustainable and Resilient Coastal Cities (SARCC) | ERDF (60% funding) | Interreg 2 Seas Mers Zeeën | 25/01/2019 | 6 months | €1,193,340.15 |  |
| PlastiCity | ERDF (60% funding) | Interreg 2 Seas Mers Zeeën | 01/01/2019 | 6 months | €1,239,544.50 |  |
| EMPOWER | ERDF (50% funding) | Interreg VB North Sea Region | 12/12/2018 | 6 months | €647.144 |  |