**Connecting Innovation**

**High Impact Project Advert**

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
| **Company Name** | Dakin-Flathers Limited |
| **Company Address** | Boothroyds Way Featherstone West Yorkshire WF7 6RA |
| **Company Contact** | Oliver Garside  [oliver@dakin-flathers.com](mailto:oliver@dakin-flathers.com)  +44 1977 705 600 |
| **Description of Company Activity** | Manufacture of Bandsaw blades and Bandknife blades |
| **Objective of the proposed project** | Suppliers are invited to provide consulting services to design an automated line for the manufacture of a new reciprocating blade product being launched to market. The design should include the manufacturing concept, full electrical design and full mechanical design required to implement the manufacture of the new reciprocating blade. |
| **Tenders are Invited from suppliers who can provide the necessary skills and expertise to deliver the specification**  **Successful applicants should be aware that this project is part-funded by the England European Regional Development Fund as part of the European Structural and Investment Funds Growth Programme 2014-2020 and the Local Growth Fund.**  **Successful applicants should be aware that award of the contract is reliant on the successful issue of a grant funding agreement following the close of the tender process.** | Suppliers must have strong skills, extensive knowledge and previous experience in the design of automated manufacturing lines and in providing fully integrated solutions to multi-process manufacturing challenges. Suppliers must also have the in-house design and engineering skills to produce a fully specified electrical and mechanical design which can then be either manufactured in-house or which can be used as the basis of a tender process. The designs must include full electrical and mechanical drawings and full details of the Human Machine Interface (HMI) and control cabinets.  The manufacturing line required will use robotics to extract blades from a prior manufacturing stage and transfer them to a multi-station process. It will feed in shanks to the same process via a hopper system. The multi-station process will laser etch the blades, locate the blade to the shank, spot weld the two together and perform a range of vision system and mechanical Quality Control (QC) checks. Transfer between the stations will be fully automated via robotics, conveyors or some other mechanism. The finished blades will be transferred to a subsequent manufacturing line. All of the preceding steps and all the equipment involved (laser cutting, robots, laser etcher, spot welder, QC systems) will need fully integrating electrically and mechanically. The whole system will require a programmable HMI. |
| **Required project timescales** | Project Start 1st October 2022  Project completion 31st December 2022 |
| **Total Anticipated Project Value** | £100,000 maximum |
| **Required response date** | Latest 23:59 on 22nd September 2022 |
| **How to apply?** | The procurement advert is available on Contracts Finder at:  <https://www.contractsfinder.service.gov.uk/Notice/45773e58-7ed5-4537-9b53-5c9a4c686e55>  **If you believe you have the skills and expertise to supply the above project and would like to submit a proposal, you will be required to sign a Non-Disclosure Agreement (NDA) and will then be provided with further details.**  To receive the NDA and for any further questions around the procurement opportunity please contact Oliver Garside via the email address below:  [oliver@dakin-flathers.com](mailto:oliver@dakin-flathers.com) |
| **Criteria for decision making** | |  |  | | --- | --- | | Criteria | % | | Price | 20 | | Expertise Fit   * strong skills, extensive knowledge, and previous experience in the design of automated manufacturing lines * in-house design and engineering skills to produce a fully specified electrical and mechanical design | 40 | | Timing fit | 20 | | Suitability of proposed methodology | 20 | | Total | 100 | |
| **Scoring** | **Price**  The lowest priced tender will score full marks and other tender scores will be calculated on the basis of their deviation from the lowest. For every 1% a price is higher than the lowest, 1% of the score will be deducted from that tenderer’s score. The minimum score will be 0. For example:   |  |  |  |  | | --- | --- | --- | --- | | Lowest gets full marks - all others 1% off the score for every 1% higher than lowest | | | | | Tenderer | Price | Score | % difference | | Tender A | £50,000 | 30 | - | | Tender B | £58,000 | 25 | 16 | | Tender C | £75,000 | 15 | 50 | | Tender D | £82,000 | 11 | 64 | | Tender E | £100,000 | 0 | 100 |   **Expertise Fit**  Expertise fit related criteria will be scored on the basis of the following scale:   |  |  | | --- | --- | | 100% | The provider has extensive experience of providing very similar projects and has all in house electrical and mechanical design and automation skills | | 80% | The provider has good experience of providing similar projects and has most in house electrical and mechanical design and automation skills | | 60% | The provider has moderate experience of providing similar projects and has most in house electrical and mechanical design and automation skills | | 40% | The provider has limited experience of providing similar projects and has most in house electrical and mechanical design and automation skills | | 20% | The provider has limited experience of providing similar projects and has all limited in house electrical and mechanical design and automation skills |   **Timing Fit**  Timing fit related criteria will be scored on the basis of the following scale:   |  |  | | --- | --- | | 100% | The proposal gives a high degree of confidence that the services can be delivered within the specified time period | | 75% | The proposal gives a high degree of confidence that MOST of the critical services can be delivered within the specified time period | | 50% | The proposal only gives a moderate degree of confidence that the services can be delivered within the specified time period | | 25% | The proposal only gives a low degree of confidence that the services can be delivered within the specified time period. | | 0% | The proposal cannot be delivered within the specified time period. |   **Suitability of proposed methodology**  Suitability of methodology related criteria will be scored on the basis of the following scale:   |  |  | | --- | --- | | 100% | In respect of each element of the Services identified in the question, the proposals fully explain how the relevant element will be delivered to the standards required, throughout the term.  The proposals are clear, precise and robust.  The explanation is sufficient to give a high degree of confidence that all of the relevant aspects of the specification will be delivered. | | 80% | In respect of each element of the Services identified in the question, the proposals explain how the relevant element will be delivered to the standards required, throughout the term.  The proposals are clear, precise and robust.  The explanation is sufficient to give a high degree of confidence that the relevant aspects of the specification will, for the most part, be delivered. To the extent that the explanation is not sufficient to give that high degree of confidence, the explanation does not raise concerns. | | 60% | In respect of each element of the Services identified in the question, the proposals explain, to some extent, how the relevant element will be delivered to the standards required, throughout the term.  The proposals are clear, but there are some concerns around precision and / or robustness.  The explanation is sufficient to give confidence that the relevant aspects of the specification will, for the most part, be delivered. To the extent that the explanation is not sufficient to give that confidence, the explanation raises one or more concerns but no material concerns. | | 40% | In respect of each element of the Services identified in the question, the proposals explain, to some extent, how the relevant element will be delivered to the standards required, throughout the term, but for certain elements the explanation is very limited.  There are concerns around the clarity, and around the precision and / or robustness, of the proposals.  The explanation is sufficient to give confidence that the relevant aspects of the specification will be delivered to some extent. To the extent that the explanation is not sufficient to give that confidence, the explanation raises one or more concerns, one of which is a material concern. | | 20% | In respect of one or more elements of the Services identified in the question, the proposals fail to explain to any extent how the relevant element will be delivered to the standards required, throughout the term; and / or the proposals are mainly or wholly unclear; and / or the explanation is insufficient to give confidence that the relevant aspects of the specification will be delivered and / or the explanation for any one or more of the elements raises multiple material concerns. | | 0% | No response or response is irrelevant to the question asked. | |
| **Date for Contract Decision** | Friday 30th September |