

Bank SCU ICE Process
LUSTN-0008798-RPT-002906

ICE Lessons Learnt Report Part II

		Signature	Date
Prepared by	Annika McKee Risk Manager
Checked by	Mark Elliott Senior Commercial Manager
Checked by	Jenny Hamilton Project Sponsor
Approved by	Simon Addyman Programme Manager

Document History

Revision	Date	Summary of changes
01.01	14.8.13	First draft
01.02	12.9.13	Second Draft

TABLE OF CONTENTS

1	Executive Summary	3
2	List of Key Recommendations	4
3	Project scope	5
3.1	The Innovative Contractor Engagement Process (ICE)	5
3.2	Project Timescales:.....	6
4	Workshop Overview	7
4.1	Methodology	7
5	Post Dialogue Phase	8
6	Tender Return / Evaluation	9
7	Pre Contract / Due Diligence	12
8	Workshop Attendees.....	14
	Appendix 1 – Workshop Outputs	16

1 **Executive Summary**

The contract for the Bank Station Capacity Upgrade was awarded to Dragados on the 30th July 2013 in advance of mobilisation on 1st August 2013, and an internal lessons learnt workshop was held on the 15th August 2013 to capture the experience of the LUL team on the final phases of the Innovative Contractor Engagement (ICE) process as below.

- Post dialogue
- Tender Return/ Evaluation
- Pre Contract

Internal lessons learnt for the ICE process up to dialogue has already been captured in LUSTN-0008798-RPT-002486.

The session was designed to identify key areas where the process worked well and to identify opportunities for improvement and is in addition to a workshop with bidders held on 9 August reference LUSTN-0008798-RPT-002907

The ICE process has been, to date, a success in delivering more value to the project than traditional procurement routes. The lead bid score was an overall improvement of 49.8 per cent in benefits over the LUL base case, which includes a 19 per cent improvement to customer journey time and 23 per cent cost reduction.

The ICE process faced a number of challenges as captured below:

- First time use of ICE as a procurement process with tight deadlines
- Increased internal and external scrutiny of the procurement process design and implementation following the termination of the Inter City West Coast franchise procurement by DfT
- Accommodation of potential scope creep from the DLR headshunt scheme
- A late tender submission by one of the bidders
- The need to commence routing of evaluation recommendation and funding approval papers through TfL's governance process in early April to achieve a 3rd July 2013 TfL Board in advance of 1st August 2013 contractor mobilisation, with a potential three month delay if this approval was not achieved

The team identified 18 key lessons learnt as listed in the following Key Recommendations section of this report with the completed list of lessons learnt appended to this report.

2 List of Key Recommendations

The key recommendations from the lessons learnt workshop are captured below:

Post Dialogue

- Take full advantage of the time pre tender return to prepare for / predict the tender return responses
- Set out resource requirements of tender evaluation phase and agree plan to manage / support key staff.
- Streamline tender query process

Tender Return / Evaluation

- Evaluator leads to be part of the question setting
- Consider electronic submission of the bid or request greater than 3 hard copies of the bids to be submitted
- Pre-prepare strategy for late bids
- Maintain good housekeeping in the evaluation room(s).
- Earlier evaluation training to provide an overview and allow teams to prepare and specific training for the individual questions
- Engage only one independent assessor of the QAB and Risk Register / Further define the scope.
- Bidders to provide an overview of their scheme for all evaluators through mandating the inclusion of an executive summary and potentially a presentation of the key features to ensure everyone has the same level of understanding.
- Train bidders on the BCA, QAB, risk register and programme requirements

Pre Contract / Due Diligence Phase

- Use of an issues log to track and close out all concerns
- Design and implement a communications plan to manage the message to the industry
- Involve the legal (and others as required) team early to pre-mobilise them
- Seek to close out key concerns pre contract award e.g. programme
- Select two competing bidders for the Due Diligence phase to maintain a competitive tension
- LUL to consider securing key members of the TWA team , in lieu of the contractor, to ensure the required quality

3 Project scope

London Underground's Bank station is located in the heart of the City of London's financial district. As the main gateway to the City for employees and visitors, the station is of strategic importance to the UK's economy. Bank station is also a strategic network interchange served by six underground lines; the Northern, Central, Waterloo & City, and the District and Circle at Monument, (which is part of the same station complex), and the Docklands Light Railway (DLR), for which Bank is the major central London terminus.

The station has been developed in a piecemeal manner from 1884 onwards as additional lines have been built, reaching its present form in 1991 when the DLR extension opened. Most of the platforms are at very deep level (i.e. 30m to 40m depth), and, therefore, are dependent upon escalators or lifts for passenger access and egress. The station has three ticket halls, ten platforms, 15 escalators, six lifts and two 300ft long moving walkways.

Bank station was designed and built in expectation of passenger levels far less than those currently using the station. It is now the fourth busiest interchange station on the Underground network. To mitigate the need to implement severe station control measures to cater for the forecasted increase in congestion there is a need to upgrade capacity at the station. The objectives of the Bank Station Capacity Upgrade project are:

- To increase the capacity at Bank station, principally to the Northern line and DLR areas as well as the associated interchange routes;
- To provide step-free route(s) to the Northern line platforms from street and DLR levels, and an accepted means of escape for Persons with Reduced Mobility;
- To provide compliant emergency fire and evacuation protection measures for Northern line/DLR passengers.

3.1 The Innovative Contractor Engagement Process (ICE)

The ICE process designed by LUL is supported by IIPAG and has been selected as an Infrastructure UK model project that seeks to maximise market value through Innovation in the Supply Chain.

LUL used the new ICE procurement process for the first time with this project. This process aims to improve relationships with the contractor market and get the benefits of early contractor involvement while developing major design and build contracts.

The process was designed to enable bidders to propose and discuss innovative ideas during a dialogue stage in advance of issuing the Invitation To Tender (ITT) that identify and deliver significant cost, risk, programme and other benefits for the Project.

Innovations were commercially confidential to each bidder so they were able to fully derive the value and competitive advantage of their innovation through the procurement process, and to avoid bidders 'holding back' innovation in the dialogue stage in the fear that LUL would divulge this in the ITT.

It is a process that has engaged the market with core requirements not a specified scheme. It is a model that looks to reward the supply chain's innovation for maximising TfL business case benefits within a benefit and cost cap.

An OJEU Notice was issued on 22 November 2011. This included the statement that the contract award would be based on the Most Economically Advantageous Tender (MEAT) in terms of the criteria as stated in the Invitation To Tender (ITT).

London Underground Limited

The project started the ICE process in April 2012 with TfL and each of the four shortlisted bidders signing an 'Information Agreement' (the vehicle to secure a confidential process and to register and value the innovation developed by the bidders). This was followed by the dialogue phase which commenced in May 2012, with independent observers present at all meetings.

The four bidders proactively engaged with the process culminating in the submission on 22 August 2012 of their Request to Proceed documents, which captured their ideas. The project team reviewed the innovative and unique ideas submitted and fed back to bidders in October. The tender documentation was formally issued on 14 November [and the evaluation criteria in Section 2 confirmed in early December]. The award of the contract was achieved by 1st August to programme and the project has been let under an NEC3 ECC Option C (target cost contract).

LUL set the supply chain a target of 15% additional value through, cost savings, improved benefits and reduction of dis-benefits (major closure). The lead bid score was an overall improvement of 49.8 per cent of benefits, which includes a 19 per cent improvement to customer journey time and 23 per cent cost reduction. The supply chain innovation was scored, evaluated and awarded on the most economically advantageous tender that met the requirements and is within the specified benefit and cost caps. These caps were set at an Estimated Final Cost (EFC) cost of no more than £625m, Capacity Enhancement of Fruin Level C and Journey Time benefits of up to £32.2m per annum, and elimination of the major closure (£67m disbenefit avoided)

The bid considered to be the most economically advantageous tender was awarded on a 'Value for money' calculation of Quality/Price. The bids were then ranked to provide value for money scores. The weightings used in the assessment are approximately 70% for the end product provided and 30% for the method of delivering the product. Should the evaluation not have resulted in a clear and unambiguous preferred bid, the right to run a Best and Final Offer (BAFO) process was reserved but was not required in this instance.

3.2 Project Timescales:

The Project team successfully kept to the ICE schedule as planned at the outset and this was in spite of constraints over the required TfL board schedule

The key project timescales are included below:

Activity	Start	Finish
Post Dialogue	14 th November 2012	25 th February 2013
Tender Evaluation	25 th February 2013	22 nd April 2013
Conform Contract	11 th April 2013	22 nd July 2013
Due Diligence and contract	29 th April 2013	30 July August 2013

4 Workshop Overview

The workshop was designed to capture the key lessons learnt from the final stages of the procurement process which could be adopted by future projects opting for the ICE approach. The workshop also served to mark the close of the procurement process and the commencement of the delivery phase.

The internal LUL workshop was scheduled to follow a separate, external bidder lessons learnt session and the high level outcomes of this were shared with the LUL team to feedback the bidder experiences. The outputs of this internal lessons learnt mirror many of the findings of the bidder session.

4.1 Methodology

The team were asked to consider the later stages of the ICE procurement process in the phases as below to provide a structure to what they considered to be the key lessons learnt for the project, both in terms of positive and negative experiences.

- **Post Dialogue**
- **Tender Return / Evaluation**
- **Pre Contract / Due Diligence Phase**

The workshop team was asked to split into 3 groups and discuss the positives and negatives of the ICE process phases and present their findings to the whole workshop group. The complete outputs of these are included in Appendix 1 of this report.

5 Post Dialogue Phase

The Post Dialogue period followed on from the intensive bidder dialogue stage and was the time in which the bidders were finalising their proposals and preparing their tender returns for submission. From an LUL perspective, for many in the team, this represented a relatively quiet stage in the process since discussions had ended with the bidder however there were Tender Queries to be responded to at this stage and the focus of the teams shifted to preparing for the return of the tenders.

Tender Query Process

There were a total of 226 Tender Queries (TQs) during this stage seeking clarification on all aspects of the ITT. The process was set up such that TQs were submitted to the LUL team and responded to in sufficient time to allow the responses to be incorporated into the tender returns. As with the Request for Information (RFI) phase the greatest number of queries related to Engineering with 27% of the total and Operational was the least common, with 1%. The most and least common categories are identical to the categorisation of the 353 RFIs during the dialogue stage, with Engineering totalling 28% and Operational amounting to 3% of total RFIs respectively. Often response to technical queries were offered to bidders faster than the 10 working day target response time with 54% of responses provided to bidders within 5 working days. The LUL team discussed how this process could have been further improved to minimise duplication of effort by potentially providing standard responses to all bidders, developing a database of previous answers or filtering the queries on receipt.

The process of responding to tender queries for many in the team served to reinforce their understanding of the Base Case scheme which in turn stood the team in good stead for the evaluation phase of comparing the bidder proposals to the Base Case Scheme. As the project had evolved from the RIBA D scheme(10 King William Street and lifts) to the Base case (Whole Block and lifts) to the Reference Case (whole block and escalators) this led to some confusion amongst the LUL team and even at tender stage there was still some uncertainty about the differences between the various LUL schemes.

Resources

A common theme throughout the workshop was resources and the management of them both in terms of the level of resource and the availability. Given the subsequent significant increase in work - load in the tender evaluation stage, it was proposed that this could have been looked at further and addressed in this pre tender evaluation stage.

All of the workshop team identified activities that could have been undertaken in this stage which could have put them in a better position once the tenders were returned. Amongst these proposals were the following, some of which were achieved in part by the team:

- Set up an evaluator's resource library
- Prepare a schedule of particular discussions during dialogue phase for evaluators
- Organise the answering of the TQ's more efficiently
- Set up a searchable database to access previous answers to tender queries to maintain consistency
- Trial scoring by evaluators on Request To Proceed (RTP) responses
- Produce a schedule of reports and drawings that had been issued to bidders that could influence ITT responses for each scoring criteria that evaluators could review as preparation.

London Underground Limited

- Consider developing a shadow bid to identify potential gaps
- Shadow the passenger modelling on the RTP responses
- Prepare “exam answers” to the ITTs.
- Aim for early issue of site information (pre ITT)
- Rationalise the Quantified Activity Breakdown (QAB) for comparative purposes

As this was the period when the bidders were preparing their tender returns there was some discussion as to what LUL had included in the Invitation To Tender (ITT). The team considered that the questions had been well devised and had been developed following consultation with the relevant parties in the main however it was proposed that for the Transport and Works Act section the questions could have been designed to allow more nuance of evaluation. (a separate lessons learnt has been prepared to address this and is available LUSTN-0008798-RPT-002905

Key Actions for Future

- Take full advantage of the time pre tender return to prepare for / predict the tender return responses
- Streamline tender query process
- Set out resource requirements and agree plan to manage / support key staff.

6 Tender Return / Evaluation

Late bid submission

The tenders were returned on 11th February 2013 at midday and 3 of the 4 bidders succeeded in submitting the returns on time whilst one bidder was 45 minutes late. LUL had stated in their tender evaluation plan that they reserved the right to discount any bids should they not meet the stated deadline. LUL undertook a risk analysis of the potential scenarios and potential outcomes as identified below:

No	Risk	Impact
1	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> - 4th bidder objects (successfully) if bid is MEAT but contract not awarded to him - 4th bidder objects (successfully) if bid is not opened and claims unfair treatment - Under bidder successfully challenges the tender process if contract awarded to the 4th bidder - 4th bidder unsuccessfully challenges the tender process 	<p>There is a risk that the procurement process may be challenged which could lead to requirement to rerun the process leading to delays and additional costs</p>

No	Risk	Impact
2	Compliant bidder objects (unsuccessfully) during evaluation 4th bidder objects (unsuccessfully) during evaluation period that being unfairly treated	There is a risk that there is a requirement to obtain additional legal advice during the tender evaluation process
3	4th bid is opened after the initial 30 days and evaluation process takes longer than anticipated	There is a risk that the tender evaluation process is prolonged leading to a requirement to delay submission to TfL board

The outputs of this risk analysis, in conjunction with LUL legal led to the decision to inform the other bidders that the bid would be opened after 30 days.

The outcome was that there were no objections raised by any of the bidders and after 30 days the late bid was opened and assessed as per the other bids. This served to extend the tender evaluation process which, in some cases, it was commented was advantageous to the LUL team in providing additional time to complete the assessment. It should be noted that as the evaluation process, as outlined in the evaluation plan, clearly stated that bids would be assessed against the Base Case and not each other; this did not delay the completion of the evaluation of the 3 bids that had been submitted on time.

Evaluation Process

There was a comprehensive, clear and approved evaluation plan written and the teams conducted their works according to this plan with schemes being scored consistently by all. This need to stick to the plan was of particular importance following the the InterCity West Coast franchise where the evaluation methodology set out in the ITT was not followed satisfactorily. The LUL team considered the tender evaluation process to have worked well with individuals being clear of their responsibilities.

As per the evaluation plan the assessment was carried out in two parts: Technical and Commercial with separate rooms assigned for each element. All evaluators were required to sign in and out of the rooms to provide a record of their attendance and leave any notes that had been made in the relevant rooms to maintain confidentiality and avoid cross contamination between the Technical and Commercial evaluation. All scoring and comments were recorded on paper to further minimise any risk of the scoring being shared between evaluators however this led to a large amount of paperwork of which some was partially illegible and the overall consensus was the process was time consuming for the evaluators.

It was noted that some resources were stretched as they were working on multiple questions and due to the nature of the bids (the tender returns were not consistent in their presentation of information and there were discrepancies between bids as to where to find key information) finding the answers to the questions was time consuming. In some cases several of the evaluators struggled to answer the answers without referencing information from other sections however this was rectified at the moderation stage and evaluators scored the questions purely based on the responses provided in the appropriate sections

as per the evaluation plan. The team commented how the Moderation process had worked well and in all instances led to a consensus of scoring and clarified any discrepancies.

The bidders were asked to submit 3 copies of their proposal which, in retrospect, was insufficient to allow sufficient people to gain access to the information they required at all times. As the evaluation process wore on general housekeeping in the room became more haphazard and it became increasingly difficult to locate sections of the bids at times.

Bid Content

The bidders had been given specific instructions as to how they should respond in their submissions with page limits and detailed instructions to what should be answered and where the responses should be included. In the main this structure was adhered to but some of the bidders “stretched” these limits and yet were not penalised in the scoring process. Some of the bidders exceeded the page limit by referencing other parts of the document which had to be addressed in the moderation phase.

Several of the questions had more scope for subjective marking than others (versus the outputs of the ped route modelling for example) for which some of the evaluators commented there could have been more guidance as to how to score the response. Many of the issues in the scoring originated in the way the questions had been drafted and whilst there was evaluation training this could have been carried out earlier and to specific evaluation teams to get a consensus as to how to deal with these issues.

In all of the bids bar one, there was no overview of the whole proposed solution to help the evaluators in the understanding of the designs. Some of the bids did not have executive summaries and whilst some of the bids included fly-throughs and 4-D models these were not made available to all team members which hindered their understanding of the schemes as a whole.

Scoring Process

The scoring and moderation was considered to have worked well, with no perverse markings however in some cases it took a long time to reach agreement on the final scores.

LUL had engaged two independent organisations to review the QAB and the Risk Register to identify any gaps and highlight any concerns and the outputs of this exercise was incorporated into the technical scoring of the QAB and Risk Register. In retrospect having two reviews prolonged the evaluation process as there was inconsistency as to how the assessment had been carried out, and subsequently the conclusions, which resulted in a need to carry out further validation to reach a consensus view.

There was a high level of variance between the level of detail of 2 of the bidder’s submissions of the QAB, Risk Register and Programme making evaluation difficult. Subsequent feedback from the bidders indicated that they struggled to complete the QAB as requested which highlighted a need for further training prior to the tender return preparation and this was mirrored in the quantified risk register / programme. The extent to which the bidders had complied with the instructions for the Risk Register submission varied greatly which could have been attributed to the novel approach / scoring proposed / instructions.

It was noted that the Notional Price Calculator had worked well to evaluate the prices and confidentiality was maintained throughout the evaluation which had further protected the process.

Key Actions for Future projects

- Evaluator leads to be part of the question setting (process followed)
- Consider electronic submission or greater than 3 hard copies of the bids to be submitted
- Pre-prepare strategy for late bids
- Maintain good housekeeping in the evaluation room(s).
- Earlier evaluation training to provide an overview and allow teams to prepare and specific training for the individual questions
- Engage only one independent assessor of the QAB and Risk Register / Further define the scope.
- Bidders to provide an overview of their scheme for all evaluators through mandating the inclusion of an executive summary and potentially a presentation of the key features to ensure everyone has the same level of understanding.
- Train bidders on the BCA, QAB, risk register and programme requirements

7 Pre Contract / Due Diligence

Following tender evaluation, the top two of the four the bids were selected to be progressed to the Due Diligence phase and the decision to not pursue the Best And Final Offer (BAFO) approach was dictated by the outcome of the scoring (i.e. the difference between the two top bid was too great as to be recoverable in a BAFO stage). This phase, pre contract, was designed to close out any technical, commercial, and other queries with the top two bids that could have resulted in issues following contract sign off and this period served to act, to a degree, as a pre mobilisation phase. The LUL team noted that at this stage as the winning bid was evident due to the difference in scoring, whilst maintaining two bidders in this phase was fundamental in retaining a competitive element, for the losing bidder this process was only ever going to be wasted time and money. Others in the team stressed that only because of this stage had the team been able to maintain the competitive edge up to the TfL Board and thus the time spent with the second, losing, bidder directly resulted in the project being able to meet the requirements for the LUL Governance.

The Due Diligence phase was managed through the issues log which was updated and sent through to the bidders with key areas of concern. It was felt that this process worked well in tracking and closing out issues. This phase and the responses from the bidders further served to back up the scoring and whilst at contract award there may have been some concerns (relating to specific resources) which had not been fully closed out, actions had been put in place to resolve this fully in the coming weeks. Given that there is a limited pool of Transport and Works Act resources available in the market it was proposed that LUL could have sought to secure this team independently to ensure the appropriate quality.

External Communications

External communications during the procurement process was deemed to have been successful in the main with press releases being prepared in advance and issued at key stages. There had however been one instance of mis-quoting in the press which stated that LUL were not going to buy any of the unsuccessful bidders' ideas or innovations as had been proposed in the published ICE process. In reality most of the unique innovations proposed by the bidders were purchased to assist in managing the risk of the Transport and Works Act not being granted although it was not proposed to incorporate these innovations in the winning bid. This mis-quote had initially potentially damaged the message that LUL wanted to present to the market but was subsequently clarified and corrected.

Terms and Conditions

The terms and conditions of the contract were agreed with limited further amendments to the contract as at the ITT stage and the time taken to complete this was considered to have been well within normal limits. There were no claims on infringement of the Information Agreement or challenge to procurement process raised in this stage which further validated the work that LUL had undertaken to maintain confidentiality and to adhere to the process as originally set out in the RTP. The involvement of the lawyers (and other specialists- TfL insurers and LUL brokers and TfL Finance for potential non-sterling payments)) at this stage was also seen as a positive in that they gleaned a greater understanding of the scheme which they would be able to bring to the project in the future.

Key actions for future projects

- Use of an issues log to track and close out all concerns
- Design and implement a communications plan to manage the message to the industry
- Involve the legal (and others as required) team early to pre-mobilise them
- Seek to close out key concerns pre contract award e.g. programme
- Select two competing bidders for the Due Diligence phase to maintain a competitive tension
- LUL to consider securing key members of the TWA team , in lieu of the contractor, to ensure the required quality

8 Workshop Attendees

Name	Role
Andy Brown	Construction / Logistics
Andy Swift	Delivery Manager
Ariella Levine	Project Sponsor
Barry Franklin	Operational Task Manager
Eamonn Cuffe	Commercial Manager
Gabrielle Coyle	Planning Consents Manager
James Bevan	Commercial Manager
Jenny Hamilton	Sponsor
Jim McCarthy	Lead Project Engineer
Mark Elliott	Senior Commercial Manager
Nad Rajwani	Construction Manager
Olu Morgan	Governance Manager
Simon Addyman	Project Manager
Steve Fleming	Senior Commercial Manager
Viki James	TWAO Works Package Manager

Workshop Agenda

Time	Activity	By
13.00	Workshop Open	All
13.00-13.05	Welcome & Setting the Scene	Simon Addyman
13.05-13.10	Overview of Workshop Process	Annika McKee
13.10-14.45	Session 1: Post Dialogue 20 min discussion in table groups 15 min sharing discussion outputs	Workshop Syndicates
14.45-15.20	Session 2: Tender Return / Evaluation 20 min discussion in table groups 15 min sharing discussion outputs	Workshop Syndicates
15.20-15.55	Session 3: Pre Contract Due Diligence 20 min discussion in table groups 15 min sharing discussion outputs	Workshop Syndicates
15.55-16.00	Workshop Summary and Close	Annika McKee

Glossary of Terms

Abbreviation	Term
ITT	Invitation to Tender
IIPAG	Independent Investment Programme Advisory Group
OJEU	Official Journal of the European Union
NEC	New Engineering Contract
RTP	Request to Proceed
RFI	Request for Information
QAB	Quantified Activity Breakdown

Appendix 1 – Workshop Outputs

Post Dialogue - GROUP 1
POSITIVE
Provision of “ teach in “ on legion modelling and BCA at the start
Negative
Dialogue followed by ITT drafting could have been done at the same time
Resource for TQs – more detailed responses for legion / Business case questions not able to answer in time frame set for process
TQ answering process better resourced
Were there things we asked the bidders to that that a. Wasn't in the scoring b. That was hard to score but not really essential
Is there any need to spend so much effort in trying to link the QAB to the schedule prior to preferred bidder stages
Project governance / IIPAG/ EE to be more structured
A more structured dialogues with each bidder regarding the completion of the QAB
Could have done more training set up for dialogue phase
Better to get final evaluation criteria out sooner
There is a clear value for money model now but would have been better as part of the earlier evaluation plan

Post Dialogue – GROUP 2
POSITIVE
Responding to technical queries improved project and station knowledge
Assisted with project understanding and cross team working
Negative
Cross discipline meetings dried up and they should have continued
Some disciplines were insufficiently resourced
Market did not understand the modelling leading to more TQs
Wishlist
Set up an evaluator's resource library
Encourage team to take opportunity for a holiday?
Have a schedule of particular discussions during dialogue phase for evaluators
Organise the answering of the TQ's more efficiently
A searchable database to access previous answers to maintain consistency
Trial scoring by evaluators on RTP responses
Produce a schedule of reports and drawings that have been issued to bidders that could influence ITT responses for each scoring criteria that evaluators could review as preparation.
Team could develop a shadow bid to look for gaps
Shadow the passenger modelling on the ITP responses
Have some set answers / FAQs
Early issue of site information (pre ITT)
Only one external post-tender cost checker required
Should rationalise the QAB for comparative purposes

Post Dialogue – GROUP 3

POSITIVE
Single option design – no opportunity for alternatives to the bid
RTP process framed the ITT stage well
Set questions were good
Page limit was a good idea
Negative
Evaluation team did not set the questions
Should have had evaluation training earlier
Should have worked up model answer earlier
Insufficient resources
Questions didn't always map to points
Insufficient training of the base case
Spending time pre thinking and guessing
Evaluators needed to be in from the start of the question setting process
Was it clear that the design was to be bought "as is"
Lack of input of operational issues during the dialogue and Post ITP places

Tender return / Evaluation – GROUP 1
POSITIVE
Silo scoring provided clarity
Evaluation confidentiality well observed
Correlation of blind scoring (including moderation process)
Works well if team leader is "pathfinder" to help others
Moderation process worked well
External evaluators worked well
Negative
Evaluation instructions should have been clearer
The quality score ignored the full design
Significant variation from base case discouraged
Page limit were not good
Showstoppers difficult to score
Low scores could be a bad design or just a poorly worded answer
Client queries were time consuming
Issues with submissions required testing
Lack of clarity of subjectivity i.e. back up facts
Time constraints
Information not all in one place in the submission
Evaluation was very time intensive
Hard to resist desire to have reassurance from other disciplines
Need more prescriptive structure to submissions to review quicker
Scoring evaluation training scoring
Big resource issue
Paper scoring was bad for those with RSI and also undecipherable when people had awful writing
Evaluators should be able to consult on technical issues especial concerning specialist knowledge or scoring of unexpected answers
No weighting

No clear understanding of what the scores meant ie. Is excellent =10 or 8-10
Should not be able to use medium
3 bidders “cheated” re: page limits
Information sometimes asked for twice gave inconsistent results e.g. CVs

Tender return / Evaluation – GROUP 2
POSITIVE
Evaluation of the price was good through the Notional Price Calculator
Good governance through the tender evaluation plan
The late tender helped in that there may have been insufficient time to do the evaluations if we hadn't had more time
Negative
Finding documentation in room wasn't always easy and the rooms were not kept tidy making it hard to find documentation
Holding meetings in the room at the same time as evaluation ongoing was distracting
Shorted governance routing to boards
There was a lack of understanding of what the base case was by the teams which
Could we have used e tendering for some / all of the returns
No risk analysis in advance of the tender returns and as it turned out one of the bids came back late and there was no contingency planning in place
Don't accept late bids
There was no overview of the bids for the evaluators
Some of the teams were on too many evaluation teams

Tender return / Evaluation – GROUP 2
POSITIVE
Emphasis was given to the destination more than the journey
Confidentiality was maintained
The definition of what Poor and excellent worked well to get consistency in the scoring
Re-defined / cleared scoring criteria worked well
The process worked and was followed
Assigning teams with difference discipline leads
Scoring and moderation was robust with no perverse results but took too long
Negative
Evaluators didn't see fly-throughs (or 4D programmes)
Few people had wider visibility of proposals which led to lots of referrals between bidders
Tender evaluation impacted the whole team and left no on to progress the TWA team
Quite archaic scoring
Some evaluators ignored word limits and others circumvented it. (we wrote do no score on some but evaluators either ignored the bids or ignored the instructions leading to a mixed evaluation approach)
There was a liberal interpretation of page limits by referencing other materials.
Bidder submissions were generally poorly structure and did not adhere to page counts
Some key resources were on holiday when the process started
The process was very time consuming
The intent of the questions at times was unclear at all times

The questions weren't subdivided making marking difficult
Not enough copies of the bid
Timescales impacted by late return – need stricter governance
There was no plan for late bids and how to manage them
The independent pricing of the QABs was not well co-ordinated
In future it may be more time efficient to ask the leading bidders to align the QAB and the programme
There was no executive summary from all the bidders
Wishlist
Live TQ questions and response viewable by all
Get questions on pricing out to tenderers earlier

Pre Contract – GROUP 3
POSITIVE
Very thorough bid analysis and close out of issues during due diligence stage
Engagement of the Corporation of London was positive
Mobilisation started early
Due diligence reinforced the scoring
Worked very efficiently – well organised with a single issue register and accountabilities
Very few issues on terms and conditions
Dropping to 2 bidders early allowed to maintain some commercial tension
Negative
Should have had a controlled press release when went down to 2 bidders
The due diligence continued to cost the unsuccessful bidder
There was no committed resource plan
Programme still not ready for acceptance

Pre Contract – GROUP 3
POSITIVE
Issues log to document issues worked well
Good team building (process frustrations had a positive effect)
Lawyers now very familiar with project and bidder . Aware of potential issues
Confirmation of all our hard work when no claims were raised
Good to finally look at the OSD
Familiarisation under team with bids
Negative
Due diligence was haphazard
PPB rumours stifled process
Gap analysis incomplete
Purpose not clear
Frustrating when Dragados took no notice re: need to sort out the TWA team
Areas for due diligence should have been identified earlier – there were too many panics
Internal politics over the OSD was annoying and delayed the process

Pre Contract – GROUP 3
POSITIVE
Issues log was dealt with well
The length of the period to conform the contract was relatively short
There was a clear steer on the BAFO decision
Confidentiality and identity of winner worked well
Quality / price result made close out easy
2 lead bidders worked well
Negative
Agree and implement PR strategy earlier
The decision over which bidder to select was largely made pre due diligence phase
The lengthy proofing process with investment papers made managing confidentiality difficult
Corporate gates and the ICE process are not aligned. Line of enquiry need updating