

Background

The advertised turnover in the highest value lots in both YORbuild2 and YORcivil2 frameworks are approaching their limits well ahead of time. As a result YORhub are intending to procure new major works frameworks to replace these, to be known as YORbuild Major and YORcivil Major. Responses to this combined questionnaire will be used to shape these new frameworks.

If you currently use both frameworks or will do so in future please respond to all questions. If you only use one framework please restrict your response to that framework.

Please note that the existing YORbuild2 and YORcivil2 frameworks will continue to operate as normal and will run in parallel to these 2 new major frameworks when they go live.

YORhub Major Works Frameworks - User Survey Consultation

Completed by:	
Job title:	
Email:	
Telephone No:	

General

1.1	Is it your organisation's current practice that frameworks should be the first consideration when procuring construction projects?	Yes	<input type="checkbox"/>
		No	<input type="checkbox"/>

1.2	If No, what are your reasons for using alternative arrangements to frameworks, and what are they?
Comments:	

1.3	What individual projects (valued at £10m+) beyond 2018/19 do you anticipate will be procured via a framework?	
	Name	Value
1)		
2)		
3)		

Framework Tender Assessment Criteria

Guidance Notes

Pricing structure: We anticipate that appointments to any replacement framework will be on the basis of:-

- 1) Capped fee %'s (primarily covering overheads and profit) , and
- 2) A schedule of rates, mainly covering people costs and preliminary/plant items such as site cabins, JCB's etc

2.1	Are there any other pricing approaches/elements that you feel we should consider?
Comments:	

Lotting Structure

Guidance Notes

It is proposed to have two Lots for YORbuild Major, one for works over £10m up to £50m and another for works over £50m

It is proposed to have the same two Lots for YORcivil Major' one over £10m - £50m and another over £50m

3.1	Do you think the lotting structure for YORbuild Major is appropriate?	Yes <input type="checkbox"/>	No <input type="checkbox"/>
-----	---	------------------------------	-----------------------------

3.2	Do you think these lotting structure for YORcivil Major is appropriate?	Yes <input type="checkbox"/>	No <input type="checkbox"/>
-----	---	------------------------------	-----------------------------

3.3	If not, what would your preferred lotting structure be?		
YORbuild Major Comments:		YORcivil Major Comments:	

Call Off Methods

Which of the following call off methods would you use?

4.1	Single stage, price only	Yes <input type="checkbox"/>	No <input type="checkbox"/>
-----	--------------------------	------------------------------	-----------------------------

4.2	Single stage price and quality	Yes <input type="checkbox"/>	No <input type="checkbox"/>
-----	--------------------------------	------------------------------	-----------------------------

4.3	Two stage price/quality	Yes <input type="checkbox"/>	No <input type="checkbox"/>
-----	-------------------------	------------------------------	-----------------------------

4.4	Negotiation with a single contractor identified by the framework	Yes <input type="checkbox"/>	No <input type="checkbox"/>
-----	--	------------------------------	-----------------------------

4.5	Two stage quality only	Yes <input type="checkbox"/>	No <input type="checkbox"/>
-----	------------------------	------------------------------	-----------------------------

The Form of Contract

5.1	It is intended to adopt the NEC4 suite as the preferred contract for YORbuild Major and YORcivil Major but retain the option of using JCT contracts on the YORbuild Major framework. Does this proposal meet your needs?	Yes <input type="checkbox"/>	
		No <input type="checkbox"/>	

5.2	If No, what alternatives would you prefer ?
Comments:	

Size of Tender Lists

Are the following number of firms proposed to be appointed to each Lot sufficient for you to run a mini competition through that lot?

6.1	YORcivil Major Lot 1 - Over £10m-£50m Suppliers - 8	Yes <input type="checkbox"/>	No <input type="checkbox"/>
------------	---	------------------------------	-----------------------------

6.2	YORcivil Major Lot 2 - Over £50m Suppliers - 6	Yes <input type="checkbox"/>	No <input type="checkbox"/>
------------	--	------------------------------	-----------------------------

6.3	YORbuild Major Lot 1 - Over £10m to £50m Suppliers - 8	Yes <input type="checkbox"/>	No <input type="checkbox"/>
------------	--	------------------------------	-----------------------------

6.4	YORbuild Major Lot 2 - Over £50m Suppliers - 6	Yes <input type="checkbox"/>	No <input type="checkbox"/>
------------	--	------------------------------	-----------------------------

6.5	If No, what alternatives would you prefer ?
Comments:	

Call Off Contracts Under The Framework Quality Criteria

Which of the following quality criteria for **single** stage call offs would you use?

Quality Criteria (single stage)	Yes	No
A. Tender Programme	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
B. Outline method statement & resources, including proposed sub-contractors	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
C. Contractor's proposed team	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
D. Contractor's design team, where relevant	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
E. Contractor's design proposals (for design & build)	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
F. Employment and Skills Plan	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
G. Social & Economic Value	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>

7.1	Do you feel that there others that we should consider?
Comments:	

Which of the following quality criteria for **two** stage call offs would you use?

Quality Criteria (two stage)	Comments	
A) The Contractor's proposed team including design team where applicable (expertise/experience etc).	Yes <input type="checkbox"/>	No <input type="checkbox"/>
B) Adequacy of the Contractor's proposed resources and supply chain	Yes <input type="checkbox"/>	No <input type="checkbox"/>
C) Contractors proposals to meet or improve on the notified completion date:	Yes <input type="checkbox"/>	No <input type="checkbox"/>
D) Contractors proposals to meet or improve on the notified estimate for the Works	Yes <input type="checkbox"/>	No <input type="checkbox"/>
E) Potential to deliver added value	Yes <input type="checkbox"/>	No <input type="checkbox"/>

F) The Contractor's initial assessment of contract risks and proposals to mitigate these.	Yes <input type="checkbox"/>	No <input type="checkbox"/>
G) Ability to meet Employment and Skills outputs	Yes <input type="checkbox"/>	No <input type="checkbox"/>

7.2	Do you feel that there others that we should consider?
Comments:	

Social Value

It is intended that the proposed frameworks will offer users the opportunity to contribute to their social value agenda by offering support to a number of key initiatives, please indicate the importance of these to your organisation.

8.1	Contractors that are committed to delivering project specific Employment and Skills outputs. E.g. Apprenticeships, school/site visits, work experience placements and employment opportunities	1. Unimportant	<input type="checkbox"/>
		2. Minor importance	<input type="checkbox"/>
		3. Moderate importance	<input type="checkbox"/>
		4. Significant importance	<input type="checkbox"/>
		5. Critically important	<input type="checkbox"/>

8.2	Contractors that are committed to reducing carbon	1. Unimportant	<input type="checkbox"/>
		2. Minor importance	<input type="checkbox"/>
		3. Moderate importance	<input type="checkbox"/>
		4. Significant importance	<input type="checkbox"/>
		5. Critically important	<input type="checkbox"/>

8.3	Requiring Contractors to reduce waste to landfill (where applicable).	1. Unimportant	<input type="checkbox"/>
		2. Minor importance	<input type="checkbox"/>
		3. Moderate importance	<input type="checkbox"/>
		4. Significant importance	<input type="checkbox"/>
		5. Critically important	<input type="checkbox"/>

8.4	Requiring Contractors to minimise their impact on the environment e.g. by adopting the Yorkshire Wildlife Guidelines	1. Unimportant	<input type="checkbox"/>
		2. Minor importance	<input type="checkbox"/>
		3. Moderate importance	<input type="checkbox"/>
		4. Significant importance	<input type="checkbox"/>
		5. Critically important	<input type="checkbox"/>

8.5	Operating a Regeneration Fund into which Contractors donate cash and/or resource to support local regeneration projects across the region.	1. Unimportant	<input type="checkbox"/>
		2. Minor importance	<input type="checkbox"/>
		3. Moderate importance	<input type="checkbox"/>
		4. Significant importance	<input type="checkbox"/>
		5. Critically important	<input type="checkbox"/>

8.6	Operating a Supply Chain Engagement Programme to create work opportunities for subcontractors and suppliers	1. Unimportant	<input type="checkbox"/>
		2. Minor importance	<input type="checkbox"/>
		3. Moderate importance	<input type="checkbox"/>
		4. Significant importance	<input type="checkbox"/>
		5. Critically important	<input type="checkbox"/>

8.7	What, if any, other social value outcomes would you like to be provided by the frameworks?
Comments:	

Final comments

Are there any final comments you would like us to take account of when designing/procuring these new frameworks?

Comments:

Thank you for completing this survey. Please return to fergus.aitken@eastriding.gov.uk by Friday 11th January 2019