

SKUESPILHUSET

Theatre Machinery Upgrade and Control replacement for the Playhouse

Invitation to Tender

Theatre Engineering Consultant

Project Information

The Royal Danish Theatre (DKT) are looking to replace the stage engineering control system and upgrade some of the stage machinery in their Playhouse venue in Copenhagen, Denmark.

DKT undertake Project Management duties and to coordinate the appointment of the Theatre Engineering Consultant for the works.

The scope of service requirement is set out in *Scope of Services.pdf*

Capability Assessment

Theatre Engineering Consultants will be appointed for the duration of the works.

1. Confirm your proposed team for this commission, including CV's detailing their relevant qualifications and experience designing technical solutions for stage engineering systems with particular focus on machinery control and safety.

Weighting 20%

2. Outline your approach to developing an initial options appraisal with particular focus on structured and proven methodologies for requirements capture. Describe how you would support the development of design and cost information throughout the design phases.

Weighting 20%

3. Provide examples and references for three similar projects you have undertaken which demonstrates your suitability for the role with particular focus on refurbishments.

Weighting 10%

Consultants will be invited to attend an interview.

Please note interviews are likely to be held at the Skuespilhuset. Kvæsthusgade 10, 1250 København, Denmark between 24.09.2020 – 28.09.2020.

The interviews will be scored and carry a weighting of 10%. The agenda for the interviews will be detailed in a supplementary issue to shortlisted tenderers

The scoring will be split **40%** Price; **50%** Quality, **10%** Interview.

It will be expected that only the actual consultant personnel carrying out and undertaking the

work attend the interview. The interview will be scored on this basis.

Indicative dates and periods for consultant tendering and appointment:

Activity	Duration	Start	Finish
ITT release	1 day	24.08.2020	
Response period	20 days		19.09.2020
Tender submission	1 day		20.09.2020
Evaluation	5 days	21.09.2020	27.09.2020
Interview period	3 days	24.09.2020	28.09.2020
Appointment	1 day		30.09.2020

Fee Assessment

On the basis of a DKK capital project, please provide fixed fee for your Services and any headline assumptions which inform the fee budget.

All fees are to be inclusive of all normal disbursements and expenses.

Stage	Lump Sum Fee (DKK)	Assumptions
Concept Design		
EU Tender preparation		
Construction		
Onsite inspection (travel expenses not to be included)		
Handover and Close Out		
ITT TOTAL (Exc VAT)		

Total Weighting 40%

Please also provide a schedule of Day Rates for the following grades within your organisation:

1. Director
2. Associate Director
3. Senior Design Consultant
4. Design Consultant

The client will select the consultant based on the Most Economically Advantageous tender including the best qualified and most experienced on the basis of the ITT submitted. All bidders will be notified by email.

Response and Contact Details

Responses to be received by e-mail to Søren Nylin SONY@kglteater.dk no later than

12:00 on the 19.09. 2020. All responses to be compiled into PDF format.

Access

An open day will be held at the Skuespilhuset. Kvæsthusgade 10, 1250 København, Denmark on 09.09 2020 between 16:00 and 19:00 hours.

To book a visit, please contact Søren Nylin SONY@kglteater.dk

Clarifications

All Clarifications to be received by sony@kglteater.dk 48 hrs prior to the tender return deadline.

Scoring methodology

Table 1. Scoring criteria table

The scoring method for the Service / Quality elements uses a linear points-based scale as described in the table below:

Points Score	Score Band	Score Description Guide
0	Fail	No response provided
1	Unsatisfactory	Does not meet any of the Client's requirements
2	Very Weak	Falls significantly short of meeting the Client's requirements
3	Weak	Achieves a basic minimum standard but falls moderately short of meeting the Client's requirements
4	Poor	Achieves a basic minimum standard but falls slightly short of meeting the Client's requirements
5	Acceptable	Probably meets the Client's requirements but some concerns and/or inference has had to be made by evaluator as some minor points not fully demonstrated / evidenced
6	Satisfactory	Satisfactorily meets the Client's requirements and is supported by clear evidence
7	Good	Slightly exceeds requirements and will bring some added value / benefit to Client
8	Very Good	Exceeds requirements and will bring moderate added value / benefit to the Client
9	Outstanding	Considerably exceeds requirements and will bring significant added value / benefit to Client
10	Exceptional	Perfect Model submission significantly exceeding requirements in all respects and will bring very significant added value / benefit to Client

Tenderer Pre-qualification questionnaire:

The Client will request tenderers to complete a pre-qualification questionnaire (typically Appendix C1) to demonstrate a tenderer's capability and eligibility to perform the contractual obligations. Following evaluation of the completed pre-qualification questionnaires, those that fail any question from the pass/fail section will be precluded from the procurement process.

Evaluating Tender Responses:

The Client's evaluation panel will review / assess and rank all compliant bids pursuant to the evaluation criteria as set out in the tender documentation. Tenders received after the specified deadline will not be evaluated.

Evaluation Criteria:

The Client will identify the Most Economically Advantageous Tender (MEAT) on the basis of the Best Price Quality Ratio over the contract lifetime.

The evaluation criteria will be based on a pre-determined percentage split of the Cost and Service Quality elements of the tender brief. The % percentage split will be set out in the Invitation to Tender (ITT) for example, 40% Cost vs. 60% Service / Quality.

Sub-criteria % weightings will be applied to specific elements of the Cost and Service / Quality for example, the Service / Quality element (60%) may be divided into 4 sub-elements each weighted at 10%; similarly, the Cost element (40%) may have 2 sub-elements worth 30% and 10% respectively.

Scoring Methodology:

Cost:

The Client uses the Standard differential model for evaluating price:

$$\frac{\text{Lowest Price}}{\text{Bidder's Price}} \times \text{Available Marks} = \text{Score}$$

The standard differential model is a form of relative scoring formula, that is, the price elements of each tender are scored in relation to each other.

Client reserves the right not to accept any tender or award a contract. Where an abnormally low tender (price) is received the Client may seek clarification the project will be delivered at the tendered price. Following such clarification, the Client's evaluation panel reserves the right to eliminate any bidder that has submitted a non-compliant bid.

The Cost element will be evaluated as demonstrated in the following examples:

The lowest compliant price is set as the denominator to compare the other bids, for example, bid A is DKK100 = 100% and compares to another bid B of DKK120 as $\text{DKK100}/\text{DKK120} \times 100\% = 83\%$.

If the weighting for the Cost element is 50%, Bid A scores $100\% \times 50\% = 50\%$ and B bid DKK120 achieves 41.5% (83% of 50%).

Service / Quality:

All Service Quality questions in the tenderer's response proforma have a weighted score per main element (Service-Quality) and by sub-question.

Application: Each question set in the tenderer's response has an overall weighting out of 100% as set out in the ITT evaluation criteria.

The evaluation panel will assess tenderers responses and apply a points score (0 to 10) based on the characteristics described in the above Table 1.

The points score will be factored against the % weighting set for each Service-Quality question, for example, a tenderer's response to a question weighted at 20% that is scored by the evaluation panel at 7(Good) out of 10 points, would achieve a total score of $7/10(0.7) \times 20\% = 14\%$.

Overall Scores / Ranking:

The total overall % scores (out of 100%) will be ranked in descending order and the tenderer who achieves the highest % score will be first placed and subject to contract be the successful awarded tenderer.

Tied bid for 1st place: In the event of a tie for first place between compliant bids, the evaluation panel will take into consideration the ratio % between the Cost score and Service Quality score of the tied bids. The tenderer with the highest score for the highest weighted elements of the Cost and Service Quality elements will be deemed the winner and awarded the Contract, for example if the tender is weighted in favour of Cost then the bidder with highest cost score will be judged the winner. Similarly, if the tender is weighted in favour of Service /Quality then the bidder with the highest Service Quality score will be judged the winner.

If this fails to split the tied bids (because the Cost/Service /Quality ratio are identical), then the evaluation panel will then compare the scores ratios with the tenderer achieving the highest scores for the highest weighted sub-questions being judged the winner.

All tenderers/interested parties will be advised of our award decision in line with our tender timeline set out in the tender documentation. Due to the commercial interests of all tenderers the Client will not disclose detailed information of the winning/unsuccessful bids to other parties involved in the bid process, subject to any of the obligations under the Freedom of Information Act 2000. However, a summary of tender scores will be made available.

The Client does not undertake to accept the lowest nor any tender and reserves the right without liability to Tenderers (including without limitation liability for any bid costs):

- a) to make a joint award
- b) To exclude a tender as non-compliant following bid distribution analysis
- c) to cancel or withdraw from the tender process at any stage
- d) not to award a contract for the services described
- e) to require Tenderers promptly to clarify their Tender in writing (by email) and or provide additional information and
- f) to amend the terms of the ITT including proposed timescales

The Client reserves the right to reject a Tender where:

- a) such Tender is submitted after the submission deadline, is completed incorrectly, is materially incomplete or otherwise fails to meet the requirements set out in this ITT or any other requirements that have been notified to Tenderers;
- b) any of the circumstances set out in Public Contracts Regulations 2015 entitling the Client to disqualify the Tenderer apply to the Tenderer at any stage during the tender process regardless of whether or not such Regulations apply to this tender process;
- c) the tenderer is guilty of material misrepresentation in relation to its Tender submission and/or the process;
- d) the Tenderer contravenes any of the requirements of this ITT;
- e) the Tenderer fails to respond promptly and adequately to any reasonable request from the Client for clarification or additional information;
- f) there is a change in identity, control, financial standing or other factor impacting on the selection and/or evaluation process affecting the Tenderer; or
- g) such Tender is submitted on terms that amend those set out by the Client in this ITT including but not limited to the terms and conditions of contract,

The rejection of a Tender will not prejudice any other remedy civil or otherwise available to the Client.

The ITT shall not confer any contractual rights on Tenderers.