

## **PROCUREMENT OF NATIONAL EMERGENCY MORTUARY ARRANGEMENTS: OVERVIEW REPORT FOR COMMERCIAL DIRECTORATE**

### **Introduction**

as part of the Mass Fatalities work-stream, led by the Home Office, this procurement aimed to put in place national arrangements for an emergency mortuary as part of the response to a mass fatality incident.

### **The Requirement**

The requirement, as set out in the invitation to tender, was for the provision of temporary structures to serve as an emergency mortuary. Also included in the invitation to tender were the provision of: storage, maintenance and delivery to any Local Authority in England and Wales within 24 hours of being called, and the provision of an all-hours call-out service. We aimed to have national arrangements operational by March 2006.

### **Cost Estimate and Project Management**

Based on costs provided to consultants engaged to report on best value options for provision of this service, we estimated costs at between £250k and £1m per year on the basis that the suppliers would make the equipment available in return for payment of a retainer fee. In fact, all suppliers required payment of a one-off up-front capital investment of between £1.6 and 4.2m in addition to a retainer fee.

Financial approval has been obtained (submission to Hazel Blears from Richard Kornicki dated 16 February 2006) and funds are available, though costs will be spread over two years.

Mike Gillespie is the project sponsor. Matthew Bird is the project manager. Kerry Chaplin is the work-stream manager.

### **The Procurement Process**

A procurement strategy was submitted to Commercial Directorate on 24 September 2005 and approved. The contract was advertised on BIP Solutions (Government Opportunities) and interested suppliers were invited to complete a pre-qualification questionnaire by 11 November 2005.

Expressions of interest were received from the following suppliers, who were sent a PQQ: PKL; AFOS; Normeca; De Boer; Field and Lawn; Alaska; LEEC; Moonburst Structures; Airegroup; Mac Containers; Mr Box; Ascot Structures; Greek Logistics KBR

Commercial Directorate carried out a financial assessment and of the suppliers who expressed an interest, Normeca AS; Aire Group Ltd; AFOS Ltd; Field & Lawn; PKL Group; Mr Box Ltd; Kellogg Brown And Root; And LEEC Ltd were sent an invitation to tender on 2 December 2005 containing a request that tenders be received by 6 January 2006. This deadline was later amended to 20 January 2006 due to suppliers' submissions concerning the short period for preparation of tenders due to the holidays over the Christmas period. De Boer Structures (UK) Ltd. were also later sent an ITT despite failing the financial assessment due to their position as the current supplier and their good performance record.

Tenders were received via Bravosolutions e-procurement portal on 23<sup>rd</sup> January 2006. An evaluation panel was formed comprising the following individuals:

- ❖ Matthew Bird – Home Office – Chair

- ❖ XXXXXXXXXXXXI - Consultant Pathologist
- ❖ Chief Inspector XXXXXXXX – XXXXXXXX Police Mortuary Manager
- ❖ XXXXXXXXXX – Metropolitan Police Service
- ❖ XXXXXXXXXX – London Borough of XXXXXXXXX Mortuary Manager
- ❖ XXXXXXXXXX – London Borough of XXXXXXXXXXXXX Mortuary Manager

Each tender was allocated to a member of the evaluation panel for appraisal and scoring against pre-determined criteria set out in the matrix below.

Criteria:	Explanation:
<b>Quality</b>	
Service proposal	
1. Understanding of requirement	<p>Important that the service proposal demonstrates that the bidder has understood the requirement. This will be demonstrated within the service proposals and should show that appropriate issues (that bidders would be expected to be aware of) have been considered and that overall the approach gives confidence as to the ability to deliver.</p> <p>Weighting = 3</p>
2. Specification – buildings (see separate 'supplier evaluation matrix')	<p>Does the supplier's proposal include provision of all the buildings set out in specification (e.g. reception; body storage; autopsy and identification; office space etc.)? If not, does the proposal include a satisfactory explanation of reasons they are not provided AND an alternative solution?</p> <p>Each area which is not included where an acceptable alternative solution is not proposed should result in the deduction of 1 point from the maximum score of ten points.</p> <p>Weighting = 5</p>
3. Specification – services (see separate 'supplier evaluation matrix')	<p>Does the supplier's proposal include provision of all the necessary services associated with the running of the emergency mortuary (e.g. ability to chill body storage area; provision of frozen storage for up to 300 bodies; air-conditioning; air purification etc.)? If not, does the proposal include a satisfactory explanation of the reasons they are not provided AND an alternative solution?</p> <p>Does the supplier's proposal include provision of all 'activation inclusions' (provision of power generation; generators; back-up generators; linkage to water mains / waste; installation of lighting; security of site), including management of any sub-contractors? If not, does the proposal include a satisfactory explanation of the reasons they are not provided AND an alternative solution?</p> <p>Does the proposal include all the 'inclusions throughout buildings' (e.g. lighting; hard-flooring; carpeting / partitioning)? If not, does the proposal include a satisfactory explanation of the reasons they are not provided AND an alternative solution?</p> <p>Each area which is not included where an acceptable alternative solution is not proposed should result in the deduction of 1 point from the maximum score of ten points.</p> <p>Weighting = 5</p>
4. Specification – ancillary services (see separate 'supplier evaluation matrix')	<p>Does the supplier's proposal include provision of all ancillary services associated with the running of the emergency mortuary (e.g. toilets; catering showers; changing area)? If not, does the proposal include a satisfactory explanation of the reasons they are not provided AND an alternative solution?</p> <p>Each area which is not included where an acceptable alternative solution is not proposed should result in the deduction of 1 point from the maximum score of ten points.</p> <p>Weighting = 5</p>
5. Specification – delivery and decommissioning (see separate 'supplier evaluation matrix')	<p>Does the supplier's proposal include credible proposals for delivery of the required structures and their construction within the time-limits specified (ke structures within 24 hours; other structures within 72 hours), and their decommissioning?</p> <p>Each area which is not included where an acceptable alternative solution is</p>

matrix')	not proposed should result in the deduction of 1 point from the acceptable score of seven points. Weighting = 5
6. Approach to stakeholder management	Supplier will be required to be involved in stakeholder management / engagement throughout the contract. Are there proposals for how this would be approached (including resources), have issues been considered? Weighting = 3
7. Quality of staff	Are the staff proposed for the project of a high quality? This area is to be separated into technical ability and experience. Technical ability weighting =1 Experience weighting =2
<b>Risk:</b>	
8. Management of perceived risks & approach	Have appropriate risks been identified? Has a sound approach to managing these been identified, with responsibilities clearly allocated to an individual? Weighting = 2
<b>Delivery:</b>	
9. Perceived "achievability" of proposals	Taking into account all the areas set out above, do the proposals suggest that the bidder has the capability to deliver the requirement and are proposals realistic? Weighting = 3

Members of the panel submitted their appraisal of each supplier's proposal to the Chair for review. An evaluation meeting was held on 2 February 2006 at which each member made a presentation of the tender he had evaluated and explained his reasons for reaching his scores. The tenders were then discussed and a consensus mark agreed upon for each tender. It was decided that a cut-off would be drawn at 300. Suppliers who had scored more than 300 would be invited to interview in order to provide further clarifications of their bid and any other details required.

Tender	Weighted Score (x/360)	Comments / Feedback	Interview
De Boer Structures (UK) Ltd	327	Amply evidenced demonstrating understanding of the requirements; technical ability; stakeholder involvement; vast experience but very much centred in a few key individuals; risks and mitigations identified; all key specifications provided.	yes
Kellogg Brown and Root	311	Very impressive bid. Minor amendments required to some areas of design but all elements of specification provided plus additional thought given to other elements e.g. trackway and deployment of storage to site. Impressive and vast experience of deploying temporary structures at very short notice to hostile environments. No direct experience of mortuary management but have addressed this through engaging with Kenyons. Very impressive project planning and contingency arrangements. Risk management outlined well but stakeholder management could do with some work.	yes

<p>PKL</p>	<p>270</p>	<p>This was in many ways an interesting and innovative solution. However, the panel did not feel that the tender adequately dealt with some logistical problems, or dealt sufficiently sensitively with other issues related to the process (family viewing located next to the embalming area), which demonstrated a lack of understanding. While the panel was impressed with some aspects of logistics, (cascading systems; contingency planning) it was not convinced that what had been designed would do the job without fundamental redesign, especially around autopsy, family viewing and ancillary services. Identification of and a plan for managing risks was lacking, as was an understanding of issues around stakeholder management. Despite being among the more expensive of the tenders, additional funding was required for generators and storage.</p>	<p>no</p>
<p>LEEC / Yorkon / Ably Consortium</p>	<p>259</p>	<p>This was an interesting tender adopting a consortium approach between the three named companies. Good innovation was evidenced but ultimately this was untested and unproven. The panel considered that several aspects of the proposal would need to be clarified and potentially redesigned, leading to additional cost and delay. The panel noted particularly, the lack of security fencing; lack of clarity around the deployment and decommissioning plans; no clear indication of how the interface between the three tendering companies would be managed; some understanding of managing relevant risks through design but no clear assessment of risk nor responsibility for managing risk (the panel noted in particular, the companies' failure to identify their lack of experience as a risk; lack of a clear timetable and milestones.</p>	<p>no</p>
<p>Field and Lawn</p>	<p>211</p>	<p>The panel considered that the bid demonstrated a limited understanding of the processes involved in an emergency mortuary. The company did not seem certain it could deliver the required service. The tender itself appeared to doubt that the body storage area would be capable of maintaining constant chilled temperatures; and to doubt whether delivery and construction could take place within 24 hours. Stakeholder and risk management had not been considered. While there was clear evidence of staff's experience and ability in erecting temporary structures for other purposes, no evidence was presented of any experience in this field or other areas of disaster response, nor of any plan or intention to obtain</p>	<p>no</p>

	such experience.	
--	------------------	--

Normeca	200	While there was clear evidence of the company's experience in South East Asia, the bid was poor, consisting of a collection of apparently unconnected documents and assurances that the desired service can be achieved. Some requirements were either not considered or dismissed as unnecessary (tracking; covered walkways). Additional funding was required in order to meet other requirements (3m height fencing). Repeated assurances that the requirements of the specification would be met but without any evidence to support those statements did not inspire confidence. There was little evidence of understanding the UK context; nor of stakeholder / risk management plans.	no
---------	-----	--	----

De Boer Structures (UK) Ltd. and Kellogg Brown and Root (KBR) were invited to attend a meeting for the purpose of bid clarification on 14 February 2006. Kellogg Brown and Root were subsequently invited to provide further bid clarification on 28 February. Following bid clarifications a marginal preference developed for KBR. De Boer has the greater experience of deploying emergency mortuaries, though its primary area of expertise is general temporary structures. Its bid was considered to be fit for purpose but there was concern that its advantage, in terms of experience, could be lost if certain key individuals were to move on. KBR also had considerable experience of deploying temporary structures and has a number of contracts with other Government Departments. It has experience of deploying at very short notice, and to hostile environments. Its project plans appear better developed and its corporate structure more resilient. The bid from KBR also offered better value to Central Government, thereby sharing the risk more equally with Local Authorities who may deploy the structures in due course.

A preliminary decision was taken to pursue the bid from KBR. Due to the increased level of expenditure incurred by contracting with any of these suppliers, Ministerial Approval was sought in a submission to Hazel Blears dated 16 February from Richard Kornicki, Director of Specialist Crime. Ministerial approval was received on 3 March 2006.