

Tender clarification questions and responses

23rd January 2017

Support for the London Borough of Redbridge to restrict kerbside residual waste collections: Reference 2016/17 - 15

The deadline for clarification questions has passed. Below are clarification questions we received and our responses:

1. In terms of delivery, does LWARB advocate the use of WRAPs KAT tool, or is this open to the bidder?
Response: *This is open to the bidder*
2. Is the tour of the authority to be included in the pricing schedule?
Response: *Yes, please include this as a half day based on the staff from your organisation who will attend*
3. Would be possible to give us some indication of the budget parameters for this project?
Response: *We do not have a specific budget in mind for this work. We would like bidders to specify how they will fulfil the brief and how much that will cost. We will then evaluate all bids on the basis of criteria and weightings shown on page 6 of the brief.*
4. Your third bullet point in section 4 appears to be missing either text or a further bullet point. Could you please confirm.
Response: *We removed the fourth bullet point but didn't remove the 'and' at the end of the third bullet.*
5. Further to section 4, first bullet point, Could LB Redbridge provide an indication of the number of options for restricting kerbside residual waste that it expects to be reviewed?
Response: *Redbridge currently use sacks for their residual waste and so the key option to address is the introduction of containerisation (bins) for residual. Other options for restricting residual would also be welcomed such as reducing the number of sacks or using clear sacks, however, there isn't a limit to the number of options that could be put forward.*
6. In relation to section 4, second bullet point, could LB Redbridge please provide further details on this requirement. Is this a review of the impact on kerbside recycling as a result of the options for restricting residual waste?
Response: *Primarily, yes. The increase in recycling would be related to the restriction of the residual waste, as the options for changing the recycling service are very limited due to the issue relating to the gate fees.*
7. In relation to section 4, third bullet point, is the requirement for an assessment of re-procurement options (i.e. method of procurement) or an assessment of the impact of modelled residual waste restriction on tender prices?
Response: *The council doesn't need the options relating to the different type of procurement and they want to retender the contract out externally as it is at the moment. They would like restricted residual service options modelled which could be included within the new tender. With regards to the vehicles, they would like different financial options modelled regarding ownership of the vehicles (whether they are owned by the Council or by the contractor) and responsibility for their maintenance. High level pros and cons and indicative costs are suitable for this report.*

8. Could I please request a full copy of the LWARB T&Cs documentation.

Response: *LWARB do not have a standard conditions. We will ask the successful supplier to provide their standard terms and conditions.*