

Tender Specification Notice

Date: 03/11/2022

Mull and Iona Ferry Committee (MIFC) – Mull Ferry Services Study

1. You are hereby invited by MIFC to tender for the provision of consultancy detailed in Schedule 1 below.
2. Your submission must be in accordance with Schedule 1 and Schedule 2.
3. It is your responsibility to obtain, at your own expense, any additional information necessary for the preparation of your tender, and you will be responsible for any expenses incurred by you during the procurement process.
4. Your submission, consisting of Schedule 2, should be returned to Joe Reade, Chair. **Submissions received after the deadline (as shown in the “Anticipated Timescales and Deadlines” table) will not be accepted.**
5. All queries regarding this invite must be raised with Joe Reade, Chair of MIFC via email to joe@islandbakery.scot. Queries and responses will be shared with all bidders.
6. You are also asked to confirm whether, or not you will be submitting a bid by the time and date indicated in the “Anticipated Timescales and Deadlines” table.

Purpose

Mull and Iona Ferry Committee (MIFC) is looking to undertake a scoping/ initial feasibility study regarding the establishment of a company based on a community ownership model focused on the future provision of Oban-Craignure ferry services.

It is anticipated that a contract for this work will be awarded on or around **December 1st 2022** allowing the work to commence immediately thereafter. The work must be completed by **February 28th 2023**.

Context and Background

In 2021, Transport Scotland commissioned Ernst and Young to review governance arrangements between Transport Scotland, CMAL and CalMac (often referred to as “the tripartite”) in the delivery of ferry services. The review, named ‘Project Neptune’, had been tasked with considering “whether the arrangement between the tripartite bodies remains fit for purpose”. As per the specification requirements for the work, the remit includes reflecting on these arrangements in regard to ‘transparency and effectiveness’, ‘accountability and decision making’, ‘collaboration’, and ‘value for money’. In addition, the specification for the work includes consideration of ‘responsiveness to change’. This aspect of the specification includes the following: “Examine and identify governance and structure options for long term consideration to include an assessment of global best practice. This should include analysis of the challenges and opportunities associated with options for decentralisation (unbundling of routes into smaller packages)”.

The focus of this work being commissioned by Mull and Iona Ferry Committee (MIFC) is to explore decentralisation in the context of the Craignure-Oban service. More specifically, the work will provide an initial assessment of the feasibility, opportunities and challenges, of establishing a community owned ferry company with the intention of bidding for future contracts for the provision of the Craignure-Oban ferry services. This concept was first put forward as part of a wider vessel and services options study, ‘Transforming Mull’s Connectivity’ (2021), which was undertaken by Pedersen Consulting on behalf of MIFC. This new commission will build upon that analysis and explore the community ownership model in greater detail.

Given that a period of public consultation on Project Neptune has been announced, following the report’s publication, the study is intended to provide evidence that can help to inform the debate on the future of ferry services during the expected period of engagement by Scottish Government on any potential changes to the governance of Scotland’s ferries services.

Objectives

Objectives of the work will include:

- An options appraisal of the merits of all alternative legal structures for a community owned company in terms of raising finance, liability of directors and members, compatibility with Government ferry contracts (e.g. the Clyde and Hebrides Ferry Service (CHFS))
- Seek examples from the UK and beyond as case studies for community owned ferry companies
- An options appraisal of alternative operating regimes e.g. own and operate, own and lease on a bare ship basis
- Seek examples from the UK and around the world for operational regimes
- An analysis of Government policy and current contractual arrangements as would apply to operation of a community owned ferry(ies) on the Craignure-Oban route
- Identify Transport Planning Objectives (TPOs) for the delivery of Oban-Craignure ferry services, informed by analysis of transport problems and opportunities relating to Mull’s external connectivity. The TPOs should reflect economic, social and environmental considerations as well as transport connectivity aims.
- An options appraisal for the provision of Oban-Craignure ferry services. Options should include, but may not be limited to:
 - o The ‘status quo’ (i.e. continuation of the service as part of the existing single CHFS bundle)
 - o Unbundling of the route and operation by a commercial operator as part of a separate contract
 - o Unbundling of the route and operation by a community company as part of a separate contract
 - o Unbundling of the route and operation by a joint venture between a community company and a commercial operator as part of a separate contract
 - o A joint venture between a community company and a commercial operator as a sub-contractor to wider network operator (e.g. as a sub-contractor to CalMac Ferries Ltd)
 - o A community company as a sub-contractor to a wider network operator (e.g. as a sub-contractor to CalMac Ferries Ltd)

- An analysis of the contractual and operational relationships between a community company operating one ferry route, and larger entities (presumed to be CalMac Ferries Ltd) operating other parts of the network. This should include ticketing, marketing, relief cover and shore facilities.
- Assess each scenario against the TPOs, considering likely socio-economic benefits/disbenefits associated with each scenario.
- An initial assessment of the risks associated with each scenario.

Scope and methodology

The methodology for this work will be largely desk-based, supplemented with a small number (around 10) consultations. Consultees to be agreed at inception. Although this will not be a full STAG (Strategic Transport Appraisal Guidance) based study, the work should draw upon STAG principles.

This study is intended as an initial examination of community ownership models in the context of the Craignure - Oban ferry service, and it is not intended as a full feasibility study, nor will it make any final recommendations regarding the feasibility of such an arrangement. In essence, the purpose of this study is to establish enough information to determine whether this is a credible approach with the potential to improve services and should be taken forward for further analysis and discussion with Transport Scotland and Mull's communities. Any future detailed analysis would include consideration of the management/ governance case, commercial case, financial case as well as further consideration of potential benefits/disbenefits for Mull's economy and communities. Any further detailed analysis would also include extensive community consultation.

Budget

The maximum budget for this commission is £15,000. Travel and subsistence should be included. Your tender should include the costs associated with any specialist technical support.

Anticipated Timescales and Deadlines

Date of invitation	03/11/22
Confirmation of bidding status, i.e. submitting a bid or not	5pm, 28/11/2022
Last date to request clarifications	5pm, 02/12/22
Deadline for receipt of tender response	5pm, 09/12/22
Estimated date for award of commission	19/12/22
Estimated date to complete deliverables	17/03/22

Assumptions

Bidders will allow time for liaising with and reporting to MIFC throughout the contract on a regular basis. An inception meeting at the commencement of the contract will be required for you to agree a timeline with MIFC. Thereafter further meetings that are required should be agreed with the MIFC at an early stage.

Response

The following rules will be applied to all submissions:

- Schedule 2 should be used for your response.
- Tenders should be completed on the basis that none of the Evaluation Panel have any prior knowledge of either the bidder or of any previous projects used as evidence.

Evaluation

An evaluation of the responses received will be completed against a predefined quality/cost ratio as outlined below with each question weighted as shown.

CRITERIA		Weighting
1	Availability and Capacity	Pass/Fail
2	Conflict of Interest	
3	Methodological approach: a. understanding of the scope b. key tasks	45%
4	Resource allocation: a. Team - skills blend and experience b. Team - resource suitability	45%
5	Price	10%
Total		100%

Pass/Fail Criteria	
Pass	Quality Response is relevant and detailed. It is sufficiently comprehensive to demonstrate a good understanding and provides specific information on how the requirements will be fulfilled.
Fail	Quality Nil or inadequate response which is lacking in sufficient detail and therefore fails to demonstrate an ability to meet the requirements.

Please note that as part of the evaluation, MIFC may require clarification or ask for additional information regarding any part of your submission.

On completion of the evaluation process, the supplier with the highest score will be selected and awarded the contract. In the event of these scores being tied, the bidder with the highest quality score will be selected.

Scoring Methodology

The Quality elements of the Award Criteria will be marked by the Evaluation Panel using the 0-4 descriptions below.

Score	Criteria
0 Unacceptable	Nil or inadequate response which fails to demonstrate an ability to meet the requirement.
1 Poor	Response is partially relevant but generally poor. It addresses some elements of the requirement but contains insufficient/limited detail or explanation to demonstrate how the requirement will be fulfilled.
2 Acceptable	Response is relevant and acceptable. It addresses a broad understanding of the requirement but may lack details on how the requirement will be fulfilled in certain areas.
3 Good	Response is relevant and good. It is sufficiently detailed to demonstrate a good understanding and provides details on how the requirements will be fulfilled.
4 Excellent	Response is completely relevant and excellent overall. It is comprehensive, unambiguous and demonstrates a thorough understanding of the requirement and provides details of how the requirement will be met in full.

Award and Formal Acceptance of Call-Off Contract

On completion of the tender evaluation process, all participating bidders will be notified by e-mail regarding the outcome. MIFC reserves the right not to award a contract.

Invoicing Procedures

Payments will be made in arrears, on completion of the required commission or at agreed milestones over the duration of the contract. Payments will be based upon the day rate and the actual number of days worked, or by task as agreed in advance by MIFC.

Conflict of Interest

For any tender exercise it is essential that bidders do not have a conflict of interest which would prevent them from participating in the process and/or being awarded a contract. This could relate either to the situation at the bidding stage and/or during the ongoing management and delivery of any contract/s awarded.

Bidders are required to state any known conflict of interests as part of this tender response (see Schedule 2). In addition, any changes to circumstances relating to conflict of interest must be declared to MIFC as soon as an actual or perceived situation arises.

Conflict of interest relates to anyone involved in the management and/or delivery of the requirements including staff and/or sub-contractors. Interests may relate to MIFC and/or be financial or non-financial. There is a particular risk in respect of financial interests and in this situation there should be a presumption that the interest is material.

Publicity

Bidders should not release any information regarding this tender to any person or organisation (except as may be necessary for the delivery of the contract) without the prior written consent of MIFC. This restriction is also applicable to any advertising copy or promotional brochures for their own purposes or trade publications.

MINI-TENDER PROPOSAL

SCHEDULE 2

Project: Mull and Iona Ferry Committee (MIFC) – Mull Ferry Services Study

Please only complete this form if you have the requisite availability and capacity to complete the commission within the timescales indicated above.

Please provide the following background information:

Supplier name:	
-----------------------	--

Name of contact for this tender:	
---	--

<p>1. AVAILABILITY AND CAPACITY Please confirm your availability and capacity to complete commission within required timescales:</p>	<p>Yes <input type="checkbox"/> No <input type="checkbox"/></p>								
<p>2. CONFLICT OF INTEREST Please confirm whether you have any potential, actual or perceived conflicts of interest that may be relevant to this requirement.</p> <p>If the answer to the above question is ‘Yes’, please outline what safeguards you would/will be putting in place to mitigate the risk of actual or perceived conflicts arising during the delivery of these services.</p> <p>MIFC will review the mitigation in line with the identified conflict of interest, to determine what level of risk this poses to them. The final decision regarding the materiality of a conflict of interest rests with MIFC.</p> <p>Please refer to the Conflict of Interest section of the Specification Notice for further guidance.</p> <p>(max. 1/2 page)</p>	<p>Yes <input type="checkbox"/> No <input type="checkbox"/></p>								
<p>3. METHODOLOGICAL APPROACH</p> <p>(a) <u>Understanding of the scope</u> Provide details which clearly demonstrate your understanding of this specific requirement and the outputs required.</p> <p>(b) <u>Key Tasks</u> Provide a concise explanation of the methodology which you will use to deliver this specific requirement to ensure the objectives detailed in Schedule 1 are achieved. This should include a breakdown of key tasks, duration and timescales.</p> <p>(max. 3 pages)</p>									
<p>4. RESOURCE ALLOCATION</p> <p>a) <u>Team - skills blend and experience</u> Please provide details outlining the composition of all members of the delivery team. You should identify their roles and responsibilities.</p> <p>b) <u>Team - resource suitability</u> Provide an explanation which demonstrates to MICT that the requirements have been appropriately resourced to ensure the deliverables are efficiently met.</p> <p>(max. 2 pages)</p>									
<p>5. PRICE</p> <p>Please provide the following information:</p> <table border="1" style="width: 100%; border-collapse: collapse; margin-top: 10px;"> <thead> <tr style="background-color: #e0f7fa;"> <th style="width: 40%;">Role</th> <th style="width: 15%;">Day Rate</th> <th style="width: 15%;">Number of Days</th> <th style="width: 30%;">Total Cost</th> </tr> </thead> <tbody> <tr> <td style="height: 20px;"></td> <td></td> <td></td> <td></td> </tr> </tbody> </table>		Role	Day Rate	Number of Days	Total Cost				
Role	Day Rate	Number of Days	Total Cost						

Senior Executive, e.g. Commission Director			
Associate Executive, e.g. Commission Lead			
Technical Specialist, e.g. Commission Expert			
Analyst, e.g. Field or Desk Worker			
Administration Support			
Travel and Subsistence			
Total Days / Cost			

Pricing should fully reflect **all charges** to be included in your invoice to MIFC. Any assumptions should be stated in response to this question and **must** be appropriately costed.

(max. 1/2 page)