

Audio Visual supply and system design integration and maintenance (AVI2003NE)

SUMMARY

Start date: 21st March, 2016

End date: 31st December, 2020

OJEU Number: 2015/S 225-409129

Lead Consortium: NEUPC

Main contact: Mark Hayter
m.hayter@neupc.ac.uk

Website:
<https://www.hecontracts.co.uk/agreements/332>

Lot 2 should be seen as a one stop shop, for all your AV needs, whereas Lot 1 is for supply only. The fact that Lot 1 exists, does not preclude purchasing product only from the Lot 2 suppliers. If you need to seek guidance on product selection, then Lot 2 is the correct route. Whilst it is a compliant approach to using the framework, NEUPC does not recommend using Lot 1 for supply only and then Lot 2 for installation only.

Not all suppliers are available to all institutions. Please refer to the Buyers' Guide for demarcation.

SCOPE

LOT 1: Supply only

LOT 2 - Supply, system design, integration and maintenance

AGREEMENT BENEFITS

Lot 1

- 9% Price versus market benefit
- 1% Cumulative volume rebates
- E-procurement and marketplace efficiencies

Lot 2

- 12% Direct price benefit
- 2% (representative) Cumulative volume rebates
- 20% (estimated) commitment efficiency benefit
- **Both Lots offer**
- Value added / Social Value benefits are offered
- You don't need to carry out a full EU tender, saving you money, time and resources
- Specification designed by higher education institutions to meet your needs
- Framework is compliant with EU procurement law, minimising your risk of litigation

USING THE FRAMEWORK

Call-off from this framework agreement is by combination of ranked and further-competition

Institutions will determine the correct lot to use when placing a call-off contract from the framework agreement by assessing their requirement against the available lots

Lot 2 should be seen as a one stop shop, for all your AV needs, whereas Lot 1 is for supply only. The fact that Lot 1 exists, does not preclude purchasing product only from the Lot 2 suppliers. If you need to seek guidance on product selection, then Lot 2 is the correct route. Whilst it is a compliant approach to using the framework, NEUPC does not recommend using Lot 1 for supply only and then Lot 2 for installation only.

Option One – Direct Award (Lot 2 only)

Institutions may contract directly with the first-ranked supplier, unless:

- The first ranked supplier confirms that they do not have capacity to undertake the work; or
- Cannot respond within the required timescales as detailed in the specification of requirements; or
- There are other relevant issues such as conflict of interest.

If any of these criteria are applicable, then the second ranked supplier should be appointed. If the second ranked supplier cannot meet the need (by reason of issues detailed above), the third ranked supplier should be approached and so on.

This award of a contract will take place after the institution has discussed its specific requirements with the supplier and agreement has been reached as to timescales, methodology/approach, specific service requirements and key milestones and performance indicators to be met. The Standard Terms and Conditions of any call-off contract shall be as those stated in the framework agreement and only minor points can be re-negotiated with the consent of the supplier and the institution such as Payment Terms. For individual assignments under longer term call-off contracts, instruction will be given and received as per the Specification of Requirements section of this ITT.

Option Two - Desktop Exercise

If time is of the essence and institutions are comfortable with the terms of the framework, and these do not require amendment or supplementary conditions then institutions may use a desktop calculator to amend the criteria to reflect their local requirements. This tool is available on UniBuy and in the [appendices to this guide](#). Based on the amended required weightings entered by the institution, the tool will recalculate the total overall score. Once complete, you should place your contract with the highest scoring supplier. This methodology is most likely to be relevant only to Lot 2.

Lot 1 is not ranked, and all suppliers are awarded with equal status. Accordingly, desktop exercise on Lot 1 is most likely to be a comparison of product pricing made available by NEUPC on UniBuy or via institutions' own e-procurement catalogues and marketplaces.

Option Three – Further-Competition

Institutions wishing to undertake a further-competition within a particular lot may do so. All the suppliers appointed to the relevant lot must be invited to submit responses to the institution's further-competition

The original framework agreement evaluation criteria should be applied in the further-competition tender document, though some of the criteria weightings may be adjusted in line with local institution requirements. As this is a Most Economically Advantageous Tender (MEAT) framework agreement, both technical and commercial evaluation criteria must be used in a further-competition tender process. A further competition based only on lowest cost is not permissible

Award criteria that can be used for evaluating further-competitions are:

Lot 1	Lot 2
Price	Price
E-procurement	Project management
Warranty support and handling claims	Innovation in design
Delivery times and geographical coverage	Engineering and installation service delivery
Stock holding	Post-sales support, warranty and maintenance
Delivery paperwork	Account management
Provision of management information	
Price list maintenance	

Notes for further competition:

- No additional criteria can be introduced.
- Sub-criteria under the criteria above can be introduced but must be relevant to the requirement and criteria. The weighting of the criteria can be amended depending on importance to the requirement and in line with the tender documentation.
- The same questions asked during the framework tender, should not be asked at further competition.
- Price agreed at framework award is capped, and will be the highest rate charged by a supplier at further competition stage.

SUPPLIERS

Lot	Suppliers
Lot 1 - Supply only	Comcen Computer Supplies Ltd, Stone Computers Ltd,
Lot 2 - Supply, system design, integration and maintenance	AV2000 Ltd, GV Multi Media Ltd, GV Multimedia Ltd. North West Office, IDNS Ltd, Nottingham Audio Visual Services Ltd, Nuway Audio Visual Limited, Pacific Computers Ltd, Pacific Computers Ltd t/a PacificWave, Pure AV Ltd, Roche Audio Visual, Saville Audio Visual, Softcat, Universal AV, Visavvi (Trading Name of the Saville Group Limited),

SUSTAINABILITY

Sustainability was used as a selection criterion.

All suppliers have demonstrated that they operate documented and audited environmental management systems aligned to ISO14001

Lot 1 suppliers are familiar with E-Procurement systems and e-marketplaces.

NEXT STEPS

Please read the Buyers' Guide for further details about using this Framework Agreement.