

Enhancements and Developments to Grenfell Tower

Notes on the evaluation of the PQQ

The following notes represent the average scores awarded by the KCTMO evaluators. Question 10.3 was evaluated in a meeting held on the 1st October. This was attended by two residents, David Gibson, Jenny Jackson and Claire Williams. The remaining questions were evaluated by Jenny Jackson and Claire Williams

Mulalley

Response to 10.2

The response is related to the projects provided in question 10.1 as requested.

The response suggests that Mulalley are proactive with statements such as “on all these projects **we** undertook initial discussions with British Gas” “**we** organised”. Mulalley state that they are a British Gas Eco funding partner (does this restrict approaching other funders?). The terminology used in the response, and the references to the different types of funding, indicates understand the area.

In general this was a satisfactory answer – the only query is whether, by being so “British Gas focused” we are ruling out other options? How do they do option appraisal to look at the benefits of various sources. What do they monitor before / after to show benefits?

Score 4

Response to 10.3

During pre-commencement they do not mention “mapping” the profile of the residents with the client / caretakers/ housing officers to tailor the response to the profile (e.g. high proportion of Somali background / high number of shift workers). Regular updates in but in what language? What about those who tend not to get involved or are illiterate. The response does refer to translation services. Due to noise there may be particular issues with shift workers and this is not referred to.

The response does not refer to a complaints procedure. *It is not clear how site issues are managed. There is reference to a coffee morning; how is the information passed back to the site team? There is no evidence of how they have changed their response after the interview with residents to reflect individual needs. They do not mention agreeing a core group of residents to review communication material.*

Like the reference to “Clean Team”

Score 3

Response to 10.4

It is considered good that the response refers to engaging with the supply chain and ensuring they understand the goals of project. Programme are referred to but no mention of the software used. No mention of identifying the items with long lead in periods or proposed any measures to mitigate against the risk of delays e.g. looking at elements of off- site construction / using construction equipment which is less likely to be affected by weather conditions.. No reference to a contingency

period for poor weather. The response contains lots of reference to n monitoring and recording but not as much on detail on mitigation. What practical measures have they introduced? If access to one property was delayed was there a bank of “void / easy access” so the programme was not interrupted? No mention of lean programming.

Score 3

Response to 10.5

This response is interesting but does not delve into **how** they worked closer with the supply chain – what was it that made the relationship work? Yes there appears to have been innovations but there is no explanation as to how Mulalley has encouraged these. We would have expected reference to shared goals, team approach, making key supply chain embers PPC2000 partners, shared savings, prompt payment terms, fair payment terms etc. We can see the outcome but not the process of **how** they made it happen. No reference to making consultants part of the team

Score 2

Response to 10.6

Good that the response refers to early meetings with the planners to clarify requirements. The responses explains the process used to get approval of materials (liaison with the residents first).

Score 4

Response to 10.7

The response uses examples from one of the projects in 10.1 as requested. The challenges are practical; good to see reference of consideration of the effect of the scaffolding on the residents (lack of light). The response refers to health and safety inspections of the scaffold. There is no mention of the risks of items being thrown / dropped by residents on to workmen below or recommending the residents inform insurers that the scaffold is in place (can invalidate some policies unless notified). No mention of how they stop children accessing the scaffold. No metion of wind speed / weather conditions having a particular issue on the works. Perhaps some / all these issues did not apply on this project.

Overall satisfactory; good that followed question and used an example.

Score 2

Response to 10.8

The response is linked to the example projects as requested in the question. It is good that the benefit is quantified – a reduction in average fuel bills £3k to £1k. All the examples provided are well explained and have benefits highlighted. Whislt the results of the innovation are evident it would have been useful if the response explained the background to how the innovations were proposed. What research and testing was done? In proposing these innovations did they take clients to see

similar installations / research centres. The question does refer to how the innovations were proposed.

Score 3

Response to 10.9

Good as clearly state that they adapted their proposals as a result of consultation with the other contractor. Response refers to on-going meeting and arrangements for deliveries. The response clearly shows relevant experience. No mention of potential sharing of some facilities – e.g. the same waste management contractor to reduce traffic movements, having out of hours contact numbers, or how issues such as noise complaints were dealt with (how was it made clear to neighbours which contractor to contact).

Score 3

Response to 10.10

This is a good response, related back to the sample projects as requested. The response shows a wide range of experience – from assistance with CV writing to training, apprentices and environmental advice. It is unclear how much of the enthusiasm was generated by the existing organisations – such as Build2Work. However the language shows an understanding of the issues and type of work. It is good to see some “outcome figures” on the numbers in work etc. There is no mention of supporting local businesses as part of the projects and – more importantly - no reference to sitting down with the client at the beginning of the processes to try and map the type of benefit the community needed.

Score 4

Response to 10.11

Given the quality of the previous responses this is slightly disappointing. The question specifically asks for the response to be based on the sample projects in 10.1 and the majority of the response is an explanation of the processes with only a small reference back to these projects at the end of the response. There is a reference to “85% recycled in one quarter” – this does not mean a huge amount. What type of waste? How was it recycled? The response focuses on waste but the question also asks about “environmental improvements”. I appreciate that the projects are in urban areas however there is still a need to consider the wildlife. Was this taken into account in considering the location of the site huts / protecting tree and gardens? Did the site accommodation use recycled water etc?

Score 3

Wates

Response to 10.2

Good that the response refers to managing the whole process.

Most of projects referred to are in the North (with the exception of Luton) – do they have suitable skills in the South?

Use the right terminology

Good that refers to “energy providers” – not being directed solely to British Gas. How do they do an option appraisal of the different energy providers to identify the “best deal”? What do they measure before and afterwards to see the benefits obtained?

We needed more information in the response on case studies.

Score 3

Response to 10.3

Good that the response refers to resident profiling – slightly limited in referring to elderly and vulnerable and how to communicate with them using family and friends. What about wider profiling? Shift workers?

Good that the response refers to surgeries and phone calls – not reliant on written communication.

Good that refers to complaints procedure – but just a reference to the document. No detail. It would be useful to expand and explain how this procedure worked.

No resident satisfaction surveys / monitoring feedback and no figures from projects.

Like the reference in the response to the comments book and the personal visit of the RLO.

No information on how do they work with residents to agree the residents pack.

Score 4

Response to 10.4

Wates refer to discussing the programme with the client but do not mention the supply chain. How do the supply chain influence / understand goals? No mention of risk based approach. No mention of identifying long delivery items. Good reference to re-scheduling but could have been more detailed.

Score 2

Response to 10.5

Mention at length how the supply chain are selected (which was not the question) but no information on how they encourage their contribution to the project. Details of the results of the

relationship in terms on innovation but nothing on how Wates have made the relationship work – partnering approach, shared savings, involvement in the team, early payment.

How did they promote the “effective working” –shared offices, particularly with the design teams during the detailed design?

Score 2

Response to Question 10.6

No mention of working with suppliers and the Planning Authority early in the process so that materials could be agreed ahead of required time to avoid delay. The response does refer to early engagement with the planning officer and the creation of a planning tracker. Further detail needed

Score 3

Response to 10.7

The response makes reference to the need to stop unauthorised access to the scaffold. There is reference to weather but insufficient details “certain weather conditions will impact on the works so they are assessed for their impact on the work” – on these projects what was the result of this assessment and what measures were taken as a result of it? Not clear why they refer to language issues – this question is focused on high rise buildings. No mention of considering effect on residents e.g lack of light / privacy or communication re insurance.

Score 2

Response to 10.8

This is interesting as it shows a wide range of innovations – including broad band and phones - rather than concentrating on environmental issues. The response lacks some background detail on how the innovations were proposed. What research was done / how were the client / planners and resident concerns addressed?

Score 3

Response to 10.9

The response refers to joint planning and meetings. Good reference to shared welfare facilities – how did this come about? Insufficient detail – who organised the meetings / who did neighbours contact re issues? Did they share designs or just programmes?

Score 3

Response to 10.10

The response demonstrates a wide range of social engagement – from community projects to apprenticeships and assistance in finding work. The response does not detail how the initiatives were determined – what research / discussions were held to understand the type of support needed by the different clients. Some evidence of outcomes but limited

Score 2

Response to 10.11

This response is very focused on waste management and there is no mention of general environmental improvements. How were trees protected / how was the area for the site compound selected? What was done to minimise dust and noise? The information on waste management is good. It would be useful to have more practical examples of how waste was avoided.

Score 3

Durkan

Response to 10.2

Member of the British Gas Construction Partnership however the response indicates that we are not being “directed” down the British Gas route as refer to EON and Scottish Power).

The question specifically asks for the response to give examples from the case studies provided. Other than a fleeting reference to Coventry Cross Project in Bow there are no examples from previous projects. How many have they actually done? Good explanation of the system but we were asking for examples of experience. How do they do the option appraisal between the different funding options to identify “best value”? What do they monitor before / after the scheme to show benefits?

Why is there a picture of two young men at the end of the response? The young men did not look cold or worried about fuel poverty. Use images where relevant otherwise leave out.

Score 2

Response to 10.3

Good that the response refers to recognising different groups – and indicates that they recruit locally to have a RLO team that reflect the ethnicity of the resident groups. However there is no reference to resident profiling - engaging with Housing Officers to understand the background to the estate before the work commenced.

Recognise disruption – noise / dust. Recognise importance of sub-contractors having the same ethos.

No mention of complaints procedure / resident feedback KPIs. Not innovative in establishing how communication would be managed. Refer to “safeguards” but do not explain what these are. Refer to “security measures” –but again there is no detail what these are.

No statistics on engagement or performance.

Score 3

Response to 10.4

Good that that the response refers to the supply chain and a risk register. Subsidiary programmes for critical path elements. No specific examples of how the risk register worked. Access to individual properties was not an issue on the example used as it was not occupied. What contingency? What key risks were identified and what were the proposed mitigation measures?

Score 2

Response to 10.5

This response refers to intergrated supply chain and early involvement but does not explain HOW Durkan worked effectively with the supply chain (sharing offices / using the same software/ shared

training?) or how they encouraged this information to work. No reference to sharing information on project goals / early payment terms / etc. The examples of the innovation achieved are good and relevant but there is insufficient information on the processes used to develop this relationship.

Score 3

Response to 10.6

Evidence of good experience relating back to the Bauhuas development in Croydon. Clearly explained the process and showed good levels of understanding. The response relates the planning issues to the programme issues and the construction methodology. The response refers to the relationship between the architects and the planners.

Score 4

Response to 10.7

Response refers to the scaffolding being alarmed to avoid intrusion and training for working at height. Consider the effect of wind speeds on materials (which is good) but not on the construction methods. The response is good but there are elements missing – consideration of the scaffold on the residents (light), advising re insurance, the risk of items being thrown.

Score 3

Response to 10.8

Good that the response refers to discussions with the supply chain and the client to propose changes but does not give details of the tests / research done. Good that the residents were involved and the benefits explained to them. Have the anticipated reductions in bills been achieved in reality? Interesting construction methodology at Arlington House.

Score 3

Response to 10.9

Good reference to projects – explaining that two of the three examples were not next to construction sites. Good reference to organised street cleaning and liaison. No reference to consideration of joint welfare / waste management services. Whilst there is reference to liaison unclear if programmes shared / drawings. No mention of out of hours numbers for adjoining contractors or clarity on which contractor neighbours are to contact.

Score 3

Response to 10.10

Whilst this response does indicate some of the issues – associated with a Bengali community not fully integrated into the wider community it does not explain what, if any, initial meetings took place with the client and community leaders to identify the issues and the support needed.

How have they “supported” the apprentices? Excellent that real examples used and that there are some statistics to support the results of the work. There is a reference to “unforeseen benefits” but it is difficult to evaluate these without understanding who has made the measurements and the comparisons. How would we know if life expectancy, for example, has improved?

Score 3

Response to 10.11

Good that statistics provided for each of the 3 sites used as examples. The response does not address the part of the project relating to environmental improvements. It is appreciated that these are urban sites but – what consideration was given to the siting of the welfare facilities to avoid damage to the flora and fauna? How were any trees protected? Was consideration given as to how to re-instate the landscaped areas following the works?

Score 3

Rydon

Responses to question 10.2

The question specifically asks for the response to be related back to the case studies as we are asking for experience. There is one fleeting reference to this in the final sentence. The terminology suggests that they understand the issue but we asked for experience relating to specific projects.

Score 2

Response to 10.3

Good reference in the response to resident profiling. Refer to resident satisfaction surveys. Rydon has made an effort to explain their experience on projects used as case studies. There is a lot of emphasis in community schemes – decorating resident rooms but could have expanded on how communication was managed. What about shift workers? No reference to complaints procedure. Refer to residents helping prepare the documentation. Like reference to residents monitoring the quality of the works.

No mention of means of communication / complaints procedure

Score 3

Response to 10.4

Good that the response mentions weather and take this into account in sequencing. Good that there is early consultation with utilities. The processes referred to, such as agreeing the design release schedule, and resident communication demonstrate a good understanding of the issues. No mention of how the works are managed if there is a difficulty in obtaining access to one unit and also no detail on a risk register. There is reference to making the works weather tight as soon as possible.

Score 3

Response to 10.5

This fails to adequately respond to the question. The question specifically asks for examples from the projects referred to in 10.1. The response is an explanation of their general approach; not referred back to the projects in any way. Whilst the wording states that they adopt a “collaborative” and “long term approach” it does not explain how this was achieved and does not refer to how effective working was achieved – such as shared training etc.

Score 1

Response to 10.6

The question specifically asks for information on the projects used as case studies. The majority of this response is a general explanation of how they manage planning issues with the only project reference being the final paragraph (Chalcots).

Score 3

Response to 10.7

Risks listed and the mitigation measures indicate good experience of the particular issues with high rise buildings. Good references to effect on air traffic control, crane costs, wind loading, fire strategy, planning and light issues. Refer back to projects in 10.1 as requested.

Score: 4

Response to 10.8

Good that refers to research and the link with the university but this appears to be limited to renewable technology. There is limited information on the actual projects. The response contains no reference to general improvements and innovations. There is reference to the RLOs understanding the technology to explain the benefits to residents.

Score 3

Response to 10.9

The response focuses on traffic management and logistics and does not explain how the liaison took place / how complaints from neighbours were managed. There is a list of what they COULD do on future projects - such as shared training / synchronised waste management – which begs the question why was this not done on the example projects? Was it proposed / discussed? The PQQ and question are about experience so this cannot be evaluated.

Score 2

Response to 10.10

The question and the entire PQQ are focused on experience – giving a glimpse of what they might do in the future is not part of this evaluation and so disregarded. The majority of this response is a “sell” of what they “will” do.

On each of the projects did they have initial meetings with stakeholders to identify what was required?

Poor explanation in example 3. Given the real social issues of worklessness a certificate in fire marshalling is failing to understand the social and cultural issues involved.

Score 1

Response to 10.11

Where is the response to this? The question asks for examples from the projects. There are no examples and no figures from the projects. There is no mention of other environmental improvements. This is a generic response which does not address the question asked.

Score 1

Keepmoat

Response to 10.2

Keepmoat has provided details of experience for Tiverton Estate (one of case studies). This is a good effort to address the question however could have been expanded. "we obtained the ECO / CESP funding" – what work was done by the Client? How were the different funding sources compared? What measurements were taken before installation so comparisons could be made after the scheme – e.g. the fuel bill as a proportion of outgoings for certain properties?

Score 4

Response to 10.3

The response refers to individual resident profiles but not a profile for the whole estate. More detail needed on the example – refer to resident satisfaction – when was this assessed and who did it? Innovative communication – Facebook. Clearly monitored engagement. Free skips. Decorated hoarding. No mention of complaints procedure. Overall response indicted excellent and innovative communication. Keepmoat has made an effort to address questions.

Like the reference to consultant with resident groups to understand issues. Indicate that they provide a choice of communication preferences. The responses indicates that they acknowledge that the works will be noisy etc.

No mention of interfacing the site manager – how does the RLO interface with the site team - how is it fed back into the works process.

Score 5

Response to 10.4

Good that the response refers to working closely with the supply chain and refers specifically to the case studies. No mention of the software used, risk register, mitigation, contingency, delivery times. All part of the experience we would expect to see. No mention lean programming.

Score 2

Response to 10.5

Reference to partnering and co-location. Refer to partnering but **HOW** - how do they encourage the supply chain? How is the relationship effective? Good reference to co-location with the asbestos contactor on the Haringey project. Reference to value engineering.

Score 3

The response to 10.6

Refer the response back to Granville Road Tower Blocks. The response is really interesting (animated videos / resident feedback/ design options) but does not fully address the specific question – how did they liaise with the planners. No mention of a series of meetings / early approval of materials / design release schedules.

Score 1

Response to 10.7

This response has insufficient detail. There are reference to “safe methods of access”, “efficient project times”, “security risks” and other issues but none are explained in any detail. Why were they issues and what steps were put into place? The response does not address issues concerning the residents – light and privacy and does not refer to training / inspections. There is also no mention of missiles being thrown, consideration of wind speed on the construction materials / methods

Score 2

Response to 10.8

This response lists many things which we do not consider to be “innovations” – such as having to dismantle a boiler to remove it from site. The question asks how innovations were proposed – what research was done / references taken / how were these “sold” to clients. This fails to answer the questions and gives no details of the way innovations were proposed, explained, implemented and the benefits monitored.

Score 2

Response to 10.9

Good references to consultation. Providing pictures only for the Granville Tower projects does not answer the question on how the liaison was managed. There is no reference to joint welfare / waste being considered. How to neighbours know which site to contact in the event of an issue?

Score 2

Response to 10.10

Very good that Keepmoat try and understand the clients objectives and link the measures to these. Good that the initiatives go beyond references to training and apprentices. Gardens / music studio.

Score 5

Response to 10.11

Failed to answer question – reference to policies is NOT sufficient. The question asks for information from the projects. Score 0

