



The Litmus Partnership

System Alert

Operations Team
 Buyer Registered User

[Tenderbox](#)
[Activity Centre](#)
[Workspace Manager](#)
[Collaboration Dashboard](#)
[Tender Manager](#)
[Message Centre](#)
[Message History](#)

Live Chat

Collaboration: Bishop Vesey's Grammar School

[Close Collaboration](#)

Tender Exercise : Bishop Vesey's Grammar School ~ Cleaning Tender

ITT : Bishop Vesey's Grammar School ~ Cleaning...

 Type: **Invitation to Tender**
 Status : **Evaluation Started**
 Contract Reference : **467177849**

 Opening Date : **20/03/2020 14:15**
 Closing Date : **24/04/2020 12:00**
 Access Code : **HAH699837A**
[Navigate to...](#)

Message History

Direct: Financial Submission

☐ = Buyer ☐ = Supplier

Created Date	To/From:	Subject	Message	Reply ?
			<p>Hi Sam</p> <p>In response to your questions please see below:</p> <p>Please can you clarify why the total cost stated within the financial rationale tab excludes the £6,946 sundry expenses stated within your forecast?</p> <p>Column C calculates everything down to row 177 which includes the sundries plus row 181 which brings the total to the same on the rationale tab. Which is the annual cost £136,309.63 and £113,902.56 (alternative) for the services.</p>	
01/05/2020 17:28:23	To: operations@litmuspartnership.co.uk, From: amanda.restall@samsic.uk	RE: Financial Submission	<p>I have also noticed that you have included £9,501 equipment costs within both bids, but have only depreciated £2,915 over the initial three years of the contract. Please can you clarify how the remaining £6,586 will be funded.</p> <p>The depreciation figure over 3 years and surplus you point out is part of our agreement with our equipment suppliers to cover the overall costs of equipment and depreciation. Our annual total figure £136,309.63 and £113,902.56 remains the same as the final cost line 177 and 181 which is reflected on the rationale tab.</p> <p>Regards Amanda Restall Samsic UK</p>	
01/05/2020 12:53:43	To: amanda.restall@samsic.uk, From: operations@litmuspartnership.co.uk	RE: Financial Submission	<p>Good afternoon Amanda,</p> <p>Thank you for your clarifications.</p> <p>Please can you clarify why the total cost stated within the financial rationale tab excludes the £6,946 sundry expenses stated within your forecast?</p> <p>I have also noticed that you have included £9,501 equipment costs within both bids, but have only depreciated £2,915 over the initial three years of the contract. Please can you clarify how the remaining</p>	

Created Date	To/From:	Subject	Message	Reply ?
			<p>£6,586 will be funded.</p> <p>Please can you look into these queries and provide clarification. Should your clarifications affect your previously submitted figures, please can you send me a revised pricing schedule to reflect the correct costs.</p> <p>If a response could be provided by the close of business today (Friday 1st May), it would be greatly appreciated.</p> <p>Kind Regards,</p> <p>Sam O'Sullivan</p>	
27/04/2020 17:23:40	To: operations@litmuspartnership.co.uk, From: amanda.restall@samsic.uk	RE: Financial Submission	<p>Dear Sam</p> <p>Further to your questions in regards to our financial submission attached is our amended costs with the individual hours broken down as requested. In answer to your questions:</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none">1. The total cost stated within the financial rationale, differs to the total cost shown in the forecast tab. Please can you confirm whether the forecast or financial rationale totals are correct? If the financial rationale totals are correct, please can you send a revised pricing schedule to reflect the correct total cost.• The annual cost on both are in the Forecast tab which is Total Labour cost plus Management fee which adds up to the figure in the Financial rationale tab2. I have been reviewing your pricing schedule, and noticed that some cleaning operatives have been grouped within the same line on the labour schedule, rather than each employee being included separately. Please can you send a revised pricing schedule which includes each employee on a separate line.• We have now put each cleaner on their own individual line3. Please can you clarify where the £3,000 consultancy fee has been accounted for within your bid?• The £3,000.00 is inclusive in our overhead costs <p>Regards Amanda Restall Samsic UK</p> <p>Email attachment Bishop Vesey's Grammar School Pricing Schedule alternative v4.xlsm (392 KB) Email attachment Bishop Vesey's Grammar School Pricing ScheduleFinal v2.xlsm (392 KB)</p>	
24/04/2020 16:11:32	To: amanda.restall@samsic.uk, From: operations@litmuspartnership.co.uk	Financial Submission	<p>Good afternoon Amanda,</p> <p>Thank you for your bids for the Bishop Vesey's Grammar School Cleaning Tender.</p>	

Created Date	To/From:	Subject	Message	Reply ?
			<p>I have been reviewing these and have the following queries, which relate to both your compliant and non-compliant bids:</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none">1. The total cost stated within the financial rationale, differs to the total cost shown in the forecast tab. Please can you confirm whether the forecast or financial rationale totals are correct? If the financial rationale totals are correct, please can you send a revised pricing schedule to reflect the correct total cost.2. I have been reviewing your pricing schedule, and noticed that some cleaning operatives have been grouped within the same line on the labour schedule, rather than each employee being included seperately. Please can you send a revised pricing schedule which includes each employee on a seperate line.3. Please can you clarify where the £3,000 consultancy fee has been accounted for within your bid? <p>Please can you look into the above queries and provide clarification. If any clarifications affect your financial submissions, please can you send revised pricing schedules to reflect the correct costs.</p> <p>If you would be able to provide a response by the close of business on Monday 27th April, it would be appreciated.</p> <p>Kind Regards,</p> <p>Sam O'Sullivan</p>	

4 items found, displaying all items.