

Report of ICT Strategic Sourcing Officer

Report to Chief Officer Access and Care Delivery

Date: 4th August 2016

Subject: Tender Award Report - LCCITS150045 Electronic Rostering and Monitoring Solution

Are specific electoral wards affected? If relevant, name(s) of ward(s):	<input type="checkbox"/> Yes	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> No
Are there implications for equality and diversity and cohesion and integration?	<input type="checkbox"/> Yes	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> No
Is the decision eligible for call-in?	<input type="checkbox"/> Yes	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> No
Does the report contain confidential or exempt information? If relevant, access to information procedure rule number: Appendix number:	<input type="checkbox"/> Yes	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> No

Summary of main issues

1. The Chief Officer Access and Care Delivery approved the commencement of a procurement for an Integrated Electronic Rostering and Monitoring Solution on the 8th April 2016
2. Following a procurement exercise run in accordance with the Councils Contracts Procedure Rules and the public Contract Regulations 2015, this report provides detail of the procurement process and outcome.

Recommendations

A contract be awarded to Care Monitoring 2000 Limited for an Integrated Electronic Rostering and Monitoring solution which will include implementation, hosting, support and maintenance and training for a period of 3 years with options to extend by up to 3 further 1 year periods.

1. Purpose of this report

- 1.1. Following the evaluation of tenders received for an Electronic Rostering and Monitoring Solution, this report recommends the award of a contract to Care Monitoring 2000 Limited

2. Background information

- 2.1. The contract is for the provision of an Integrated Electronic Rostering and Monitoring Solution which will include implementation, hosting, support and maintenance and training
- 2.2. The procurement followed the Open Procedure of the Public Contract Regulations 2015.
- 2.3. An Invitation to Tender was published on the Council's procurement portal Yortender, with advertisements sent to the Official Journal of the European Union and Contracts Finder on 20th April 2016 with a closing date for receipt of tenders of 1st June 2016.
- 2.4. The duration of the contract is three years with three further options to extend by periods of one year.
- 2.5. The value of the contract being awarded is £ 283,087.00. This contract will be available to Council services which may have requirements which can be met by this solution. Total spend through this contract will not exceed £1m (including any variation and available extensions)
- 2.6. The tender was run using the EU Open procedure. The evaluation panel comprised:
 - Qualification Stage
 - Amanda Wardman – SKILs Service Manager (Reablement, ASC)
 - Janet Gordon – Business Support Manager (Reablement, ASC)
 - Perry Hunt – Business Support Team Manager (Reablement, ASC)
 - Rebecca Parsons – Assistant Manager (Extra Care Housing, ASC)
 - Rachel Reynolds – IM&T Business Partner (ASC)
 - Invitation to Tender Stage
 - Jacqueline Wright – SKILs Service Manager (Reablement, ASC)
 - Janet Gordon – Business Support Manager (Reablement, ASC)
 - Perry Hunt – Business Support Team Manager (Reablement, ASC)
 - James Weatherall – Registered Manager (Extra Care Housing, ASC)
 - Rachel Reynolds – IM&T Business Partner (ASC)
 - Martyn Tinsley – Solution Architect (ICT)
- 2.7. The Council chose not to divide the contract into lots. The Council is seeking a single integrated solution and intends to appoint a single contractor capable of

providing and supporting all the required functionality. The Council considered separate lots for monitoring and rostering and concluded a single integrated solution will simplify and reduce the work and cost for the on-going support and maintenance of the system.

3. Main considerations and reasons for contract award

- 3.1. The full tender scoring breakdown can be found at Appendix A and the Tender Evaluation Criteria can be found at Appendix B. The following provides a summary of the outcome.
- 3.2. The following tenderers submitted a response to the Council's Invitation to Tender:
 - Care Monitoring 2000 Limited
 - Civica UK Limited
- 3.3. Tenderers were required to demonstrate their experience, skills, resources and capacity to deliver the contract by responding to a Qualification Questionnaire. Those that did not demonstrate this were not evaluated further.
- 3.4. One tender (Civica UK Limited) failed to pass the qualification questionnaire and was not evaluated further.
- 3.5. Tenders that successfully passed the Qualification Questionnaire were evaluated on 50% quality and 50% price.
- 3.6. The tender from Care Monitoring 2000 Limited was evaluated in accordance with the tender evaluation criteria (Appendix B) to ensure it successfully met the Council's technical requirements and met the minimum quality thresholds detailed within the evaluation criteria.
- 3.7. Price was evaluated on a Total Cost of Ownership calculation. As Care Monitoring 2000 Limited were the only supplier to pass the qualification questionnaire, technical requirements and pass the minimum quality threshold they achieved full marks for price.
- 3.8. The final tender scores for Care Monitoring 2000 Limited can be found at Appendix A.

4. Corporate considerations

4.1. Consultation and engagement

- 4.1.1. Engagement has taken place between key stakeholders from Reablement, Extra Care Housing, Homes for Older People, the Mental Health Service and the Adult Social Care Information and Management Team. The ICT Strategic Sourcing Team have also been involved to ensure that the Procurement Process has been undertaken appropriately.
- 4.1.2. Subject Matter Experts from Extra Care Housing, Mental Health Services and Reablement attended the supplier demonstration to provide input.

4.2. Equality and diversity/cohesion and integration

- 4.2.1. An EDCI screening tool has been completed for the awarding of the contract and is appended to the main delegated decision panel report.

4.3. Council policies and best council plan

4.3.1. The ability to improve the way that Care Workers are allocated their work and utilise their capacity effectively contributes to the following policies and plans:

4.3.2. Best Council Plan 2015-20

- the Better Lives Programme
- the Breakthrough Project of making Leeds the best place to grow old

4.3.3. Council Business Plan

- to increase the number of people successfully completing a programme to help them re-learn the skills for daily living
- increase the proportion of older people (65 and over) who are still at home 91 days after leaving hospital into rehabilitation services
- increase the percentage of service users who feel that they have control over their daily life.

4.3.4. Leeds Joint Health and Wellbeing Strategy 2016-21

- The best care, in the right place at the right time
- Age friendly city where people age well
- Maximise the benefit of information and technology

4.4. Resources and value for money

4.4.1. The requirements specification was developed to reduce the impact on Council services and resources where possible.

4.4.2. The evaluation criteria included minimum quality thresholds which Care Monitoring 2000 Limited comfortably exceeded.

4.4.3. The contract has been structured so that other services across the council can utilise this system if it meets their requirements in the future. This therefore reduces the need for additional procurement exercises to be undertaken

4.5. Legal implications, access to information and call-in

4.5.1. The decision in this report is a Significant Operational Decision and not subject to call in.

4.5.2. The procurement was run under the EU Open Procedure in accordance with Public Contracts Regulations 2015.

4.6. Risk management

4.6.1. Contract risk will be managed by an appointed contract manager who will implement a contract management plan.

5. Conclusions

5.1. The successful tenderer has demonstrated its ability to meet the Council's requirements and represents value for money.

6. Recommendations

- 6.1. A contract be awarded to Care Monitoring 2000 Limited for an Integrated Electronic Rostering and Monitoring solution which will include implementation, hosting, support and maintenance and training for a period of 3 years with options to extend by up to 3 further 1 year periods.

7. Background documents

None

APPENDIX A

TENDER SCORES

Qualification Questionnaire

The following scores were achieved at the qualification stage:

Scheme ID: A8LF-5MMAWW

Scheme

Title: LCCITS150045 Integrated Electronic Rostering and Monitoring Solution

Qualification Questionnaire			1	2
No.	Description.	Weight	Civica	CM2000
6.1	<p>Tenderers should evidence that they can deliver appropriate and timely solution with regards to an Integrated Electronic Rostering and Monitoring solutions as detailed within the Part 2 Specification.</p> <p>In this instance the Council does NOT wish to work with a supplier to develop a new solution, the Council requires a single “off the shelf” ready-to-use solution capable of delivering the roosting and monitoring functionality as detailed within the Part 2 Specification.</p> <p>In this regard, in respect of two contracts of similar size and scope you have delivered within the last five years, please describe:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • organisation contract awarded by; • The scope of the requirements of the contract; • the nature of the goods supplied/services undertaken and your company’s specific purpose/function; • contract start and Length of contract; • value of contract; • Savings or efficiencies and any added value benefits delivered through this contract 	70%	28.00%	49.00%
6.2	<p>The tenderer should evidence that they can deliver on-going value to customers in providing the goods and services required by the Council, as detailed within the Part 2 Specification. In this regard, with respect to one of the current contracts you have delivered, please indicate:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • The scope of the requirements of the contract; • The benefits realised by the customer and whether these benefits have matched or exceeded expectations; and • The on-going level of your engagement with the customer and how this continues to deliver value to the customer. 	30%	6.00%	15.00%
Total		100%	34.00%	64.00%

Minimum Threshold = 50%

Quality Evaluation

The following scores were achieved on the Quality evaluation:

Scheme ID: A5EM-CYSELY

Scheme Title: LCCITS150045 Integrated Electronic Rostering and Monitoring Solution

Tender Evaluation				1	
No.	Description.	Points	Min. Threshold	CM2000	
1	Referral / Initial Assessment	30	15.00	21.00	
2	Scheduling and Rostering	100	50.00	90.00	
3	Mobile Working and Monitoring	100	50.00	90.00	
4	Invoicing, Exiting and Transitioning Service Users	20	10.00	18.00	
5	Information and Reporting	50	25.00	50.00	
6	Interfaces	45	22.50	40.50	
7	System Administration	45	22.50	40.50	
8	Audit Requirements	20	10.00	18.00	
9	Project Management and Implementation	20	10.00	18.00	
10	System Support Development	60	30.00	54.00	
11	Optional Modules or Services	10		10.00	
12	General Requirements	Pass/Fail	N/A	Pass	
13	Performance and Measurement	Pass/Fail	N/A	Pass	
12	Technical Requirements	Pass/Fail	N/A	Pass	
		Quality	500		450.00
		Price	500		500.00
		Total Price/Quality Score	1000		950.00

APPENDIX B

TENDER EVALUATION CRITERIA

8 TENDER SUBMISSION ITEMS

8.1 Tender submission

8.1.1 Tender submissions will be opened and recorded by the council's Procurement Unit. Tender submissions received after the required submission deadline will be disqualified and will not be evaluated.

8.1.2 During the evaluation period, all communications with tenderers will be managed by the Procurement Lead. No other communications with tenderers will be permitted during the evaluation process.

8.2 Certificates

8.2.1 You should complete, sign and submit the certificates, detailed below, in the tender schedule at Part 1 appendix 1:

- (a) Form of tender
- (b) Certificate confirming questionnaire
- (c) Declaration of non-collusive tendering
- (d) BACS payment form

8.3 Price Criterion

8.3.1 The maximum amount of points available for price will be **500**

8.3.2 You should complete the pricing schedule attached at Part 1, Appendix 2, noting the following:

- (a) All prices, costs or rates stated on the form of tender and/or schedule of prices must be quoted in British currency to 2 decimal places (i.e. whole pence).
- (b) All prices quoted should be exclusive of VAT.
- (c) All prices quoted should take into account the requirements of
 - (i) The council's specification for this contract as set out in Part 2 (Specification) and Part 2(a) (Technical Requirements) of these tender documents.

- (ii) The payment and indexation terms for this contract as set out in Appendix 2 (Payment schedule) of these tender documents.
- (iii) The contract terms and conditions for this contract as set out in Part 3 (Contract Terms and Conditions) of these tender documents.

8.4 Quality Criterion

- 8.4.1 The quality criteria are detailed at section 8.5.
- 8.4.2 The maximum amount of points available for quality will be **500**
- 8.4.3 You should submit your responses to the quality criteria (method statements), as set out below at section 8.5, in the tender schedule at Part 1 Appendix 1.
- 8.4.4 You should ensure that you do not exceed the maximum word count given for each method statement. All documents must be in a Microsoft Word format. Please do not answer questions by referring to other documents or to specific paragraphs within other documents as these will not be evaluated. You should be aware that any text over the limit for the relevant method statements will be removed from the tender schedule before being issued to the evaluation panel.
- 8.4.5 You should submit clear, concise and unambiguous statements that provide sufficient evidence as to how you will deliver the requirements of the council's specification and associated contract terms and conditions.
- 8.4.6 It is important to ensure that any information submitted is relevant to the quality evaluation criteria. Information which is not relevant will not be taken into account and will not be evaluated.
- 8.4.7 You should be aware that if your tender submission is successful the method statements that you submit in the tender schedule will form part of your contract with the council.

8.5 Quality Evaluation Criteria

No.	Method Statement	Assessment Method	Maximum Points Available	Minimum Score Threshold	Maximum Word Count/Page Limit

No.	Method Statement	Assessment Method	Maximum Points Available	Minimum Score Threshold	Maximum Word Count/Page Limit
1	Referral / Initial Assessment	Scored	30	15	1500
2	Scheduling and Rostering	Scored	100	50	3000
3	Mobile Working and Monitoring	Scored	100	50	3000
4	Invoicing, Exiting and Transitioning Service Users	Scored	20	10	1500
5	Information and Reporting	Scored	50	25	2000
6	Interfaces	Scored	45	42.5	1000
7	System Administration	Scored	45	42.5	1500
8	Audit Requirements	Scored	20	10	1000
9	Project Management and Implementation	Scored	20	10	1500
10	System Support Development	Scored	60	30	1500
11	Optional Modules or Services	Scored	10		1500
12	General Requirements	Pass/Fail			N/A
13	Performance and Measurement	Pass/Fail			N/A
14	Technical Requirements	Pass/Fail			N/A

8.6 Other items

None

8.7 Presentations

- 8.7.1 All tenderers that successfully pass the qualification questionnaire and achieve the minimum score threshold for each method statement (as detailed within 8.5) will be invited to make a presentation to the evaluation panel and other representatives of the Council. Provisional dates for the presentations are detailed in 5.1.1 and we will write to you at least 5 working days before the specific date and time of your presentation. Please note the provisional date for supplier presentations detailed within 5.1.1.

9 TENDER EVALUATION

9.1 Introduction

- 9.1.1 The tender evaluation will objectively assess the extent to which each tender submission meets each of the specified evaluation criteria, and will identify the strengths and weaknesses of the tender submissions in respect of those criteria.
- 9.1.2 The evaluation will assess the tenders on the basis of the submitted tenders only. No prior knowledge of the tenderer will be assumed. Although the aim is for tenderers to address the evaluation criteria in separate method statements, the council will review each tender submission as a whole.
- 9.1.3 The council's intention is to award a contract to one successful tenderer.

9.2 Quality and price evaluation

- 9.2.1 Tender submissions will be assessed on the basis of the most economically advantageous tender, using a most cost effective approach to price and quality evaluation.
- 9.2.2 The criteria against which tender submissions will be evaluated are set out below.

9.3 Evaluation panel

- 9.3.1 The Procurement Lead will ensure the distribution of compliant tender submissions to each member of the evaluation panel.

The evaluation panel will consist of representatives from the Council with suitable knowledge and experience to evaluate tender submissions.

9.4 Consultees and advisors

- 9.4.1 Relevant extracts of the tender submissions will be sent to advisors and consultees who have been asked to review the submissions.

- 9.4.2 Consultees and advisors will provide their opinions of the strengths and weaknesses of each tender submission to the evaluation panel. Consultees and advisors will not score or rank the tenders.
- 9.4.3 The evaluation panel will consider the views of the consultees and advisors in determining and agreeing the final scores and final comments.

9.5 **Assessing tenders**

- 9.5.1 Tenderers must successfully pass the Part 1 Qualification Questionnaire (Part 1 appendix 3), in accordance with the evaluation criteria detailed within that document. Tenderers that do not pass the qualification questionnaire will not be considered further in the assessment process.
- 9.5.2 The evaluation panel will review each tender submission and objectively assess the extent to which each tender submission meets each of the specified evaluation criteria. The panel will agree scores for tender submission for each criteria and will identify the strengths and weaknesses of the tender submissions in respect of those criteria.
- 9.5.3 The evaluation panel will assess each submission on a consensus approach.
- 9.5.4 The Part 2(a) Technical Specification will be evaluated on a pass/fail basis by an officer of the Council's ICT Service who will consult with other ICT specialists as required. The response to each requirement will be evaluated individually together with your response as a whole and where your response does not demonstrate to the Council's satisfaction that it is acceptable for our technical and security environments it will fail and your tender will be rejected. It is your responsibility to provide sufficient information in your tender to allow the Council to fully assess the technical merits of your proposed solution.
- 9.5.5 The chair of the evaluation panel will ensure the panel appropriately considers the views expressed by the consultees and advisors.
- 9.5.6 The chair of the evaluation panel will ensure that an accurate formal record of the evaluation panel's final scores and final assessment of the strengths and weaknesses of each tender is prepared. Any draft papers and personal notes will be disposed of as confidential waste.
- 9.5.7 The Procurement Lead will retain for audit purposes: one reference copy of the tender submissions, clarification logs, scoresheet booklet, scoring matrix, formal reports and formal correspondence.

9.6 **Clarifying tender submissions**

- 9.6.1 If, at any time during the evaluation process, the council discover that any information or documentation submitted by a bidder is or appears to be incomplete or erroneous, or missing, the council may (but shall not be obliged to) ask you to submit, supplement, clarify or complete the relevant information or documentation.
- 9.6.2 Such requests will be responded to within 24 hours and if the council decides in a particular case to make such a request it shall do so on a fair basis to all bidders so that every bidder will be given the opportunity, where appropriate, to re-submit the information or documentation requested.

9.7 Evaluating price

- 9.7.1 The price evaluation will be based on a Cost of Ownership calculation comprising the prices submitted in Pricing Schedule (Part 1 appendix 2) and any additional costs identified in Pricing Schedule Cost of Ownership Model (Part 1 appendix 2a)
- 9.7.2 Price will only be evaluated for those submissions that meet the required quality thresholds following the initial evaluation of the written method statements.
- 9.7.3 The tenderer with the lowest total price will achieve the highest score available for price and the other tenders a reduced score based on calculating the percentage difference between them and the lowest price and deducting this percentage from the maximum score available.

Tenderers should be aware that although this calculation may result in a negative number, the minimum score for price will be nil (0).

- 9.7.4 An example of the price calculation is shown below:

Example Price Evaluation

Total Marks Available

500

	Tenderer A	Tenderer B	Tenderer C	Tenderer D	Tenderer E
Cost of Ownership	£60,000	£75,000	£105,000	£125,000	£90,000
difference to lowest price	£0	£15,000	£45,000	£65,000	£30,000
% Difference	0%	25%	75%	108%	50%
Points to deduct	0	125	375	500	250
Price Score	500.0000	375.0000	125.0000	0.0000	250.0000

9.7.5 Tenderers should be aware that in evaluating costs, the council will consider the credibility of the price submitted for the goods, works or services being procured. If officers believe the cost is abnormally low (e.g. unrealistically low prices for goods/works or resource commitments etc), the council will seek clarification from the Tenderer to understand further the basis of the price submitted. If clarification does not satisfy the council's concerns, the council reserves the right to discount the proposal from further evaluation and the tender will be discounted from the process. Tenderers should note that prices cannot be altered after final tenders have been submitted.

9.8 Evaluating quality

9.8.1 Scores for quality will be allocated on a 0 – 10 basis as set out below for all questions with the exception of method statement question 11 which will be scored as detailed in 9.8.2 :

Score Guide (0 – 10)

Score	Assessment
10	Outstanding: The response covers all elements of the criterion, and associated specified contract requirements and standards; and with a high level of relevant and detailed information, backed up with clear evidence; and demonstrates a robust and coherent understanding of the council's requirements; and with no issues, weaknesses or omissions.
9	Excellent: The response covers all elements of the criterion, and associated specified contract requirements and standards; and with relevant and detailed information, backed up with clear evidence; but with limited minor issues, weaknesses or omissions in the information/evidence only.
8	Very good: The response covers all key elements and almost all of the other elements of the criterion, and associated specified contract requirements and standards; and with relevant and detailed information, backed up with clear evidence; with a few minor issues, weaknesses, or omissions in the information/evidence.
7	Good: The response covers all key elements and the majority of the other elements of the criterion, and associated specified contract requirements and standards; and with relevant information, backed up with evidence, but lacks detail in some areas; some minor issues, weaknesses, or omissions in some areas of information/evidence.
6	Better than satisfactory: The response addresses all key elements of the criterion, and associated specified contract requirements and standards; but is not fully detailed or fully backed up with clear evidence in some areas; a number of minor and/or one or two more significant issues, weaknesses, or omissions in some areas.
5	Satisfactory: The response addresses all key elements of the criterion, and associated specified contract requirements and standards; but is not fully detailed or fully backed up with clear evidence in some areas; with a large number of minor, and/or a number of significant weaknesses, issues or omissions in the detail/evidence.

4	Less than satisfactory: The response has some weaknesses, issues or omissions, lacking detail, clarity and/or evidence with regard to at least one key element of the criterion, and associated specified contract requirements and standards with respect to this criterion.
3	Weak: The response has some weaknesses, issues or omissions, lacking detail, clarity and/or evidence with regard to several key elements of the criterion, and associated specified contract requirements and standards.
2	Poor: The response has material weaknesses, issues or omissions, lacking detail, clarity and/or evidence with regard to many key elements of the criterion, and associated specified contract requirements and standards.
1	Very poor: The response does not meet the criterion, or does not include sufficient information or clarity or evidence or information in support, to determine whether the solution meets the council's requirements or standards.
0	Unacceptable: Failed to provide a response, or the response provided is wholly inconsistent with the council's specified contract requirements and standards with respect to this criterion.

9.8.2 Score for method statement question 11 will be allocated on a 0 – 5 basis as set out below

Score Guide (0 – 5)

Score	Assessment
5	Optional modules or services could offer significant value/opportunities to the Council which may be of future interest
3	Optional modules or services could offer some limited value/opportunities to the Council which may be of future interest.
0	No response / irrelevant.

- 9.8.3 Once the final score for each method statement question has been determined the appropriate weighting for each question will be applied.
- 9.8.4 For example, if a question had a weighted score of 100 points and following evaluation the panel scored the response a 5, then the total score awarded to the tenderer for that question would be 50.
- 9.8.5 The evaluation panel will ensure that supporting comments are recorded during the evaluation process. These will later form the basis of the report to the decision maker, and will also form the basis of feedback to tenderers at the end of the evaluation period.
- 9.8.6 If a tenderer scores less than the minimum score threshold in any of the method statement question, as detailed at section 8.5, the tenderer will be automatically eliminated from the evaluation process and not considered for the contract.

9.9 **Scoring presentations**

- 9.9.1 The presentation will be assessed on the basis that the evaluation panel have the opportunity to adjust their initial scoring of your written tender submissions based on information you provide at the presentation.
- 9.9.2 The purpose of the presentations is to allow evaluation panel members, plus other invited guests, to view each qualifying Tenderer's proposed solution. For those who scored the invitation to tender (ITT) responses, it provides an opportunity to validate what was contained in the written ITT submissions.
- 9.9.3 The Evaluation Panel will also use this day to interview the tenderer on any aspects of their solution that requires clarification.
- 9.9.4 As a result of the presentation days, the scores awarded to Tenderers on review of the written responses may be adjusted up or down.

10 **AWARD PROCESS**

10.1 **Reporting and decision making**

- 10.1.1 The chair of the evaluation panel will submit a report to the decision maker summarising the evaluation process highlighting any particular areas of concern and making a recommendation on which of the tenderers (if any) should be selected as the preferred provider(s).
- 10.1.2 For the avoidance of doubt, the decision-maker cannot replace their views in place of those of the evaluation panel with respect to the scores or the ranking of tender submissions. The decision-maker can comment on the process and can seek further clarity or justification of scores or comments prior to taking a decision. The decision-maker can decide that no contract should be awarded, or that there should be a new tender exercise.

10.2 **Call-in and stand-still**

- 10.2.1 The Public Contracts Regulations either require or enable a 'standstill period' of at least 10 calendar days before a contract can be awarded, and within that period an unsuccessful tenderer can challenge the process if they believe it has not followed the requirements of the Regulations. Additionally for certain decisions the council's governance arrangements may include a 'call in' period, when any elected member can challenge an officer decision.
- 10.2.2 These processes will be followed before the contract can be awarded and usually take 2-3 weeks, but may take longer in some circumstances.

10.3 **Informing tenderers**

- 10.3.1 You will be notified of the outcome of your tender submission as soon as practical after the decision maker makes his/her decision..
- 10.3.2 You will be given a summary of your scores, those of the highest scoring tenderer and, where applicable, the characteristics and relative advantages of the winning bid in accordance with the Public Contracts Regulations 2015.

10.4 **Contract award**

- 10.4.1 After the decision to award the contract is confirmed, and the relevant 'standstill' and 'call in' periods have been observed as detailed at section 10.2, the council will award the contract and liaise with the winning bidder(s) to complete and sign the necessary contract documents and start the process of mobilising prior to contract commencement.