

DELEGATED DECISION NOTIFICATION

REF NO¹

D34722

SERVICE AREA

Children's Services

SUBJECT²

To award a contract for the delivery of Connexions Services In Leeds: Information Advice And Guidance.

DECISION³

COUNCIL FUNCTION	<input type="checkbox"/>	EXECUTIVE DECISION (KEY)	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	EXECUTIVE DECISION (MAJOR)	<input type="checkbox"/>	EXECUTIVE DECISION (OTHER)	<input type="checkbox"/>
NOT SUBJECT TO CALL IN		⁴ EXEMPT FROM CALL IN: NO		⁴ EXEMPT FROM CALL IN: YES / NO		NOT SUBJECT TO CALL IN	

The Acting Chief Officer for Early Years and Integrated Youth Support Services agreed the recommendation to award the contract to Prospects Ltd. for the delivery of Connexions Services In Leeds : Information Advice and Guidance.

AFFECTED WARDS

All

ADVICE SOUGHT

	Yes	No
Legal	x	
Finance	x	
Personnel	x	
Equal Opportunities	x	
Other (please specify)		

DECLARED OFFICER /
MEMBER INTERESTS⁵

None

¹ This reference number will be assigned by Governance Services and notified to you

² A brief heading should be inserted

³ Brief details of the decision should be inserted. This note must set out the substance of the decision, options considered and the reason for deciding upon the chosen option, although care must be taken not to disclose any confidential or commercially sensitive information. Guidance on the substance of the note is available from Governance Services

⁴ For Key and Major decisions only. If exempt from Call In details to be provided in the report. The Call In period expires at 5.00 pm on the 5th working day after publication. Scrutiny Support will notify decision makers of matters called in by no later than 12.00 noon on the 6th day.

⁵ No officer having a pecuniary interest in any matter should take a decision in relation to that matter. Other interests of a non-disqualifying nature should be recorded here.

DISPENSATION BY STANDARDS COMMITTEE

DATE: ...N/A.....

BACKGROUND PAPERS⁶

Tender Evaluation Report plus associated appendices.

CONFIDENTIAL REPORT

YES NO RULE NO 10.4⁷ (3) – **Appendices Only.**

DETAILS OF CONSULTATION UNDERTAKEN (OTHER REASONS/ ORGANISATIONS CONSULTED)

	Yes	No	Date
Executive Member	x		
Ward Councillors		x	
Chief Officers Affected	x		
Others (Specify)			

CONTACT PERSON

Gerry Hudson

CONTACT NO

2243653

AUTHORISED SIGNATORY⁸

 Sally Threlfall	DATE 9 th December 2008
--	---------------------------------------

	KEY	MAJOR	OTHER
⁹ *First publication (5 day notice)	10/12/08		
Commencement for Call In	18/12/08		
Last date for Call In	24/12/08		
Implementation Date	29/12/08		

* If key decision not on Forward Plan, the reason and need that the decision be taken are that: :

⁶ A separate Index should be prepared if necessary. ALL DOCUMENTATION UPON WHICH THE DECISION WAS BASED MUST BE RETAINED AND BE READILY ACCESSIBLE SO IT CAN BE PRODUCED SHOULD THE DECISION BE CHALLENGED

⁷ Access to Information Procedure Rules

⁸ The signatory must be duly authorised by the Director to make the decision in accordance with the Department's scheme. It is not acceptable for the signature to be 'pp' for an authorised signatory. For Key Decisions only, the date of the authorised signature signifies that, at the time, the Officer was content that the decision should be taken. However, should representations be received following public availability of reports the signatory will consider the effect which such representations should have upon the final decision.

⁹ Governance Services will enter these dates

CONTRACT AWARD REPORT



FROM: Procurement Unit
TO: JOINT PREVENTATIVE COMMISSIONING PANEL (JPCP)
ORIGINATOR: Strategic Procurement Manager
DATE: 5/12/2008
CONTRACT: CONTRACT FOR THE DELIVERY OF CONNEXIONS SERVICES IN LEEDS :INFORMATION ADVICE AND GUIDANCE

1. CONTRACT DETAILS

1. This contract is for the The Delivery Of Connexions Services In Leeds :Information Advice And Guidance
- 1.1. The approval to commission these services through a competitive tendering process was given by the JPCP at its meeting held in September 2007.

2. SELECTION AND TENDERING PROCEDURE

- 2.1. The procurement was conducted utilising the restricted procedure. This entails the issue of a pre qualification questionnaire (PQQ) which determines whether organisations have a track record in delivering the range and scope of services as required by the contracting authority.
- 2.2. The scheme was advertised in line with the requirements of the Councils contracts Procedure rules and expressions of interest were received from 7 Organisations.
- 2.3. The evaluation of the PQQ's was undertaken by the following officers and/or representatives of the following organisations :
 - Children Leeds Participation Unit representative
 - VCFS Representative
 - 14 – 19 team Education Leeds Representative
 - Colleges representative
 - IYSS representatives
 - Secondary Schools Representatives
 - Procurement Unit Representative (non scoring)
- 2.4. The evaluation was undertaken by assessing the responses of the organisations against the following criteria :
 - Financial Robustness
 - References
 - Equal Opportunities Policies
 - Technical ability to deliver the required services
 - Staff and Qualifications
 - Quality management and project competency
 - Health and Safety
 - Eligibility and professional conduct

2.5. The scores attributed to each organisation as a result of the evaluation of the PQQ are attached at appendix 1 – Evaluation Comments PQQ.

2.6. The shortlisted organisations were :

- Prospects
- Igen
- Better Choices
- Connexions Humber

2.7 It should be noted that on advice received from the Procurement Unit, no scores were carried forward from the evaluation of the PQQ and that all organisations would be judged on the basis of their tender submission against the established evaluation criteria.

3. TENDER EVALUATION

3.1. Tender documents were issued to the shortlisted organisations on 8/10/2008.

3.2. The bid documents consisted of a pricing document, terms and conditions of contract, IAG Specification, tender evaluation model, Connexions delivery Plan, LYWP service plan and terms and conditions attributable to the transfer of staff under the acquired rights directives (2006) known as the TUPE regulations.

3.3. The TUPE terms were included as the staff that were currently providing the service as employees of the current service providers would have the right to transfer their employment should new service providers be chosen. This included a number of staff who had a legacy of employment with the Council.

3.4. An open day was held in the Civic Hall on Thursday 9th October at which an overview of the key issues of the contract was given and how the contract linked into some of the strategic issues facing the city.

3.5. During the period of time when the bids were being constructed by the Shortlisted bidders, Connexions Humber indicated that they had made a decision not to submit a bid

3.6. The deadline for the receipt of bids was 12th November 2008 and the following bids were received :

- Igen
- Better Choices
- Prospects

3.7. The bids were evaluated on the basis of a price quality model, details of which are attached at appendix 2. This set the points to be awarded for the qualitative element of the bid at 1000 and the points awarded for the financial element of the bid at 1000.

- 3.8. The evaluation panel consisted of the following Officers and /or representatives of the following organisations :
- Children Leeds Participation Unit representative
 - VCFS Representative
 - 14 – 19 team Education Leeds Representative
 - Colleges representative
 - IYSS representative2
 - Secondary Schools Representatives
 - Children’s Services Unit Representative
 - Procurement Unit Representative (non scoring)
- 3.9. The evaluation panel were issued with the method statements submitted by each bidder in support of their proposals to run the services. They were also issued with the evaluation model to be utilised in respect of the review of the method statements. This is attached at appendix 2. The evaluation model also contained what were considered to be the key issues that the panel should identify within the method statements. These were then assessed by the individual members of the panel.
- 3.10. The panel then met on Monday 24th November to discuss their assessment of the bids and to arrive at a score for each element of the bids by consensus. The representative from the colleges and one of the secondary school heads were unable to attend this meeting and as such it was decided not to include their scores within the evaluation process, but that any comments they had made would be debated by the panel.
- 3.11. The organisations who had submitted the bids were invited to present the evaluation panel on Tuesday 25th November. They were asked to present to the panel on the following key areas
- Going up a league as a city – making Leeds an internationally competitive city, the best place in the country to live, work and learn, with a high quality of life for everyone
 - Narrowing the Gap between the most disadvantaged people and communities and the rest of the city.
 - Developing Leeds' role as the regional capital, contributing to the national economy as a competitive European city, supporting and supported by a region that is becoming increasingly prosperous.
- 3.12. The evaluation panel were also asked to take part in a number of exercises conducted by a young persons panel.
- 3.13. It should be noted that neither the presentation to the panel or the young persons panel were identified as scoring elements within the tender evaluation model, but were used to confirm the panels understanding and scoring of the bids
- 3.14. Support was also provided to the panel by relevant finance officers in respect of financial elements of the bid, IT Officers in respect of the interface of IT systems and the Safeguarding Officer in respect of the assessment of the bidders safeguarding policies. The safeguarding Officer rated the safeguarding policies of all 3 bidders as being sufficiently robust. No scores were apportioned in respect of the policies and as such the final scores in

the evaluation model reflect a score apportioned to each bidder against a grand total of 1970.

- 3.15. The scores were then entered into the evaluation model and were combined with the score allocated to the price submission and this gave an overall score for each bidder.
- 3.16. Prospects were the organisation that had scored the highest points against the evaluation model utilised in respect of this project.
- 3.17. Prospects were invited to a further meeting with panel held on Monday 1st December at which further questions were asked to confirm that the content of the bid was fully understood by the panel and that they were happy to recommend the award of the contract to prospects.
- 3.18. The bidder also clarified that in respect of the transferring staff it intended to seek membership of the West Yorkshire Pension Fund.
- 3.19. The evaluation panel also considered a number of key issues in respect of the mobilisation of the contract and it was agreed that a number of meetings would be required to be scheduled in respect of managing the transition period.
- 3.20. The full evaluation scores apportioned to all bidders are attached to this report at appendix 3
- 3.21. Interim notices have been issued to the unsuccessful bidders indicating an intention to contract with another organisation but that this is subject to the award following the required processes as prescribed within the Councils constitution.
- 3.22. The JPCP should note that should the recommendation be approved to award the contract to Prospects, then the official notification can be issued on or around 23rd December

4. AWARD RECOMMENDATIONS

- 4.1 The JPCP is recommended to award the contract to the Prospects who have scored the highest mix of quality and price in accordance with the completed evaluation models
- 4.2 It is proposed that the new contract will commence on 1st April 2009.
- 4.3 The JPCP is recommended to appoint an appropriate officer(s) to manage the transition period. This officer will be supported by an officer from the Procurement Unit to assist this process, particularly in respect of the TUPE implications of a service provider change.