

BIRMINGHAM CITY COUNCIL

PUBLIC REPORT

| | |
|--|---|
| Report to: | CABINET |
| Report of: | Acting Strategic Director of Place |
| Date of Decision: | 17th November 2015 |
| Subject: | Contract Award for the Provision of Responsive Repairs & Maintenance Services, Gas Servicing and Capital Improvement Work Programmes (including Major Adaptations to Council Housing Stock) in the North, South, West-Central, and East areas of Birmingham. (CONTRACT REF: F0239) |
| Key Decision: Yes / No | Relevant Forward Plan Ref: 000837 |
| If not in the Forward Plan: (please "X" box) | Chief Executive approved <input type="checkbox"/> O&S Chairman approved <input type="checkbox"/> |
| Relevant Cabinet Member(s) or Relevant Executive Member for Local Services: | Cllr Stewart Stacey, Cabinet Member, Commissioning, Contracting & Improvement Cllr John Cotton, Cabinet Member for Neighbourhood Management and Homes |
| Relevant O&S Chairman: | Councillor Waseem Zaffar - Corporate Resources Councillor Zafar Iqbal - Neighbourhood and Community Services |
| Wards affected: | All |

| |
|---|
| 1. Purpose of report: |
| <p>1.1 This public award report provides details of the procurement process undertaken for the provision of Responsive Repairs & Maintenance Services, Gas Servicing and Capital Improvement Work Programmes (including Major Adaptations to Council Housing Stock) in the North, South, West-Central, and East areas of Birmingham – F0239.</p> <p>1.2 The accompanying Private Report contains the confidential information in relation to the contract award. The information in this report is not repeated in the Private Report and both reports should be read together.</p> |

| |
|--|
| 2. Decision(s) recommended: |
| <p>That Cabinet:</p> <p>2.1 Notes the process followed for the procurement of Responsive Repairs & Maintenance Services, Gas Servicing and Capital Improvement Work Programmes (including Major Adaptations to Council Housing Stock) in the North, South, West-Central, and East areas of Birmingham – F0239.</p> |

| | |
|---------------------------------|--|
| Lead Contact Officer(s): | Rob James - Service Director – Housing Transformation |
| Directorate: | Place |
| E-mail Address: | robert.james@birmingham.gov.uk |
| Telephone Number: | 0121 464 7699 |

| | |
|----------------------------|--|
| Contact Officer(s): | Martin Tolley - Head of Capital Investment |
| Directorate: | Place |
| E-mail Address: | martin.tolley@birmingham.gov.uk |
| Telephone Number: | 0121 303 3974 |

| | |
|----------------------------|--|
| Contact Officer(s): | John Jamieson - Head of Asset Management |
| Directorate: | Place |
| E-mail Address: | john.jamieson@birmingham.gov.uk |
| Telephone Number: | 0121 303 4082 |

| | |
|----------------------------|--|
| Contact Officer(s): | Ann Marie Rochford - Procurement Manager |
| Directorate: | Economy |
| E-mail Address: | ann-marie.rochford@birmingham.gov.uk |
| Telephone Number: | 0788 135 8476 |

| |
|---|
| 3. Consultation |
| <p>3.1 <u>Internal</u></p> <p>3.1.1 Service Director - Housing Transformation and the Assistant Director – Corporate Procurement Services have been consulted regarding the preparation of this report and have agreed with the contents.</p> <p>3.1.2 Officers from City Finance and Legal and Democratic Services have been consulted regarding the preparation of this report and have agreed with the contents.</p> <p>3.1.3 Trade Unions are receiving regular updates on the progress of this procurement at Housing Consultation Forum meetings.</p> <p>3.1.4 This procurement and proposed contract award have also been subject to a detailed review by Birmingham Audit and no issues were identified.</p> <p>3.2 <u>External</u></p> <p>3.2.1 Representatives from the City Housing Liaison Board (CHLB), Acivico Ltd and Service Birmingham formed part of the evaluation team for the Pre-qualification (PQQ).</p> <p>3.2.2 Representatives from the City Housing Liaison Board (CHLB) and Service Birmingham formed part of the evaluation team for the Detailed Solution (DS) and Final Tender (FT) stage of this procurement. All representatives have been consulted regarding the preparation of this report and have agreed with the contents.</p> <p>3.2.3 PricewaterhouseCoopers LLP were engaged as the Council's Critical Friend to provide assurance that the process followed was robust. No material issues were identified during the process.</p> |

| | |
|-----------|--|
| 4. | Compliance Issues: |
| 4.1 | <u>Are the recommended decisions consistent with the Council's policies, plans and strategies?</u> |
| 4.1.1 | <p>Details were included in the Cabinet report dated 17th March 2014 and the same continue to apply.</p> <p><u>Birmingham Business Charter for Social Responsibility (BBC4SR)</u></p> |
| 4.1.2 | <p>Compliance with the BBC4SR is a mandatory requirement in the conditions of these contracts. Bidders provided, along with their Final Tender submissions, an action plan that was evaluated in accordance with Section G of the Procurement Scoring Matrix. This document details the respective weightings for each section and question and can be located in Appendix 1. The action plans of the successful Bidders will be implemented and monitored during the contract period.</p> |
| 4.2 | <u>Financial Implications</u> |
| 4.2.1 | <p>Under the terms of these contracts the Council will be committed to revenue expenditure for each property held within the HRA covering repairs, voids and gas servicing/repairs. The contracts do not commit the Council to any particular level of capital expenditure. The existing approved HRA Business Plan 2015+ includes provision for revenue expenditure within the scope of these contracts of £218.1M and capital expenditure of £209.5M between 2016/17 and 2019/20.</p> |
| 4.2.2 | <p>The existing HRA Business Plan 2015+ will be updated to take into account the new national rent policy announced by the Chancellor on 8th July 2015 and will be reported to Cabinet on 1st March 2016.</p> |
| 4.3 | <u>Legal Implications</u> |
| 4.3.1 | <p>Under the Housing Act 1985 and the Landlord and Tenant Act 1985 the Council has statutory obligations to carry out the repairs and maintenance of its housing stock.</p> |
| 4.3.2 | <p>The transfer of staff will take place by operation of law if the conditions in the Transfer of Undertakings (Protection of Employment) Regulations 2006 ("TUPE") are satisfied. The incumbent providers have already provided details of employees who are likely to transfer under TUPE if they were unsuccessful and this information was provided to all bidders.</p> <p><u>Pre-Procurement Duty under the Public Service (Social Value) Act 2012</u></p> |
| 4.3.3 | <p>Consideration of how this project might contribute to achieving the Council's priorities and improve the economic, social and environmental well-being of the relevant area was discussed at the Cabinet Strategy report stage of this procurement. Further consultation with the Cabinet Member for Commissioning, Contracting & Improvement, the Service Director – Housing Transformation, Head of Capital Investment and Procurement Manager concerning the percentage weighting on social value was concluded on 24th November 2014. These final discussions ensured that the requirements were relevant and proportionate to the overall contract.</p> |
| 4.3.4 | <p>The process for securing this social value during the procurement will be through the BBC4SR. See Item 4.1.2.</p> |

4.4 Public Sector Equality Duty

4.4.1 The requirements of Standing Order No. 9 in respect of the Council's Equal Opportunities Policy is part of the conditions of contract.

4.4.2 The requirements of the Equality Act 2010 are also part of the conditions of contract.

4.5 Data Protection

4.5.1 The requirements of the Data Protection Act 1998 and Human Rights Act 1998 have been taken into consideration in terms of the processing, management and sharing of data involved in these proposals. Data Processing/ Sharing Agreements will be agreed with each recommended successful contractor.

5. Relevant background/chronology of key events:

5.1 Responsive repair and maintenance services (Council Houses and Garages) and Gas Servicing, maintenance and heating system replacement services are currently provided under contracts that will expire on 31st March 2016. A significant element of the Council Housing Capital Improvement programme is currently managed by Acivico with delivery through the Constructing West Midlands Framework.

5.2 Following the award of contracts as proposed the existing arrangements will be replaced by integrated delivery of both revenue and capital works in order to ensure a more effective approach to investment planning and to maximise value for money delivered through the new contracts.

5.3 The new proposed contracts include provisions for performance related pay and share of savings to ensure a clear focus on the effective and efficient delivery of services going forward. These will ensure that contractors are incentivised to deliver efficiency savings and that high performance standards will be appropriately rewarded.

Context

5.4 The relevant background, chronology of key events, pre-qualification stage and evaluations, Invitation to Participate in Dialogue (Detailed Solution; ((DS)) and evaluation are documented in:

- Report to Cabinet dated 17th March 2014 - Procurement Strategy for Council Housing Repair, Maintenance and Improvement Services – Contract Reference F0239;
- Report to Assistant Director – Corporate Procurement Services dated 19th August 2014 – Qualification Long List Report and
- Report to Assistant Director – Corporate Procurement Services dated 22nd June 2015 – Detailed Solution Short List Report.

Final Tender (FT) Dialogue Meetings

- 5.5 Following the approval of the Report to Assistant Director – Corporate Procurement Services dated 22nd June 2015 – Detailed Solution Short List Report; five shortlisted Bidders (Keepmoat Regeneration Limited, Kier Services Limited, Mears Limited, Wates Construction Limited and Willmott Dixon Partnerships Limited) were invited to prepare for further dialogue concerning the FT stage of this procurement.
- 5.6 A number of FT dialogue meetings were arranged for each specialist work stream, as detailed below, commencing 22nd June 2015 and ending 5th August 2015; with FT dialogue formally closing 26th August 2015.

| .WORK STREAMS AND SPECIALIST AREAS | | | | | | |
|------------------------------------|------------------------------|-----------------|--|-----------------|------------------|-------------------|
| Work Stream Number | Specialist Area | Specialist Area | Specialist Area | Specialist Area | Specialist Area | Specialist Area |
| 1 | Technical | Operational | Contract Management | Implementation | IT / Call Centre | Health and Safety |
| 2 | Equalities and Customer Care | Jobs and Skills | Business Charter for Social Responsibility | - | - | - |
| 3 | Legal | - | - | - | - | - |
| 4 | Commercial / Finance | - | - | - | - | - |

- 5.7 To provide Bidders with a fair and equal opportunity during the process, the FT dialogue meetings were arranged on rota basis order.
- 5.8 Minutes of meetings were taken and produced by the Council and circulated to appropriate Bidders as a true record of the discussions that had taken place along with any action points.

Clarification Phase during FT Dialogue

- 5.9 If a Bidder was in doubt as to the interpretation of any part of the FT documentation or if they considered that any of the requirements were ambiguous they were permitted to contact the Council via the Council's Tender portal <https://intendhost.co.uk/birminghamcc/> using the appropriate clarification template. The clarification period opened on 4th August 2015 and closed on 28th August 2015.
- 5.10 During the FT stage a total of 131 clarifications were submitted by Bidders and responded to via in-tend.
- 5.11 The FT documentation was explicit in that if clarification was deemed to be non-commercially sensitive (NCS) the responses would be shared with all Bidders to ensure and demonstrate equality.

5.12 Below is a table illustrating the number of clarifications received per Bidder:

| Bidder | Number of Clarifications |
|-------------------------------------|--------------------------|
| Keepmoat Regeneration Limited | 9 |
| Kier Services Limited | 13 |
| Mears Limited | 20 |
| Wates Construction Limited | 67 |
| Willmott Dixon Partnerships Limited | 22 |
| Total – 131 | |

Returned Final Tender Submissions

- 5.13 Returned FT submissions were received via in-tend from all Bidders noon on 4th September 2015.
- 5.14 A pre-evaluation due diligence process was undertaken to ensure that the hard copy final tenders submitted were an exact copy of the final tenders uploaded onto intend. The findings of this due diligence process are detailed in the Private Agenda report.
- 5.15 FT evaluations commenced on 9th September 2015 and concluded on 9th October 2015.
- 5.16 In addition to the pre-evaluation due diligence process a post evaluation due diligence process was also undertaken to ensure a consistent evaluation approach from DS to FT had been followed. The table below details the officers that were responsible for this process.

| Work stream | Work Stream Lead |
|--|--|
| Work stream 1 Service Delivery - Section B | Head of Capital Investment |
| Work stream 1 ICT - Section C | Service Birmingham |
| Work stream 1 Contract Management - Section D | Head of Capital Investment |
| Work stream 1 Implementation - Section E | Head of Capital Investment |
| Work stream 2 Social Value - Section F | Head of Asset Management |
| Work stream 2 Section G Birmingham Business Charter for Social responsibility (BBC4SR) | BBC4SR Project Manager |
| Work stream 3 Legal | Solicitor |
| Work stream 4 Section A Commercial | Head of City Finance - Housing Revenue Account |

Work stream Evaluation Teams

- 5.17 In order to adequately assess this complex project, four specialist work streams were formed in order to ensure that Officers with specific skill sets, in areas such as Social Value, were at the forefront of the evaluations.

| Work stream | Chair |
|----------------------------------|--|
| Work stream 1 – Service Delivery | Head of Capital Investment |
| Work stream 2 – Social Value | Head Asset Management |
| Work stream 3 – Legal | Solicitor |
| Work stream 4 – Commercial | Head of City Finance - Housing Revenue Account |

- 5.18 In addition service users nominated by City Housing Liaison Board were members of the evaluation team as detailed below.

| Work stream | Service Users |
|----------------------------------|--|
| Work stream 1 – Service Delivery | Chair of CHLB |
| Work stream 2 – Social Value | Chair of Acocks Green HLB |
| Work stream 3 – Legal | Chair of New Oscott and Wyrley Birch HLB |
| Work stream 4 – Commercial | Chair of CHLB |

Evaluation of Bids and Scoring Methodology

- 5.19 The evaluation criteria set out in the Tender Strategy report dated 17th March 2014 and outlined that the submissions received would be evaluated using the value assessment approach that enabled the Council to assess bids on both 'Quality' and 'Price'. In this instance a split of 30% quality and 70% price was endorsed. Further consultation with the Cabinet Member for Commissioning, Contracting & Improvement and the Service Director – Housing Transformation concerning the percentage weighting on social value was concluded on 24th November 2014.
- 5.20 Each stage of the FT was evaluated against a set of criteria so that each bid was assessed on a fair and consistent basis. The evaluation criterion and the 0-5 scoring methodology for assessing the FT Bidder contributions are summarised in the Private Agenda report.
- 5.21 The results of the FT evaluations are summarised in the Private Agenda report along with confidential information related to the Bidders, including their costs.

Contract Management

- 5.22 The contracts recommended for award will be managed operationally and commercially by Asset Management and Maintenance Division with strategic support from the Contract Manager within Corporate Procurement Services.
- 5.23 The key criteria on which the Bidders FT were evaluated as follows.

| PRICE 70% | | | QUALITY 30% | | |
|------------------------------------|--------------------|-----------|------------------------------------|----------------|--------------|
| Commercial and Legal | Technical Delivery | ICT | Contract Management | Implementation | Social Value |
| Criteria percentages of 70% | | | Criteria percentages of 30% | | |
| 70 | 20 | 10 | 30 | 10 | 60 |

- 5.24 Each stage of the FT was evaluated against a set of criteria so that each bid was assessed on a fair and consistent basis. The evaluation criterion for assessing the FT Bidder contributions is summarised in **Appendix 1** Procurement Scoring Matrix. That document details the respective weightings for each section and question.

5.25 It should be noted that the FT documentation set out that the Council may amend Tier 3 weightings described for the Detailed Solution by up to +/- 5% to reflect the FT solution. For the FT, site visits were not undertaken as the objectives of the site visit exercise was to witness first hand Bidder service capability and experience, performance, approach to joint working, customer satisfaction and customer experience. This was only considered necessary as a part of the DS stage. Therefore the 5% weighting for this area was added to Contract Management; sub section Driving Performance Management including KPIs and Performance Measures.

Scoring Methodology

5.26 This methodology is set out in **Appendix 2** and applied to the FT stage of this procurement.

Potential Contract Permutations

5.27 Bidders were asked to submit tenders for each individual lot and, to also identify any savings in the event that they are awarded more than one lot. Each individual lot and permissible combination of lots was separately evaluated. The Most Economically Advantageous Tender(s) (i.e. price and quality) for the Council as a whole was identified utilising the outcome of the evaluations for each overall permutation of tender awards that were consistent with the permissible lot combinations as set out in the 'Invitation to Tender' documents and summarised below. Analysis of the Most Economically Advantageous Tender Contract Award Permutations has identified that the optimal permutation is Option 6.

| Most Economically Advantageous Tender Contract Award Permutations | | | | |
|---|---|--------------------|------------------------------------|--------------------|
| Option | Lot | Lot | Lot | Lot |
| 1 | Lot 1 South | Lot 2 West-Central | Lot 3 East | Lot 4 North |
| 2 | Lot 1 South / Lot 4 North combined | | Lot 2 West-Central | Lot 3 East |
| 3 | Lot 3 East/ Lot 4 North combined | | Lot 1 South | Lot 2 West-Central |
| 4 | Lot 2 West-Central / Lot 4 North combined | | Lot 1 South | Lot 3 East |
| 5 | Lot 2 West-Central / Lot 3 East combined | | Lot 1 South / Lot 4 North combined | |
| 6 | Lot 2 West-Central / Lot 3 East combined | | Lot 1 South | Lot 4 North |

Depots Usage / Locations

5.28 It is anticipated that the following depots will be utilised to deliver the services under these contracts. The final details will be confirmed during the mobilisation period.

| Option | Quadrant | Depot |
|--------|--|----------------|
| 6 | Lot 1 South | Stonebrook Way |
| | Lot 2 West-Central / Lot 3 East combined | Kings Road |
| | Lot 4 North | College Road |

| | |
|-----------|---|
| 6. | Evaluation of alternative option(s): |
| 6.1 | Not to award contracts. This would result in the Council not having appropriate arrangements in place to undertake repairs and investment in HRA dwellings, and therefore being unable to comply with the requirements of both tenancy agreements and statute. |
| 6.2 | To award contracts using any of Options 1 to 5. Each of the other award permutations would allow the required services to be delivered, but would not represent the Most Economically Advantageous Tender permutation. This would therefore be non-compliant with the methodology set out in the previously issued procurement documentation. |

| | |
|-----------|---|
| 7. | Reasons for Decision(s): |
| 7.1 | To enable Cabinet to award contracts for the provision of Responsive Repairs & Maintenance Services, Gas Servicing and Capital Improvement Work Programmes (including Major Adaptations to Council Housing Stock) in the North, South, West-Central, and East areas of Birmingham – F0239 for an initial term of four years, commencing 1 st April 2016 with the option to extend for up to two periods of two years, subject to satisfactory performance against prescribed Key Performance Indicators. |

| | |
|---|-------|
| Signatures: | |
| Recommendations Approved by: | |
| | |
| Jacqui Kennedy | Date |
| Acting Strategic Director of Place | |
| | |
| Councillor Stewart Stacey | Date |
| Cabinet Member for Commissioning, Contracting and Improvement | |
| | |
| Councillor John Cotton | Date |
| Cllr John Cotton, Cabinet Member for Neighbourhood Management and Homes | |

| |
|---|
| List of Background Documents used to compile this Report: |
| Public Report to Cabinet dated 17 th March 2014 - Procurement Strategy for Council Housing Repair, Maintenance and Improvement Services – Contract Reference F0239 |
| Suite of Final Tender Documents |

| |
|--|
| List of Appendices accompanying this Report (if any): |
| Appendix 1 Procurement Scoring Matrix |
| Appendix 2 Scoring Methodology |

Procurement Scoring Matrix

| Tier 1 | | Tier 2 | | Tier 3 | |
|----------|-----------|------------------------------------|-----------|--|-------------|
| Criteria | Weighting | Criteria | Weighting | Criteria | Weighting |
| Price | 70% | Section A Commercial & Legal | 70% | Price Per Property Commentary (Responsive Repairs) | 5% |
| | | | | Price Per Property (Responsive Repairs) | 15% |
| | | | | Price Per Property Commentary (Gas) | 2% |
| | | | | Price Per Property (Gas) | 6% |
| | | | | Price Per Element Commentary (Capital) | 5% |
| | | | | Price Per Element (Capital) | 15% |
| | | | | Schedule of Rates Commentary (Capital) / Composite | 4% |
| | | | | Schedule of Rates (Capital) / Composite | 12% |
| | | | | Price Per Void Commentary | 3% |
| | | | | Price Per Void | 7% |
| | | | | Share of Savings | 4% |
| | | | | Performance Related Pay | 3% |
| | | | | Pricing Approach | 4% |
| | | | | Legal Terms and Conditions | 9% |
| | | | | Financial Risk Management and Mitigation | 6% |
| | | | | Total | 100% |
| | | Section B Technical Delivery | 20% | Depot Usage | 10% |
| | | | | Repair and Maintenance Technical | 12% |
| | | | | Capital Technical | 12% |
| | | | | Capital Electrical | 12% |
| | | | | Repair and Maintenance Gas | 12% |
| | | | | Capital Gas | 12% |
| | | | | Aids and adaptations | 5% |
| | | | | Sundries | 5% |
| | | | | New Technologies | 5% |
| | | | | Voids | 15% |
| | | | | Total | 100% |

| | | | | | |
|----------------|-----|---|-------------|--|-------------|
| | | Section C ICT | 10% | Contact Centre | 25% |
| | | | | IT and Mobile Solutions | 50% |
| | | | | Integration with Council systems including OMFAX, APEX, Northgate, CRM, Optitime and Techforge | 25% |
| | | Total | 100% | Total | 100% |
| Quality | 30% | Section D Contract Management | 30% | Service and Contract Management and Governance | 5% |
| | | | | Quality Control and Audit | 5% |
| | | | | Site Visits – Not to be included in Final Tender | 0% |
| | | | | Supply Chain including the Management and Monitoring of the Supply Chain | 5% |
| | | | | Communication and interaction with the Council (Relationship Management) | 5% |
| | | | | Understanding of and contribution to Council's Strategy | 5% |
| | | | | Management of Service Integration including working with / coordinating other parts of the Council or other Partners | 5% |
| | | | | Safeguarding | 5% |
| | | | | Management of Health and Safety and other Legislative Requirements. | 5% |
| | | | | Supplier Business Continuity Management | 5% |
| | | | | Driving Performance Management including KPIs and Performance Measures | 15% |
| | | | | Customer Relationship Management (Residents) | 15% |
| | | | | HR Management | 5% |
| | | | | Management of Recoverable Repairs and Leaseholder Apportionment | 5% |
| | | | | Management of Out of Hours Delivery | 5% |
| | | | | Providing and Maintaining Stock Condition Data | 5% |
| | | | | Service Delivery Risk Management | 5% |
| | | | | Total | 100% |
| | | Section E Implementation | 10% | Mobilisation Plan and Management | 40% |
| | | | | Staff Transfer, Recruitment and Induction | 40% |
| | | | | Mobilisation Strategy for Customer and Stakeholder Engagement | 20% |
| | | | | Total | 100% |
| | | Section F Social Value | 60% | Jobs and skills | 70% |
| | | | | Customer Care and Equalities | 30% |
| | | | | Total | 100% |
| | | Section G BBC4SR | | Birmingham Business Charter for Social Responsibility (BBC4SR) | Pass / Fail |
| | | Total | 100% | | |

Scoring Methodology

The following scoring methodology applied to the FT of this procurement is set out below:

- Excluding Legal A9, all relevant evidence submitted was assessed in accordance to the 0-5 scoring methodology as set out in the table below:

| Scored Questions - 0-5 Scoring Methodology to be Applied to Qualitative / Narrative Questions Excluding A9 | |
|--|---|
| Mark | Description |
| 0 | Highly unsatisfactory The solution shows that the Bidder does not understand the Council's requirements or the solution is incapable of meeting the Council's requirements. |
| 1 | Poor The solution shows that the Bidder understands the Council's requirements but there are some major risks or omissions in the proposed solution to deliver the service and the Council would not be confident of the requirements being met. |
| 2 | Doubtful The solution shows that the Bidder understands the Council's requirements and the solution could meet them but there are some areas in the proposed solution to deliver the service which require refinement to ensure the solution answer meets the Council's needs. |
| 3 | Satisfactory The solution shows that the Bidder understands the Council's requirements, has offered a solution including a robust approach / method statements or other processes and resources to deliver the service and the solution is capable of meeting the Council's needs. |
| 4 | Good The solution shows that the Bidder understands the Council's requirements, offers a solution including a robust approach / method statements or other processes and resources to deliver the service and the solution is capable of meeting the Council's needs and the solution has some additional benefits and opportunities to add value or otherwise enhance the delivery of the required outputs. |
| 5 | Excellent The solution shows that the Bidder understands the Council's requirements, offers a solution including a robust approach / method statements or other processes and resources to deliver the service and the solution is capable of meeting the Council's needs and the solution has significant additional benefits and opportunities to add a high level of value or otherwise significantly enhance the delivery of the required outputs. |

- The process adopted for the allocation of scores for scoring of qualitative / narrative answers (including questions A1.1, A2.1, A3.1, A4.1, A5.1 BUT excluding Legal A9) / price responses is described below:
 - Each member of the evaluation team, within their designated work stream, individually scored the bidder response and allocated a provisional score between
 - 0-5 for each answer based on the scoring descriptions set out below.
 - The option to score any ½ marks was not permissible.

- The evaluation team member then presented their rationale for their individual scores to the rest of the work stream evaluation team.
- Once this process has been complete each member of the evaluation team had an opportunity to reflect on their provisional scores. There was a provision in the process for individual scores to be adjusted either up or down.
- All individual scores, within the designated work stream, were collated, added together and divided by the number of evaluation team members to reach an average total score for each qualitative / narrative answer for each Bidder.
- Scores were then multiplied by the question weightings to achieve a weighted score for each question.
- The weighted scores for all qualitative / narrative answers were then added together to reach a total weighted score for each Bidder.

Scoring of Qualitative / Narrative answers (Legal A9 only)

- For the FT, a decision was made to have a varied scoring methodology for the Legal submission opposed to that for the remaining qualitative / narrative answers. All Bidders were notified and agreed to this change.

The requirement was for Bidders to submit their legal documents, listed below, as agreed at the time FT dialogue formally closed. The only provision for alterations was the identification of any omissions or typos by the Council. If Bidders decided to provide additional marked version of the contract or fail to provide all the documents below a score of zero would be applied.

- Volume 2.0 Standard Clauses
 - Volume 2.1 General Operational Clauses
 - Volume 2.2 – Day to Day Clauses
 - Volume 2.3 – Safety and Safeguarding Clauses
 - Volume 2.4 – Legal Contract
- All relevant evidence submitted was assessed in accordance to the 0 or 5 scoring methodology as set out in the table below:

| Scored Questions - 0-5 Scoring Methodology to be Applied to Qualitative / Narrative Questions Legal A9 ONLY | |
|--|---|
| Mark | Description |
| 0 | Unsatisfactory The solution shows that the Bidder does not understand the Council's requirements or the solution is incapable of meeting the Council's requirements. |
| 5 | Satisfactory The solution shows that the Bidder understands the Council's requirements, offers a solution including a robust approach to deliver the service and the solution is capable of meeting the Council's needs. |

- The process adopted for the allocation of scores for Legal A9 was assessed in accordance to the 0 or 5 scoring methodology as set out in the table below:
 - Each member of the evaluation team, within their designated work stream, individually scored the bidder response and allocated a provisional score either 0 or 5 for each answer based on the scoring descriptions set out below.
 - The evaluation team member then presented their rationale for their individual scores to the rest of the work stream evaluation team.
 - Once this process was complete each member of the evaluation team had an opportunity to reflect on their provisional scores. There was a provision in the process for individual scores to be adjusted either up or down.
 - All individual scores, within the designated work stream, were be collated, added together and divided by the number of evaluation team members to reach an average total score for each qualitative / narrative answer for each Bidder.
 - Scores were then multiplied by the question weightings to achieve a weighted score for each question.
 - The weighted scores for all qualitative / narrative answers were then added together to reach a total weighted score for each Bidder.

Throughout the course of the procurement the evaluation provided coverage of fundamental measures such as, but not limited to, cost, quality, risk, operational capacity, KPIs, technical expertise, customer care and affordability. Other dimensions such as value for money, performance, strategic vision, innovation and creativity, integration and implementation were also incorporated. These cut across the key evaluation criteria outlined above.