

	<p style="text-align: center;">Executive 18 October 2010</p> <p style="text-align: center;">Report from the Director of Finance and Corporate Resources</p>
For Action	Wards Affected: ALL
<p style="text-align: center;">Authority to award a contract for the provision of a Managed Print Service</p>	

Appendices 6, 7 & 8 are not for publication

1.0 Summary

- 1.1 This report relates to the provision of a managed print service covering all office printing and all printing currently undertaken by the Print Shop. The report summarises the process undertaken in tendering this contract and, following completion of the evaluation of the tenders, requests approval from the Executive for the award of the contract.
- 1.2 The managed print service is expected to deliver estimated savings against current costs of a minimum of £2.7 million over 6 years.

2.0 Recommendations

- 2.1 That Members award a contract for a managed print service contract to Xerox (UK) Ltd to start on 3rd January 2011 to last for a period of 4 years with the option to extend the contract for a further 2 years.

3.0 Detail

The Current Situation

- 3.1 The Council's current print infrastructure is archaic, expensive, unmanageable and totally inappropriate for a modern organisation. It cannot support hot desking, it cannot provide a One Council uniform print service at a standard cost and most of the current devices are energy inefficient.
- 3.2 Printing is carried out on over 500 devices including networked printers and scanners, standalone photocopiers and faxes. This gives a staff to printer ratio of about 7:1 but this is not common across the council. These devices have been purchased or leased on an ad hoc basis from around 15 suppliers

over a number of years. They are of differing ages and have different facilities. The majority cannot print double sided or colour and there is no standardisation of toners and other consumables. Paper is separately ordered by service areas for all devices but most paper is ordered through the council's corporate contract.

- 3.3 In the past individual sections have had complete freedom to set up expensive photocopier contracts so annual lease charges vary significantly from contract to contract and in most cases there is a page charge in addition. There is currently a ban on new and the renewal of photocopier leases.
- 3.4 The Council is currently printing around 21 million sheets of paper per year on networked devices which includes separately leased photocopiers, where 'printing' covers printing, photocopying, and faxing. An additional 2 million sheets per year minimum are printed on non-networked photocopiers to give a total of 23 million sheets per year. 14% of the total is colour printing, 6% is double sided, however most of the current printers are black and white single sided only. Where colour printing is available it can rise to nearly 50% of the total print where colour printing can be up to seven times more expensive than b/w. Where double sided printing was available it only accounted for around 20% of the total print.
- 3.4 Research by independent document management consultants (Newfield IT), estimate that for unmanaged print services in a public sector organisation the total cost is £450 per employee per year. This equates to around £1.35 million per year on printing for the Council. Our own current estimate for the total printing cost is over £1 million per year including paper but excluding energy and office space costs. This includes identified photocopier leases of £560,000 pa for 96 devices.
- 3.5 For the leased photocopiers and printers that have been purchased outright the consumables are separately purchased by individual service areas. There are a multitude of different devices from different suppliers so there is no standardisation or common ordering across the council or savings with bulk purchase.
- 3.6 Since there is no common method of purchasing/leasing equipment and consumables or of recharging for printing, for most staff the true total cost of printing is not visible.
- 3.7 The Print Shop is located at the Town Hall and carries out bulk printing and prints jobs that require special finishing. It is only used by a few departments most of which are based at the Town Hall. However there are problems with turn round times for delivery of print to other council offices so the service is underutilised. The equipment and software needs to be upgraded and the service needs to be fully integrated with the office printing environment.
- 3.8 Summary of the problems of the current print environment:

- There is no restriction on colour printing or enforcement of double sided printing
- There is no monitoring of printing so sections and individuals are unaware of the amount of print they are producing.
- With a range of devices, suppliers and contracts there is no common cost of printing across the council or any savings by standardising on devices and consumables. With no common pricing across the council it is not possible for sectional print budgets to be established and controlled.
- The age and variety of devices means that many devices are energy hungry and the toners they use are ecologically poor both for the chemicals they use and for their disposal.
- The Print Shop is underutilised and without an upgrade to hardware and software will remain underutilised.
- It cannot support hot desking and flexible working is difficult.
- It cannot support a secure print service
- It is totally inappropriate for the Civic Centre with its flexible working environment and low energy requirements.

Benefits of a Managed Print Service

- 3.8 The Corporate Management Team received a report in January 2010 about printing and agreed to the procurement of a managed print service.
- 3.9 All service areas will be covered by the new service including the Brent Housing Partnership. Schools would have the option of using the contract.
- 3.10 The winner of the contract will take over management of all existing devices, the outstanding photocopier leases and the management of the Print Shop. All print devices will eventually be replaced by modern low energy multi-functional devices (MFDs) from a single supplier which can print, photocopy, scan and, if required fax. They will use modern toner technology which is more efficient in the use of toner and uses less harmful chemicals.
- 3.11 There will be a significant reduction in the number of devices. This will partly be due to replacing separate printers, photocopiers, scanners and faxes with one MFD, but there will also be policy to increase the ratio of staff to printers. This will obviously depend on the particular council site and usage of different teams, but could be over 20:1 in modern open plan offices. Staff-printer ratios will be constantly monitored to provide an optimum service to the council.
- 3.12 The managed print service will provide a One Council service and support flexible working, secure printing and the low energy requirements of the Civic Centre.
- 3.13 The new managed print service will be controlled by a corporate print policy which was approved by CMT in January 2010. This has the aim of providing a generic high standard of printing across the council while reducing printing and the total cost of printing. Its major policies are:
- The managed print service will affect everyone in the Council who prints

- There will be a charge by the supplier to the Council based on each sheet of paper printed (a “click charge”)
- There will be an internal click charge to service areas which will recover the supplier costs, paper costs and infrastructure and ITU support costs i.e. the full cost of printing.
- No individual will have their own private printer or be allowed to separately install a printer
- There will be a significant reduction in the number of devices
- Existing separate photocopier leases will not be renewed and no new ones allowed to be set up.
- MFDs will default to black and white and double sided
- MFDs are a corporate resource useable by all staff. ‘Pull printing’ software will enable printing from any device on the network in any building
- All print will be identified to the person who requested the print job and the internal click charge will be charged to the responsible section regardless of which printer is used.
- Comprehensive monitoring of printing will enable targets to be set to reduce total printing and identify expensive print jobs (for example single sided colour).
- Large print jobs will automatically divert to a new central Print Facility which will have a strict SLA for the turn round of jobs.

3.14 A modern managed central Print Facility and despatch service will be established at the current site at the Town Hall and will eventually be moved to the Civic Centre. As part of the procurement process, one member of staff at the print shop was identified as likely to transfer under TUPE.

3.15 The supplier will monitor on-line all devices, provide support and supply all consumables except paper.

4.0 The Procurement Process

4.1 It was decided that the most straightforward procurement route was under a pre-existing framework agreement established in accordance with the Public Contracts Regulations 2006. The framework agreement awarded by Office for Government Commerce (OGC) Buying Solutions that covers the requirement of this contract is RM450 Multifunctional Products & Services.

4.2 The suppliers listed on the Framework have been assessed and pre-qualified by OGC through a rigorous tendering and evaluation process and give the Council the assurance that each supplier provides a managed print service at competitive prices and full compliance with the EU Regulations. These suppliers are listed in Appendix 8.

4.3 A Capability Assessment was sent via the OGC Buying Solutions web site to all suppliers shown on the framework agreement. Six suppliers responded stating they were capable and were able to meet the requirements of the contract. Supplier F did not respond. A Tender Evaluation Panel (TEP) was established with representatives from all Service Areas.

- 4.4 The Council gave a presentation of requirements to the six capable suppliers and all were invited to take part in a mini-competition under the framework agreement. The suppliers had to provide a written response to a series of questions based on a high level specification, provide indicative costings and to make a presentation of their solution to the TEP. From this first stage a short list of two would be drawn.
- 4.5 Under the rules of the OGC framework, the Council had to use the evaluation criteria and weightings specified by the Framework Agreement. These rules require the following high level split as well as more detailed sub-criteria (see appendices 1 and 3):

Evaluation Criteria	Weighting
Price	60%
Quality	40%

- 4.6 The detailed evaluation methods and the sub-criteria are given in Appendix 1.

Supplier D withdrew before the deadline and supplier E withdrew on the day of the supplier presentations leaving suppliers A, B, C and G.

The scoring by the TEP of the remaining suppliers is given in Appendix 2. In view of these scores suppliers A and B were shortlisted and invited to participate in the second stage of the mini-competition. (OGC guidance for this framework indicated the use of a two-stage approach with two tenderers being taken forward to the second stage).

- 4.7 The second stage required the shortlisted suppliers to provide a written response to a detailed service specification, a fully costed proposal based on predicted print volumes supplied in the tender documentation and a detailed presentation of their proposal to the TEP.
- 4.8 For Stage 2 the overall evaluation criteria remained the same but there was a small change in the percentage weightings within the sub-criteria. These are given, along with the Stage 2 scoring process in Appendix 3.
- 4.9 A summary of the financial bids from the two suppliers are given in Appendix 6. Although the total predicted print volumes were supplied it was up to the individual supplier, based on their experience, to suggest the split between office and central printing, predict the percentage of colour and the uptake of double sided printing. For both suppliers the figures given in the line 'Total from bid' are the figures the suppliers gave in their Costing Spreadsheet submission. The additional costs are costs taken from their written submissions and from clarifications. These have been added to the bid costs to make the two submissions compatible.
- 4.10 Supplier A proposed differing click charges for office and Print Shop printing, the Print Shop charges being higher. These click charges decrease over the six years. They assume that by year 6, despite the higher charge, about 90%

of print will go to the Print Shop. TUPE costs were not separately identified. In addition to the costs identified there are disposal costs and possible additional move costs for existing devices. There were some optional software costs that may add to the final contract.

Supplier B's costing were more detailed. They assume that by year 6 40% of all print would go through the Print Shop. The click charge is the same for office and Print Shop printing and remains constant over the contract but there is a £50,000 annual management charge for the Print Shop. TUPE costings were separately identified. All printer moves and disposals are included in the costs.

Both suppliers said they would just recharge the existing leases at cost and not charge any management costs to the council.

For these indicative costs Supplier A's cost over 6 years is £3.5 million while supplier B's costs are £3.3 million.

- 4.11 The final scoring is shown in Appendix 4. This shows that supplier A scored 76.8% while supplier B scored 88.6%. Significantly supplier B scored best for both Price and for Quality and therefore it is recommended that the contract is awarded to supplier B – Xerox (UK) Ltd for a period of 4 years with the option to extend for 2 years.

5.0 Financial Implications

- 5.1 Current unmanaged print costs are shown in Appendix 5. Potential cost savings of a managed print service compared to current estimated costs are shown in Appendix 7.
- 5.2 The table in Appendix 7 part b) sets out projected spending against estimated current spending.
- 5.3 The savings principally arise as a result of leases for current photocopiers and printers falling out and not having to be replaced. The cost of these leases is £560k currently but will reduce to £46k by 2013/14 and zero by 2014/15. There are also savings in future years from assumptions about reduced use of printing and increased use of double sided instead of single sided printing.
- 5.4 The current devolved nature of budgets makes it difficult to identify all existing costs. The current estimated spending shown above is considered a prudent estimate. Actual spending is thought likely to be higher than this meaning the saving from the move to the new contract will be greater than shown.
- 5.5 In order to capture the saving within the council's budget, it is proposed to centralise all current lease costs and reduce budgets by an equivalent amount. This means that future savings from leases dropping out will be captured as part of the annual budget process. The saving from this is estimated at £39k in 2012/13, a further £475k in 2013/14 and £46k in 2014/15.

- 5.6 Savings from reduced use of printing will be monitored and captured within annual budget rounds.

6.0 Legal Implications

- 6.1 The contract being recommended for award has been procured from a framework agreement set up by the Office for Government Commerce. A contract of this value would otherwise have been subject to the full tendering requirements of the EU public procurement regime. Use of a framework agreement that has itself been tendered in accordance with the EU procurement rules is an exemption from the standard requirement. As a result, the procurement process can be quicker and less costly in terms of officer time.
- 6.2 The essence of a framework agreement is that the suppliers are invited to express interest in being on the framework, and are then approved for issues such as financial capacity and technical ability. A further tender exercise is then undertaken amongst the approved companies using indicative pricing and assessment of service delivery to appoint a number of companies to the framework.
- 6.3 Under Contract Standing Orders, a proposal to use a framework set up by a third party needs prior approval. This is set out in Standing Order 86(d). Firstly the Chief Officer has to recommend award, and then the Director of Finance and Corporate Resources has to approve. The Borough Solicitor also has to confirm that use of the framework is legally permissible, checking that the owner of the framework procured it according to the EU rules and that it covers the service that the Council needs. These approvals were obtained before the procurement process started.
- 6.4 As the contract proposed for award is a High Value Contract under Contract Standing Orders (exceeding £500,000 in value), then Executive approval is required for award.

7.0 Diversity Implications

- 7.1 Part of the shortlisting evaluation covered accessibility and supplier B, the successful tenderer, scored the highest. During implementation the project team will consult with the council's Disabled Staff Forum on the setting up of the MFDs.

8.0 Staffing/Accommodation Implications

- 8.1 The Print Shop service is currently run by two staff. The manager is due to retire so only one member of staff may transfer under TUPE regulations. The relevant details of this staff member were passed to tenderers so that associated costs could be included in any submission.

- 8.2 A managed print service would enable flexible working, free up accommodation space due to the reduction of the number of devices and meet the energy requirements for the Civic Centre.

9.0 Comments of Union

The following are the comments of Unison regarding the proposal to TUPE the Print Shop function. The issues raised are answered in the body of the report.

As a Trade Union, Unison supports the need for efficient, responsive and high quality public services and believes that the transformation of public services can be achieved by using different strategies, which avoid the negative impact of marketisation and privatisation.

Unison believes the focus should be on in-house improvement.

The privatisation of public services means that public service principles and values are eroded as business practice and commercial values dominate service delivery.

The privatisation of Public Services leads to the fragmentation of service delivery, reducing democratic accountability and transparency.

Employees who are TUPE'd to private employers often have problems with preserving the continuity of their terms and conditions of employment. New starters taken on after the transfer are not covered by TUPE and are often employed on worse pay and conditions. This creates a two tier workforce and negatively impacts on the staff who have been TUPE'd.

Contract monitoring is often not as rigorous and comprehensive as it should be.

Financial savings in the privatisation of public services are often exaggerated. A greater share of public spending is often absorbed by transaction costs – the cost of management consultants, lawyers, managing the procurement process and managing and monitoring contracts. This diverts resources from frontline services.

10.0 Background Papers

Tender documents for both stages.

11.0 Contact Officers

Tony Ellis, Assistant Director of Information Technology
020 8937 1400

Director of Finance and Corporate Resources

- APPENDIX 1** The Shortlisting Evaluation Scoring Process
- APPENDIX 2** Shortlisting Stage Scoring
- APPENDIX 3** The Stage 2 Evaluation Scoring Process
- APPENDIX 4** Stage 2 Scoring
- APPENDIX 5** Current Costs of the LBB Unmanaged Print Service

The following appendices are not for publication:

- APPENDIX 6** Shortlisted Suppliers' Bids (NOT FOR PUBLICATION)
- APPENDIX 7** Managed Print Service Costs Based on Xerox Bid and Estimated Savings (NOT FOR PUBLICATION)
- APPENDIX 8** Suppliers on the RM450 Framework (NOT FOR PUBLICATION)

APPENDIX 1 The Shortlisting Evaluation Scoring Process

1 Evaluation criteria

Bids will be evaluated for Stage 1 on the basis of the most economically advantageous proposal using the following criteria. Each criterion has been assigned a weighting to reflect the relative importance of such criterion to the Evaluation Panel members.

Evaluation Criteria			Weighting
	a)	Price	60%
Quality	b)	Product Range	8%
	c)	Managed or Extended Services	9%
	d)	Maintenance, Support, Training & Performance	10.5%
	e)	Identification of Requirements	5%
	f)	Management of Product Fleet	3%
	g)	Communication	2%
	h)	Sustainability and Environment	1%
	i)	Management of the Contract	1.5%

2. Detailed description of evaluation

a) *Evaluation of 'Price'*

At Stage 1, there are five sub criteria under 'Price' and a total weighting of 60% of marks. These are as follows:

1	Total Cost (Click charge + implementation)	35%
2	Outsource of Print Shop	10%
3	Additional costs associated with the Civic Centre relocation	5%
4	Proposals for profit sharing	5%
5	Energy & Efficiency of MFDs	5%

There are then nine questions relating to these five sub criteria in the Shortlisting Questionnaire document.

At this stage in the process, it is not feasible to request specific pricing models and therefore the evaluation will focus on indicative costs (excluding the Print Shop and the Civic Centre move) the methodology of pricing and how the costs are arrived at will be evaluated based on a 6 month roll out programme.

Total Cost will be evaluated via Questions 1 (20%), Question 2 (5%) and Question 9 (10%) to provide a weighted score out of 35.

The methodology given for arriving at that figure, as well as the Indicative Cost will be evaluated jointly. That is to say that the methodology and the accuracy of the Total Cost figure provided will be given equal weighting so as to prevent bidders distorting the process by quoting an unrealistic click charge.

Indicative Costs for the Outsourcing of the Print Shop (Question 3) and Additional Costs of Civic Centre Relocation (Question 4) will also be assessed using the methodology above and weighted as per the above table.

Profit Sharing (Questions 5 and 6) and Energy & Efficiency (Questions 7 and 8) will be assessed in the manner used to assess Qualitative aspects of the proposals and more detail is contained within Section 3.3b of this document.

b) Scoring of Qualitative Criteria

At Stage 1 there are 15 sub-criteria spread across the 8 qualitative evaluation criteria, with a total weighting of 40% of the marks (see Evaluation Criteria for Shortlisting Stage document). There are eighteen questions relating to these 15 sub-criteria.

These eighteen questions (and Questions 5 & 6 and Questions 7 & 8 from the Price section) in the Shortlisting Questionnaire document will all be assessed on the basis of the tenderer's completed Method Statements and supporting evidence.

Scores will be awarded against each sub-criterion using the following marking regime:

Assessment	Score	Interpretation
Unacceptable	0	Fails to meet requirement - major omissions/weaknesses
Weak	1	Limited evidence of ability to meet requirement - omissions/weaknesses in key areas
Adequate	2	Meets requirement but with some minor omissions/weaknesses
Good	3	Fully meets requirement
Excellent	4	Fully meets requirement demonstrating added value in proposals for delivery of service

Each evaluation sub-criteria may attract up to a maximum of 4 marks, the mark awarded will be multiplied by the weighting for each of the Qualitative sub-criteria to provide a total score out of the maximum score possible of 120.

The achieved Qualitative score will then be divided by 120 (maximum marks) and multiplied by 40 (total maximum Qualitative score) to give a final weighted score.

c) Minimum requirements

Included in the Evaluation Criteria for Shortlisting document are four minimum requirements sections, which will be evaluated by Technical Members of the IT Unit. These sub sections are on a pass / fail basis, so to say that if a bidder is judged not to meet this minimum standard in any one of the four areas detailed below, they will be adjudged to have failed the process altogether, and will not be further evaluated.

- Product Range, compatibility with Brent IT infrastructure (technical questionnaire)
- Admin of Orders & Invoices, e-invoicing
- Security and Standards, conformance with Corporate Security standards, Accessibility standards and certified for ISO 14001 or equivalent.
- Sustainability & Environment

All questions for these categories must score 2 or more (as per above table) and the overall score must be a minimum of 75% of the total score possible for that section, i.e. where there is only one question in a section, a minimum of 3 out of 4 must be scored (see first two examples below)

- Sustainability & Environment Q27 of Shortlisting Questionnaire – Minimum score: 3
- Admin of Orders & Invoices, e-invoicing Q10 Security Questions – Minimum score: 3
- Compatibility with Brent IT Infrastructure Q1 – Q27 Technical Questions & Q1 – Q8 Unix Questions – Minimum score: 105
- Security and Standards Q1 – Q9 Security Questions – Minimum score: 27

d) Scoring for Qualitative Criteria and 'Price'

The scores for Price will be added to those for the Qualitative aspects to provide a total percentage score, the scores will then be ranked and the two highest scoring bidders recommended for invite to Stage 2 of the process.

APPENDIX 2 Shortlisting Stage Scoring

Criteria	Max Score %	Supplier A	Supplier B	Supplier C	Supplier G
Price	60%	34.1	41.8	31.2	20.4
Quality	40%	28.7	37.1	26.6	25.7
Total	100%	62.8	78.9	57.8	46.1
Rank		2	1	3	4

Suppliers A and B shortlisted for the second stage of the mini competition.

APPENDIX 3 The Stage 2 Evaluation Scoring Process

1. Stage 2 Evaluation Criteria

Bids will be evaluated for Stage 2 on the basis of the most economically advantageous proposal using the following criteria. Each criterion has been assigned a weighting to reflect the relative importance of such criterion to the Evaluation Panel members.

Evaluation Criteria		Weighting
a)	Price	60%
Quality	b) Product Range	6%
	c) Managed or Extended Services	10%
	d) Maintenance, Support, Training & Performance	9%
	e) Identification of Requirements	6%
	f) Management of Product Fleet	3%
	g) Communication	2%
	h) Sustainability and Environment	1%
	i) Management of the Contract	3%

3.3 Detailed description of evaluation

a) Evaluation of 'Price'

At Stage 2, there are five sub criteria under 'Price' and a total weighting of 60% of marks. These are as follows:

1	Total cost (Click charge + implementation)	35%
2	Outsource of Print Shop	15%
3	Additional costs associated with the Civic Centre relocation	2.5%
4	Management of existing photocopier leases	2.5%
5	Energy & Efficiency of MFDs	5%

Bidders are required to complete tab 5 of the Pricing Document which contains more detail. The completed schedule will provide a total estimated cost for print via a click charge for the maximum 6 years, this total figure will be the figure evaluated. A maximum of 35 marks are available for this element of Total Cost and they will be

awarded as per the Cost Formula below. All calculations will be verified by a Finance Officer.

The 15% for Outsource of the Print Shop will be evaluated via the proposed total cost method as well. Additionally, there is a further weighting of 10% contained within the qualitative criteria and this 10% will be awarded via the response to detailed specification document.

Additional costs associated with the Civic Centre move, Management of existing photocopier leases and Energy & Efficiency will be assessed in the manner used to assess Qualitative aspects of the proposals and more detail is contained within Section 3.3b of this document.

Cost formula

- The 'Price' uses proportional scoring system to award the full score to the lowest price. The remaining bids will be awarded scores to reflect their individual value in relation to that of the lowest price.
- For example, where the total contract price for Bid X is £1,000 and for Bid Y £500, Bid Y receives the maximum score of 50% and Bid X a score of 25% calculated as follows:

$$\frac{\text{Lowest price bid (Bid Y)}}{\text{Bid X price}} \times \text{Weighting} \qquad \frac{£500}{£1,000} \times 50\% = 25\%$$

$$\frac{\text{Lowest price bid (Bid Y)}}{\text{Bid Y price}} \times \text{Weighting} \qquad \frac{£500}{£500} \times 50\% = 50\%$$

b) Scoring of Qualitative Criteria

At Stage 2 there are 16 sub-criteria spread across the 8 qualitative evaluation criteria, with a total weighting of 40% of the marks (see Evaluation Criteria document). There are 45 questions relating to these 16 sub-criteria.

These 45 questions contained within the Detailed Specification document will all be assessed on the basis of the bidders completed Method Statements and supporting evidence.

Scores will be awarded against each sub-criterion using the following marking regime:

Assessment	Score	Interpretation
Unacceptable	0	Fails to meet requirement - major omissions/weaknesses
Weak	1	Limited evidence of ability to meet requirement - omissions/weaknesses in key areas
Adequate	2	Meets requirement but with some minor omissions/weaknesses
Good	3	Fully meets requirement
Excellent	4	Fully meets requirement demonstrating added value in proposals for delivery of service

Each evaluation sub-criteria may attract up to a maximum of 4 marks, the mark awarded will be multiplied by the weighting for each of the Qualitative sub-criteria to provide a total score out of the maximum score possible of 120.

The achieved Qualitative score will then be divided by 120 (maximum marks) and multiplied by 40 (total maximum Qualitative score) to give a final weighted score.

c) Scoring for Qualitative Criteria and 'Price'

The scores for Price will be added to those for the Qualitative aspects to provide a total percentage score, the scores will then be ranked with the highest scoring bid recommended for contract award.

APPENDIX 4 Stage 2 Scoring

	Criteria	Max %	Supplier A	Supplier B
PRICE	Total Cost (click charge and implementation)	35	33.0	35.0
	Outsource of Print Shop	15	10.1	15
	Civic Centre Relocation	2.5	1.5	2.5
	Management of Existing Photocopier Leases	2.5	2.5	2.5
	Energy & Efficiencies of MFDs	5	3.8	3.8
	Total Price Score	60	50.8	58.8
QUALITY	Product Range	6	4.0	5.1
	Managed or Extended Services	10	6.6	6.8
	Maintenance, Support, Training & Performance	9	6.3	7.3
	Identification of Requirements	6	2.8	3.2
	Management of Product Fleet	3	2.1	2.4
	Communication	2	1.3	1.6
	Sustainability and Environment	1	0.8	0.8
	Management of the Contract	3	2.1	2.6
	Total Quality Score	40	26.0	29.8
TOTAL SCORE		100	76.8	88.6

APPENDIX 5 – Current Costs of the LBB Unmanaged Print Service

Existing Unmanaged Print Service Estimated Costs per year

<u>VOLUMES</u>	Full Year Costs
	23,000,000
Colour	20%
Duplex	10%
Sheets of Paper	25,564,500
<u>CURRENT PRINTING & PAPER COSTS</u>	
Print Shop Staff Costs	£90,600
Outstanding Lease Costs	£560,500
Print Cost	£322,000
Paper Costs	£94,589
Current Annual Costs	£1,067,689
<u>CURRENT ITU SUPPORT COSTS</u>	
Printer maintenance costs	£10,000
IT Costs (Service Desk, support etc)	£20,000
Total LBB ITU Costs	£30,000
TOTAL CURRENT UNMANAGED PRINT SERVICE COSTS	£1,097,689