



Executive
27th May 2008

**Report from the Director of
Housing and Community Care**

Wards Affected:
None

**Authority to award two Framework Agreements for
Services for People with a Learning Disability**

Forward Plan Ref: H&CC-07/08-33

Appendix 3 of this Report is Not for Publication

1.0 Summary

This report relates to the tendering of Housing Support and Care Services for People with a Learning Disability, undertaken over the past 6 months.

The report summarises the process undertaken in tendering these framework agreements and following completion of the evaluation of the tenders, recommends the organisations to be appointed to the framework agreements and the award of initial call-off contracts.

2.0 Recommendations

- 2.1 That the Executive approve the appointment of the following organisations to the framework agreements for housing support services for people with a learning disability for a period of two years (plus provision for extension of up to two years) commencing on 1st September 2008

Lot 1 Accommodation Based services

Brent Mencap/Stadium Housing Association
Support for Living Ltd
Yarrow Housing Limited

Lot 2 Floating Support services

Brent Mencap/Stadium Housing Association
Support for Living Ltd
Turning Point Services Ltd

- 2.2 That the Executive approve the award of the following call-off contracts for a period of two years commencing on 1st September 2008 with an option to extend the contracts for a further two year period:
- A contract for accommodation based services, approx 350 hours per week (inclusive of front line managers) to Yarrow Housing Ltd
 - A contract for floating support to be phased in up to a maximum of 350 hours per week plus 70 hours per week for housing advice to Brent Mencap/Stadium Housing Association.
- 2.3 That the Executive note the abortion of the tender process with respect to Lot 3 for personal and care services.

3.0 Detail

Background

- 3.1 The following information is on people with learning disabilities living in Brent -
- Approx 4500 people aged 18 – 64 are believed to have a learning disability
 - Nearly 1101 adults are registered on the Learning Disability Register.
 - Over 362 people with learning disabilities were helped to live at home in Brent
 - Just under 600 people with learning disabilities received health and social care support from the Community Team for People with Learning Disabilities.
 - Approximately 150 others received health support.
 - About 60% of people with learning disabilities live with parents
 - 14 people with learning disabilities were applicants on the Housing Register.
 - 185 people with learning disability are helped to live in the accommodation of their choice with support from Supporting People
 - There is an increase in the number of people who present behaviour that challenges. These people often need specialist support and housing, increasing the demand for self-contained flats.
 - There is a rise in the number of people diagnosed with Autism/Asperger's syndrome.
 - 180 children between the ages of 14 and 19 have learning disabilities/autism.
 - Most young adults with learning disabilities have a Direct Payment, live at home and do not use a Day Centre.
- 3.2 The publication "Valuing People" A New Strategy for Learning Disability for the 21st Century (A White Paper from the Department of Health March 2001) identifies four key priorities for people with a learning disability.
- Rights
 - Independence
 - Choice
 - Inclusion
- 3.3 In Dec 2007 Valuing People Now was published by the Department of Health as a consultative document. In this the government has set the following priorities for 2008-2011 for services for people with learning disabilities:
- Personalisation

- What people do during the day
- Better health
- Access to housing
- Making sure that change happens

- 3.4 Brent wished to put in place contracts that have the ability to offer services that are person centred and are aligned with the above priorities.
- 3.5 Accommodation based housing support services are currently provided by Brent Mencap, Stadium HA and Adepta across 13 houses scattered throughout the borough. Low and medium levels of specialist housing support are provided for up to 77 service users living in these properties. Remodelling of two houses is expected in the future to accommodate people with learning disability and additional complex needs. This will increase costs of services as a higher housing support need is anticipated. This has been allowed for within the proposed budget.
- 3.6 Floating support services are currently provided by Lifeways Community Care, Adepta and Housing Options/Move on support is provided by Brent Mencap. Under these contracts, low level support is provided to 100 plus service users. It is intended to increase the level of funding made available from the Supporting People budget and so increase the capacity to service users.
- 3.7 The social care elements of the learning disability services funded through the Adult Social Care Department had not previously been subject to formal tendering. The tendering exercise described in this report therefore offered the opportunity to tender for these services at the same time, with the possibility of securing efficiencies of scale and improvements in service delivery to individuals. Only those elements of the current Adult Social Care contracts where service users receive both the social care and housing support services were subject to re-tender.
- 3.8 An additional sum of £263,120 from within the Supporting People budget has also been allocated for the future use of Individual budgets, in line with the personalisation agenda.

The Tender Process

- 3.9 At Executive in September 2007 Members gave approval to officers to invite tenders for these services for people with a learning disability.
- 3.10 It was agreed by the Executive that there would be three framework agreements:
- Lot 1: Housing Support Services (Supporting People) for Accommodation-based services
 - Lot 2: Housing Support Services (Supporting People) for Floating support
 - Lot 3: Personal and General Care services for people needing both care services and housing support services (Adult Social Care)

The essence of framework agreements is that a framework for the placing of future contracts is set up with known contract terms and pricing. It is useful where the Council's requirements for a particular service are not known in

advance. During the term of the framework, individual call-off contracts can be placed that relate to a specific need or client.

- 3.11 The process used by the council for the procurement of the framework agreement was a two stage tender process, allowing the Council to eliminate unsuitable contractors at the pre-qualifying stage.
- 3.12 The tender process was assisted by officers from Procurement, Legal Services and the Joint Commissioner for People with Learning Disabilities and by a small group of people with learning disabilities who use services.

Stage one - Pre Qualifying Stage

- 3.13 Advertisements were placed in the Official Journal of the European Union (OJEU) in September 2007 to seek initial expressions of interest. Advertisements were also placed in the trade press, national and local newspaper in September 2007 and posted on the Council's website. The Council's standard pre-qualification questionnaire ("PQQ") together with a Summary of Information about the Council and the Borough were included in the documentation provided to interested parties.
- 3.14 Contractors responding to the advertisement were requested to complete and return the PQQ together with relevant supporting evidence. A total of 29 PQQs were received. Of this number 7 expressed an interest for Supporting People contracts only, 15 for Supporting People and Personal and General Care contracts and 7 for Personal and General Care only.
- 3.15 All PQQs were checked to ensure that had been completed fully and that all the relevant supporting information had been submitted. A number of contractors failed to complete the PQQ fully or supply all relevant supporting information and were contacted to supply the information within 48 hours.
- 3.16 PQQs and supporting information were copied and sent to a qualified accountant within Housing and Community Care Department in order to carry out a financial assessment and to an officer in the Health, Safety and Licensing Unit to carry out a health and safety assessment. PQQs and supporting information were also sent to a panel of officers in order to assess the technical capacity of the contractors. It had been decided to ask detailed questions in the PQQ to assess general technical capacity, with reference to applicable national standards, rather than ask these at stage 2. This assessment process established that a total of 12 contractors should be invited to tender (Stage Two) for the framework and to indicate the 'lots' they wished to be considered for. Two of the interested contractors indicated that they wanted to be considered jointly and they were invited on this basis.

Stage Two - Invitation to Tender

- 3.17 A tender pack was issued to the 12 contractors invited to tender. The tendering instructions stated that the contracts would be awarded on the basis of a 45% weighting for cost and 55% weighting for quality issues and that in evaluating tenders, the Council would have regard to the criteria detailed in Appendix 1. These criteria were a simplified version of those approved by the Executive, due to recognition that the original evaluation scheme was too complex and included some criteria that were assessed at PQQ stage.
- 3.18 At this stage it was apparent that the Adult Social Care element of the tender submission would not be in a position to award call-off contracts as soon as the framework agreement for lot 3 was in place. However, it was agreed to

continue to seek providers for the framework so that contracts could be called off at a later date.

- 3.19 All tenders had to be submitted no later than Wednesday 23rd January 2008. The tenders were opened on the same day. Ten valid tenders were received from 12 contractors invited to tender (Two tenderers (1 and 2) formed a consortia for the tender stage, one tenderer did not return the tender documentation, contractor 12). Tenderer 8 sought to be part of the framework only, and did not at the present time wish to be awarded a call-off contract under the framework.
- 3.20 The following tender submissions were received for the three lots:
- Lot 1) 8 tenders
 - Lot 2) 6 tenders
 - Lot 3) 4 tenders
- 3.21 Tenders were sent to an evaluation panel. The evaluation panel consisted of two officers from the Supporting People Team, one officer from Brent Adult Social Care, and one officer from Brent's Procurement Unit. Each panel member read and marked the tenders individually for quality issues and the panel then met to agree scores. Where tenderers had bid for more than one lot, it was found that the scoring was identical as many of the information submitted was common to all lots. The financial evaluation was carried out by the evaluation panel with assistance from the Finance Officer Supporting People. Contractors were required to submit prices for each lot in the framework agreement they were invited to tender for. In addition, where they tendered for more than one lot, they were also asked to submit combined prices for these lots to demonstrate cost efficiencies.
- 3.22 Following the quality and financial evaluation two of the organisations, contractors 4 and 11 were eliminated because of their low score. Both scored poorly in the finance section and were not considered viable on the information given. Contractor 8 also scored poorly on the finance section, but was applying for the framework only - unfortunately due to the lay out of the questions within the tender pack they were considered disadvantaged and taken through to interview stage to verify the quality and financial information. The nine organisations responsible for the remaining eight tenders were invited to meet with the panel and with service users, (contractors 1&2, 3, 5, 6, 7, 8, 9, 10). This represented 7 tenders for lot 1, 6 tenders for lot 2, and 3 tenders for lot 3.
- 3.23 On behalf of the evaluation panel, 1-2 members of the panel visited the facilities of the eight contractors, accompanied by 1-2 people who use services and a facilitator. The purpose of these visits was to undertake a file audit and to speak to the staff and service users in confidence. References were also taken up.
- 3.24 The people who use services who took part in the visits had received preparation training in interviewing. Accompanied by a facilitator, they questioned staff and service users on the quality of the service provided and the way in which it meets service user's needs. They used materials which had been specially devised to be more accessible for people with learning disabilities. They fed comments back via their facilitator to the main panel. Interestingly the service users' views and comments validated the Quality scores that had been evaluated by the panel. Service users commented on this process

- I thought everyone took their time off to answer our questions which was very good
- It was all very interesting and I would like to do more
- Learning from doing it was good. I enjoyed going to meet people in new places and talk to them though it was a bit worrying at first

3.25 Formal interviews took place in March 2008 with the evaluation panel. In addition, providers gave a short presentation to people who use services, followed by questions. Contractors had been asked to prepare a 10 minute presentation for the service users on 'how will you help me make friends with my neighbours'. Comments from the service users on the presentations included:

- The presentations went well and also I got here on time today
- Everything went well and I learned there are many ways I could make friends with the neighbours

3.26 Following the site visits, interviews and receipt of references, the panel met, including the facilitator for people who use services, to finalise the overall evaluation of the tenders. It was considered that the amplification and clarification of tenders obtained from the interviews and site visits had in all cases reflected the quality scores already given, so it was agreed that the original quality scores would apply for all tenders.

Evaluation Conclusions – Lots 1 and 2

3.27 A copy of the Tender Evaluation Grid used to evaluate tender papers is detailed in Appendix 1. Appendix 1a details the total quality and financial scores and weighting for each tender. Appendix 1b gives the more detailed scores. The prices submitted by contractors for each lot are detailed in Appendix 2, including prices showing cost efficiencies where contractors tendered for more than one lot. The names of the contractors are contained in Appendix 3.

3.28 It is recommended to appoint three contractors to the framework agreement for lot 1 and three for lot 2. In addition the highest scoring tenderer for each lot is recommended for award for the initial call-off contract for service users who are receiving services under the current contracts. These providers showed innovation in service delivery, were aware of future directions and were already moving towards personalisation agenda. In addition they provided most documents to their current service users in easy read.

3.29 Personal and Care Services

In addition to tendering the above Housing Support services, it was the intention to further develop the local market for personal and care services through a framework agreement with between 3 and 5 high quality, good value competent providers. Unfortunately, the tender process was unable to identify a sufficient range of providers of an acceptable standard for this. It is thought that this indicates the level of market readiness to meet the new personalised objectives at the current time, with many providers in transition from residential to more independent models of provision. Appendix 1a indicates their overall scores.

3.30 There is an alternative means of securing the services that would have been covered by the framework agreements if Brent had been able to award these. The North West London sector tender is led by Ealing Council for supported living providers for people with learning disabilities, challenging behaviour and

complex needs with a forensic history. This is also been set up as a framework agreement – Brent will not be a party to the framework agreement but will have the ability to call off its own contracts for individual service users. This tender together with Brent's own contract for residential, respite and supported living as part of a PFI development (Melrose) will both stimulate the local and national market and give more information on the state of the care market to meet Brent's local objectives.

3.31 Ealing Council have tendered for supported living services for people with learning disabilities and complex needs (as referred to in the previous paragraph) on behalf of the eight North West London boroughs (Brent, Harrow, Hammersmith, Hillingdon, Hounslow, Westminster and K&C). Ealing Council have invited the boroughs to be part of the tender process by consulting on the tender documents, attending site visits and being part of the interview process. The final decision will be for Ealing Council to make as they will hold the contract. Because of the specialist nature of the service, this tender has attracted a number of national providers who do not have a presence in Brent and sometimes in London. This arrangement would enable Brent Council to fill a market gap in competent providers for people with this level of need and enter into an arrangement which would provide more value for money than negotiating a contract on an individual basis. If we are able to access this framework contract, then any subsequent tenders for supported living services will focus on the less complex people with an anticipated reduction in service costs.

3.32 It is intended to further review the position following the successful conclusion of these tenders and to make a decision as to whether to re-tender for a framework agreement for care services or to focus current resources on market development.

4. Financial Implications

4.1 The Councils Contract Standing Orders state that contracts for supplies and services exceeding £500K or works contracts exceeding £1 million shall be referred to the Executive for approval of the award of the contract

4.2 In awarding the contract Members need to consider:

- a) which is the most economically advantageous tender; and
- b) whether the tender is affordable within existing resources

In determining which is the most economically advantageous tender it is necessary to consider the tender against the evaluation criteria set out in the Instructions to Tenderers which includes both cost of the contract and quality of service. In view of the importance of quality of service in evaluating the most economically advantageous, there is no presumption that the tender will be awarded to on the basis of lowest cost.

4.3 The current combined annual value of all Learning Disability Supporting People contracts is £1,194,703. In addition to the funding released through ending the above contracts (detailed in 3.4, 3.5 & 3.6 above), the Supporting People Commissioning Body has agreed to expand the services to people with Learning Disability. The Supporting People grant will fund an expanded service, in line with the Supporting People Strategic Review, taking the contract values up to c£1,496,352 per year. This increased cost will be met from savings elsewhere within the Supporting People budget. Savings have arisen from negotiations with Supporting People providers to release monies. New and remodelled services will increase satisfaction with people who use services and will match need to housing/support services.

5.0 Legal Implications

5.1 The estimated value of each lot in the framework agreement exceeds the Public Contracts Regulations 2006 threshold. Each lot is for Part B Services for the purposes of the EU Regulations and as such are subject to partial application of the EU Regulations, including:

- i) non-discrimination in the technical specification
- ii) notification of the contract award to the EU Publications Office
- iii) provision of information about the contract to the Department for Communities and Local Government if requested.

The contract is not therefore subject to the full tendering requirements of the EU Regulations although subject to overriding EU principles of equality of treatment, fairness and transparency in the award process.

5.2 The estimated value of each lot in the framework agreement over its lifetime (including any extension) is in excess of £500,000 and the award of the framework agreement and call-off contracts are consequently subject to the Council's Contracts Standing Orders in respect of High Value contracts and Financial Regulations. As a result Executive approval is required for the award of the framework agreement.

5.3 In considering the recommendations, Members need to be satisfied on the basis of the information set out in the report that the appointment of the recommended contractors to the two frameworks, and the award of initial call-off contracts, will represent best value for the Council and mean that the tenderers appointed have offered the most economically advantageous tenders.

5.4 In relation to the proposal by Adult Social Care to utilise a framework agreement being established by Ealing Council, the use of this does not require specific approval by the Executive. It is not a Collaborative Procurement (which under Contract Standing Orders 85 requires Executive approval if the contract exceeds £500,000) because Brent will not be a party to the framework agreement with the provider. However each time that Adult Social Care wishes to make a call-off from the framework, it will need to follow the procedure set out in Contract Standing Order 86(d)(ii) which involves various officer approvals.

5.5 Under the Disability Discrimination Act, the Council in common with other public authorities, is under a duty to:

- promote equality of opportunity for disabled people
- eliminate unlawful discrimination and harassment of disabled people
- promote positive attitudes towards disabled people and encourage participation by disabled people in public life

The services offered under the contracts recommended for award will assist the Council in meeting this duty, as these housing support services assist disabled people in living independently. Participation by some users in the tender process is also relevant to the discharge of this duty. As indicated in section 6 below, the Council has taken diversity and equalities issues into account at appropriate stages of the tender process and in preparing the specification.

6.0 Diversity Implications

- 6.1 The proposals in this report have been subject to screening and officers believe that there are no diversity implications. However, it should be noted that diversity and equality perspectives were incorporated into both the assessment and evaluation process, with the evaluation panel having regard to diversity and equalities when reviewing written tenders and asking questions during contractors' presentations.
- 6.2 The new framework agreement will require the contractors to deliver services which are:
- culturally sensitive by providing cultural awareness training for all care workers, matching specific language requirements where possible and recruiting a local workforce which reflects the communities of Brent;
 - able to support people with a learning disability who additionally may have complex needs, including communication disabilities and those who challenge services, through all staff
 - able to offer service users a male or female support worker if specifically requested.

Contractors will be monitored to ensure that they are complying with their requirements through checking of records, reviews, monitoring meetings, etc.

7.0 Staffing Implications

- 7.1 These services are currently provided by external contractors and there are no implications for Council staff arising from the award of the contracts.
- 7.2 The staff currently involved in delivering the services have never been local government employees whilst delivering the services and there are no direct pension implications in relation to this group of employees.
- 7.3 The Council does however consider that TUPE will apply to the award of contracts against this framework agreement and contractors were asked to submit bids on this basis. It is envisaged that staff within Lot 1 will move from the current contractors, Brent Mencap, Stadium Housing Association and Adepta, to new contractors Yarrow Housing Ltd. That staff within Lot 2 will move from the current contractors, Adepta and Lifeways Community Care Ltd to new contractors Brent Mencap/Stadium Housing Association if the framework agreement is awarded.

Background Papers

Supporting People Grant Conditions (CLG)
Brent Five Year Supporting People Strategy 2005/10
Learning Disability Strategic Review July 2007
Valuing People A New Strategy for Learning Disability for the 21st Century A White Paper DoH March 2001
Valuing People Now From progress to transformation Dec 2007
Brent Learning Disability Housing Strategy 2006
White Paper – 'Our Health, Our Care, Our Say: a new direction for community services' (DoH Jan 2006)

Contact Officers

Helen Duckworth (Supporting People Lead Officer)
Karen Ahmed (Joint Commissioner for Learning Disabilities)

Christabel Shawcross (Assistant Director of Community Care)
Housing and Community Care Department
34 Wembley Hill Road
Wembley
Middx HA9 8AD

Evaluation form

	Financial	Weighting	Score	Total
1	<i>hourly rate</i>	40		0
2	<i>Staff: client ratio</i>	40		0
3	<i>contact time</i>	20		0
4	<i>Overheads %</i>	20		0
5	<i>TUPE experience</i>	20		0
6	<i>Implementation Plan</i>	25		0
7	<i>added value to existing service</i>	20		0
	Experience			
8	<i>service user involvement</i>	20		0
9	<i>outcomes focused</i>	20		0
10	<i>offer person centre planning</i>	10		0
11	<i>provision of specialist & complex needs</i>	20		0
	Capacity to Deliver Services			
12	<i>flexibility to changing needs (strategic Relevant)</i>	15		0
13	<i>training & staff skills</i>	15		0
14	<i>recruitment & induction</i>	10		0
15	<i>adherence to policies & procedures</i>	15		0
16	Addressed all points of the questionnaire	10		0
	Effective Working Methods			
17	<i>Partnership working (including local groups)</i>	25		0
18	<i>addressing challenging behaviour or high needs</i>	10		0
19	<i>evidence to reflect outcome focused</i>	15		0
20	<i>effective monitoring systems in place to show above</i>	10		0
	Continuous Improvement			
21	<i>innovation to service delivery</i>	15		0
	Understanding Council's Objectives			
22	<i>cultural sensitivity & Equalities</i>	15		0
23	<i>promoting IB/SDS</i>	10		0
	Possible maximum score	840		0
	100% or 840			
	Pass 400/840			
	Scoring Mechanism			
	0 = Unacceptable [Complete failure to grasp / reflect the core issue]			
	1 = Acceptable [Reflects adequate understanding of all issues and aspects]			
	2 = Excellent understanding and interpretation. Innovative & proactive with sound strategy			

Appendix 1a

Final scores

Contractor 1&2 Lots 1 & 2

	Weighting	Score	
Quality	55	287.5	33.64
Finance	45	265	32.23
		Total	65.87

Contractor 7 Lots 1 & 2

	Weighting	Score	
Quality	55	226.25	26.48
Finance	45	185	22.5
		Total	48.98

Contractor 3 Lots 1,2 & 3

	Weighting	Score	
Quality	55	323.75	37.88
Finance	45	216.25	26.30
		Total	64.18

Contractor 8 Framework only

	Weighting	Score	
Quality	55	230	26.91
Finance	45	80	9.73
		Total	36.64

Contractor 5 Lots 1,2 & 3

	Weighting	Score	
Quality	55	225	26.33
Finance	45	188.75	22.95
		Total	49.28

Contractor 9 Lot 1

	Weighting	Score	
Quality	55	442.5	51.78
Finance	45	210	25.54
		Total	77.32

Contractor 6 Lots 1 & 2

	Weighting	Score	
Quality	55	246.25	28.82
Finance	45	240	29.18
		Total	58

Contractor 10 Lots 1,2 & 3

	Weighting	Score	
Quality	55	330	38.62
Finance	45	120	14.59
		Total	53.21

Contractor 11 Lot 3

Quality	55	105	12.29
Finance	45	95	11.55
		Total	23.84

Contractor 4 Lot 1

Quality	55	222.5	26.04
Finance	45	105	12.77
		Total	38.81

Appendix 1b

Evaluation scores of Learning Disability Tenders

	weighting	Contractor 1&2 Lots 1&2		Contractor 3 Lots 1,2&3		Contractor 5 Lots 1,2&3		contractor 6 Lots 1&2		contractor 7 Lots 1&2		
		score	total	score	total	score	total	score	total	score	total	
Financial												
1	<i>hourly rate</i>	40	1	40	2	80	1	40	1.5	60	1	40
2	<i>Staff: client ratio</i>	40	2	80	0	0	1.5	60	1	40	1	40
3	<i>contact time</i>	20	1	20	0	0	0	0	1	20	0	0
4	<i>Overheads %</i>	20	1	20	2	40	1	20	0	0	1.5	30
5	<i>TUPE experience</i>	20	2	40	1.75	35	1.5	30	2	40	1.5	30
6	<i>Implementation Plan</i>	25	1	25	1.25	31.25	0.75	18.75	2	50	1	25
7	<i>added value to existing service</i>	20	2	40	1.5	30	1	20	1.5	30	1	20
				265		216.25		188.75		240		185
Experience												
8	<i>service user involvement</i>	20	1.5	30	1.5	30	1	20	0	0	1.5	30
9	<i>outcomes focused</i>	20	1.25	25	1.25	25	1	20	1.5	30	1	20
10	<i>offer person centre planning</i>	10	1	10	2	20	1	10	0.5	5	1	10
11	<i>provision of specialism & complex needs</i>	20	1	20	1.75	35	1	20	1.25	25	1	20
Capacity to Deliver Services												
12	<i>flexibility to changing needs (Strategic Relevant)</i>	15	1.5	22.5	1.5	22.5	1.5	22.5	1	15	1.25	18.75
13	<i>training & staff skills</i>	15	1	15	1.25	18.75	1	15	1	15	1	15
14	<i>recruitment & induction</i>	10	1	10	1	10	1.5	15	1	10	1	10
15	<i>adherence to policies & procedures</i>	15	1	15	1	15	1	15	1	15	1	15
16	Addressed all points of the questionnaire	10	1	10	1.5	15	1	10	1	10	0.75	7.5
Effective Working Methods												
17	<i>Partnership working (including local groups)</i>	25	1.5	37.5	1	25	0.5	12.5	1.25	31.25	0.5	12.5
18	<i>addressing challenging behaviour or high needs</i>	10	1.75	17.5	1.5	15	1.5	15	1.5	15	0.5	5
19	<i>evidence to reflect outcome focused</i>	15	1	15	1	15	1	15	1	15	0.5	7.5
20	<i>effective monitoring systems in place to show above</i>	10	1	10	1.75	17.5	1	10	1.5	15	1	10
Continuous Improvement												
21	<i>innovation to service delivery</i>	15	1	15	1.5	22.5	0	0	1	15	1	15
Understanding Council's Objectives												
22	<i>cultural sensitivity & Equalities</i>	15	1	15	1.5	22.5	1	15	1	15	1	15
23	<i>promoting IB/SD</i>	10	2	20	1.5	15	1	10	1.5	15	1.5	15
				287.5		323.75		225		246.25		226.3

	weighting	Contractor 8 Framework only		Contractor 9 Lot 1		Contractor 10 Lots 1,2&3		contractor 4 Lot 1		contractor 11 Lot 3		
		score	total	score	total	score	total	score	total	score	total	
Financial												
1	<i>hourly rate</i>	40	1.5	60	1	40	0	0	0	0	1	40
2	<i>Staff: client ratio</i>	40	0	0	1	40	0	0	1	40	0	0
3	<i>contact time</i>	20	0	0	1	20	0	0	1	20	0	0
4	<i>Overheads %</i>	20	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
5	<i>TUPE experience</i>	20	0	0	1	20	1.5	30	0	0	1	20
6	<i>Implementation Plan</i>	25	0	0	2	50	2	50	1	25	1	25
7	<i>added value to existing service</i>	20	1	20	2	40	2	40	1	20	0.5	10
				80		210		120		105		95
Experience												
8	<i>service user involvement</i>	20	1.5	30	2	40	1.5	30	0	0	0.5	10
9	<i>outcomes focused</i>	20	1.5	30	2	40	1	20	0.5	10	1	20
10	<i>offer person centre planning</i>	10	0.75	7.5	1.5	15	2	20	1	10	0	0
11	<i>provision of specialism & complex needs</i>	20	0.75	15	2	40	1.5	30	1	20	0.5	10
Capacity to Deliver Services												
12	<i>flexibility to changing needs (Strategic Relevant)</i>	15	1.25	18.75	2	30	1.5	22.5	1	15	0.5	7.5
13	<i>training & staff skills</i>	15	1	15	2	30	1.5	22.5	1.5	22.5	0.5	7.5
14	<i>recruitment & induction</i>	10	1	10	1.25	12.5	1	10	1	10	1	10
15	<i>adherence to policies & procedures</i>	15	1	15	1	15	1	15	1	15	1	15
16	Addressed all points of the questionnaire	10	1	10	2	20	1.5	15	0.5	5	0.5	5
Effective Working Methods												
17	<i>Partnership working (including local groups)</i>	25	0.75	18.75	2	50	1.5	37.5	1	25	0	0
18	<i>addressing challenging behaviour or high needs</i>	10	0.5	5	2	20	1	10	1	10	0	0
19	<i>evidence to reflect outcome focused</i>	15	1.5	22.5	2	30	1	15	1	15	0.5	7.5
20	<i>effective monitoring systems in place to show above</i>	10	1	10	2	20	1.5	15	1.5	15	0	0
Continuous Improvement												
21	<i>innovation to service delivery</i>	15	0.5	7.5	2	30	2	30	1	15	0	0
Understanding Council's Objectives												
22	<i>cultural sensitivity & Equalities</i>	15	1	15	2	30	1.5	22.5	1	15	0.5	7.5
23	<i>promoting IB/SD</i>	10	0	0	2	20	1.5	15	2	20	0.5	5
				230		443		330		222.5		105

0 = Unacceptable (complete failure to grasp/reflect the core issues)

1 = Acceptable (reflects adequate understanding of all the issues and aspects)

2 = Excellent understanding and interpretation, innovation & proactive with sound strategy

Hourly cost

Costs per Hour

	Between 35 -150 hrs per day									More than 150 hrs per day								
	Lot 1			Lot 2			Lot 3			Lot 1			Lot 2			Lot 3		
Contractor 11	9.99	5.44	£15.43	14.24	5.44	£19.68	9.08	5.44	£14.52	9.99	4.94	£14.93	14.24	4.94	£19.18	9.08	4.94	£14.02
Contractor 5	12.65	3.50	£16.15	12.85	3.65	£16.50	12.65	3.50	£16.15	12.12	3.53	£15.65	12.50	3.50	£16.00	12.12	3.53	£15.65
Contractor 8	10.33	7.89	£18.22	10.33	7.83	£18.16	10.33	7.89	£18.22	10.33	7.89	£18.22	10.33	7.89	£18.22	10.33	7.89	£18.22
Contractor 3	16.62	3.28	£19.90	16.86	2.84	£19.70	15.86	2.93	£18.79	16.78	2.38	£19.16	16.77	2.26	£19.03	15.55	2.67	£18.22
Contractor 6	14.47	8.13	£22.60	14.12	7.36	£21.48			NA	14.47	7.16	£21.63	14.12	6.46	£20.58			NA
Contractor 9			£22.92			£0.00			£0.00			£22.20			£0.00			£0.00
Contractor 1&2	15.19	8.73	£23.92	15.02	8.78	£23.80			NA	15.19	7.84	£23.03	15.02	8.78	£23.80			NA
Contractor 7	21.80	2.39	£24.19			NA			NA	21.80	2.39	£24.19			NA			NA
Contractor 10	21.63	9.15	£30.78	25.42	11.42	£36.84	21.63	10.15	£31.78	20.39	7.83	£28.22	23.96	9.20	£33.16	20.39	7.83	£28.22
Contractor 4	25.90	12.29	£38.19			NA			NA	25.90	12.29	£38.19			NA			NA

Hourly rate taking into consideration TUPE costs

Contractor 5	23.11	2.39	£25.50				23.11	2.39	£25.50
--------------	-------	------	---------------	--	--	--	-------	------	---------------

Notes

Contractor 5 The above hourly rates from Contractor 5 will be plus set-up costs for the first year
Contractor 5 This was the only contractor to show varying prices for with and without TUPE

