



**Joint Committee of the London
Boroughs of Brent, Lewisham and
Southwark**
26 November 2024

**Report from the Managing Director of
Shared Technology Services**

Briefing Laptop Refresh Project – Procurement process review


Wards Affected:	N/A
Key or Non-Key Decision:	N/A
Open or Part/Fully Exempt: <small>(If exempt, please highlight relevant paragraph of Part 1, Schedule 12A of 1972 Local Government Act)</small>	Open
No. of Appendices:	Three Appendix 1: Further Competition Guidance Appendix 2: Social Value Policy and Methodology included in the Tender Appendix 3: Scoring Methodology
Background Papers:	None
Contact Officer(s): <small>(Name, Title, Contact Details)</small>	Fabio Negro Managing Director of Shared Technology Services Email: Fabio.Negro@sharedtechnology.services

1.0 Purpose of the Report

The purpose of this briefing is to demonstrate the processes and steps taken in the Laptop Refresh Procurement. These steps were to ensure most advantageous tender, value for money, social value and future proof solution for 5 years.

The table below outlines the high-level summary of the steps taken in conjunction with PCR2015, the guidance of the chosen framework and STS procurement protocols aligned to London Borough of Brent’s Constitution.

Tender Stage	Action	Responsible / Involved	Date
Pre-tender and governance considerations	Pre-Market Engagement: engaging with the market and shortlisting/benchmarking exercise carried out. Also followed the guidance in the preferred framework at that stage: RM6098 Market engagement best practice & process v2.7.	STS IT Department Procurement & Commercial Project Management Partners (LBL, LBS, LBB & LGA)	Oct/Nov 23
	OEM's shortlisted based on initial engagement with the market. STS drafted specifications.	STS IT Department Procurement & Commercial Project Management Partners (LBL, LBS, LBB & LGA)	Nov 23 – Dec 23
	Internal assessment of all OEM's. One OEM was shortlisted on the basis of which Supplier best meets the technical and pricing requirement. Technical specification was in-depth to ensure capability with current infrastructure and market standards, and future proofing for 5 years to achieve best value for money and most advantageous tender.	STS IT Department	Feb / Mar 24
	Shortlisting of different Frameworks concluded.	Procurement Legal	Mar 24
	Approval of route to market* using CCS Technology Products and Associated Services Framework RM6098. <i>*Gateway 1 report drafted and approved by Legal. Approving the use of the Framework, for further competition as recommended route to market. Suite of documents from Framework shared with Legal. Initial governance report encompassed all three Boroughs and LGA.</i> The Further Competition* - (Appendix 1) route to market was determined based on	Procurement Legal	Jun 24

	<p>internal requirements and also following the guidance in the Buyers Guide of the chosen framework:</p>  <p>RM6098-Buyer-guid e-v8.odt</p> <p>Social value considerations were included within the tender as identified in Appendix 2.</p>		
Tender Stage	<p>Tender (further Competition) was published through CCS Portal to shortlisted suppliers on Lot 1 of the above framework.</p>	Procurement	Jun 24
	<p>Tender evaluation and moderation of scoring</p> <p>8 evaluators involved of the technical methodology. Technical Questionnaire consisted of 41 questions, to ensure all details necessary were captured.</p> <p>Scoring Methodology – appendix 3*</p>	STS IT Department Procurement	July 24
Contract Award & Governance	<p>The Contract was awarded to the successful supplier following moderation.</p> <p>Lead member of Cabinet approved Gateway 2 (authority to award)</p> <p>Following authority to award approval, outcome letters were issued to both unsuccessful and successful supplier(s)</p> <p>Voluntary standstill period was observed before signing of the contract. No challenges were received during this period.</p> <p>Contract awarded to successful supplier for duration of 5 years. Commencing 1st Sept 24.</p>	STS IT Department Project Team Procurement Finance Lead Member Legal	Aug – Sep 24

Appendix 1 – Further Competition Guidance

When to run further competition

A further competition is a thorough, open and fair method to find the best outcome for your requirements. CCS always recommends a further competition to be run over the other available buying options included within the framework agreement.

Your evaluation criteria can include weighted questions on price, quality and social value.

Criteria	%
Price	Central Government 10-90% Wider Public Sector 0-100%
Quality	0-90%
Social Value	Central Government 10-90% Wider Public Sector 0-90%

When carrying out a further competition Central Government buyers must comply with the policy set out in PPN 06/20 by ensuring that they evaluate against social value requirements aligned with governments Social Value Model.

The social value question you include within your invitation to tender can be a pass / fail (yes / no) for simple and /or urgent requirements. We recommend forming your social value question around your organisation's values, objectives and ESG aims to gain the best value from this ensuring your are proportionate to the value of the contract.

Appendix 2 – Social Value Policy and Methodology included in the Tender



Appendix E1 - Social
Value and Ethical Proc

Please explain your proposals for delivering Social Value to the participating organisations over the life of the contract. As the London Borough of Brent is the Contracting Body for this procurement, Brent's Social Value and Ethical Procurement Policy is appended separately (Appendix E1). This provides information on the council's themes along with examples of opportunities to provide Social Value. It should be noted however that the Supplier's Social Value offerings should be available to any or all participating organisations.

Explain how your disposal services deliver value through cost savings, social value, and service improvements. Include how you handle the resale of IT assets and reallocation of funds.

Appendix 3 - Scoring Methodology

The following marking scheme will be used to assess the response provided to this question:	
Score	Criteria
0	Weak submission that falls short of the requirements, is poorly <u>explained</u> and will not deliver the value required of the opportunity or no response received
1	Submission that meets only some of the requirements and will not deliver the value required of the opportunity
2	Satisfactory submission that meets the essential requirements and is explained adequately.
3	Good submission that meets all the requirements, is fully explained demonstrates the business benefits to be gained.
4	Very good submission that exceeds the required standard, is clear, fully explained and delivers additional benefit on many aspects of the requirement.
5	Very good submission that exceeds the required standard, is clear, fully explained and delivers additional benefit on all aspects of the requirement.