

Tender evaluation report

Contract name: Community Meals



Brighton & Hove
City Council

Contents

Page

1	Executive Summary	1
2	Introduction	2
3	Tender Process	3
4	Invitation to Tender Process	4
5.	Evaluation Results	9
6.	Value for Money	10
7.	Recommendations	10
8.	Approval	10



1 Executive Summary

- 1.1 The procurement exercise was to ensure that sufficient suitably qualified suppliers were invited to tender to meet the requirements of Brighton and Hove City Council.
- 1.2 Following completion of the Pro 5/ESPO framework documentation/process, 5 potential suppliers were identified. The ITT was issued on 8th February 2013 to 4 of the 5 suppliers. 1 supplier declined to bid.
- 1.3 Three tender responses were received by the deadline of 1st March 2013
- 1.4 Tenders were evaluated in accordance with the approved Evaluation Framework Criteria.
- 1.5 The Tender Evaluation Team recommends contracts be awarded to the Tenderer detailed in 5.2, subject to any challenges during the Alcatel period.
- 1.6 The Tender Evaluation Team seeks to obtain approval from the Director of Adult Social Services – Denise D’souza to award the contract to Tenderer identified in 5.2.
- 1.7 Subject to approval, a standard Award Letter covering Alcatel will be issued to Successful Tenderers and an Unsuccessful Letter covering Alcatel will be issued to unsuccessful Tenderers on 21st March 2013.
- 1.8 Both successful and unsuccessful Tenderers will be provided with the opportunity to receive feedback in accordance with the standard procedures.

2 Introduction

- 2.1 The requirement is for the provision of a fully-managed community meals service, which by providing a wholesome and nutritious meal to Customers will help to promote the health, wellbeing and independence of people living at home who are at risk of nutritional disadvantage. The service is in principle required 365 days per year, although individual Customers will not necessarily require a service every day. The service will also include a safe and well check.
- 2.2 Brighton & Hove City Council also seeks a reduction in the overall contract costs in line with budgets. Improved levels of sustainability to compliment Brighton & Hove sustainability policy are also requirements of the new contract. A reduction in social isolation has been identified as a key element of the new contract.

3 Tender Process

3.1 Tenders were sought from suitably qualified contractors through the Pro 5/Espo framework contract. These 5 suppliers have already been pre-qualified as per Official Journal of the European Union (OJEU) regulations.

3.2 The following suppliers were short-listed to be invited to tender:

1	WRVS (Women's Royal Voluntary Service)
2	Agincare
3	Apetito
4	I Care
5	ISS (declined to bid prior to tender documents being issued)

3.3 Tender documents were sent out on 8th February 2013 and were to be returned by 1st March 2013.

3.4 The tender documents comprised:

- A standard Pro 5/ ESPO invitation to tender (ITT) document detailing the specific tendering instructions.
- Pro 5/ESPO Terms and Conditions
- A technical specification specific to Brighton & Hove City Council

4 Invitation to Tender Process

4.1 Tender Receipt and Opening

4.1.1 After the deadline for receipt had passed on the 1st March 2013, the tenders for each lot were opened and recorded on the Record of Tenders Received form.

4.1.2 Of the 4 tenders issued 3 were returned.

4.1.3 Each tender submission comprised:

Prices:

Each contractor submitted prices for the following criteria:

- Annual cost based on the supply of 84,000 meals – 20%
- A selection of unit food prices to weight against other bidders to compare comparative “retail” values. – 10%

Quality Statement

Each contractor was instructed to submit a written statement for thirty seven quality related questions covering their approach to:

1.	Please provide an ‘executive summary’ of your proposal, covering the main features of your offer. This is to include the strengths of your organisation in the context of the delivery of these services.	2
2.	By whom are the hot meals you propose to supply prepared?	1
3.	Where are the hot meals you propose to supply prepared?	3
4.	Is your hot meals service based upon the regeneration of frozen meals, or would you cook meals fresh on the day, or adopt cook-chill methodology?	2
5.	How and where will you store meals prior to their reheating and delivery to customers?	3
6.	How do you propose to ensure hot meals are at an appetising and safe temperature when delivered to customers?	3
7.	What are your proposed arrangements for sourcing, preparing, storing and delivering salads and other cold or ambient meals?	3
8.	For the frozen meals option (i.e. where customers receive frozen meals instead of hot) where and by whom are your frozen meals prepared	2
9.	Where are meals for the frozen meals service stored prior to delivery? How do you ensure that they remain frozen during delivery?	3
10.	How do the food/ingredients supplied comply with BHCC sustainable food standards?	3

11.	Do you offer (as part of this proposal) the supply of freezers and microwave ovens to those customers who require them? Please describe this aspect of the service, including what equipment and customer training you offer, and the basis of the provision (on loan, presumably?) Please describe ways, if any, in which the equipment you offer is designed to be easily useable by customers of the community meals service (who may, for example, have sensory or mobility impairments).	1
12.	What other meal options can you provide, as add-ons to the core service? For example, meal packs to be eaten by the customer at tea-time, or breakfast.	2
13.	Please describe how individual meals are packaged and presented. What packaging options do you offer (foil, PET, polypropylene, cardboard, etc, 2- or 3-compartment) and what are the practical and environmental implications of each?	2
14.	For the hot meals service, what meal choices are customers typically offered? Please be explicit as to whether there is a 'default' dish of the day, with alternatives only available as substitutes where the 'default' was unsuitable for individual customers, or whether all customers would be offered a genuine choice between different dishes.	3
15.	Please describe (and offer an example of) a typical menu plan for the hot meals service. For the hot meals service, how is the menu plan communicated to customers, and how and when do they make their choice of meal (assuming choice is offered)?	3
16.	For the frozen meals service, what is the range of dishes from which customers can select? For the frozen meals service, what are the arrangements for customers to place their orders? How far in advance do they order? How frequently do you deliver? How do you ensure that meals remain frozen?	2
17.	What choices will be available to users requiring special diets (e.g. diabetic, texture-modified, etc)?	3
18.	What choices will be available to users wishing to take Kosher, Asian or other culturally appropriate style meals (including details of any third party supply arrangements you may have for such items)?	3
19.	Please confirm that meals supplied will comply with NACC nutritional guidelines and requirements.	1
20.	What premises do you propose to occupy in connection with providing the service? Where will these be located, and what operations will be carried out there?	3
21.	Please describe your arrangements for receiving payment from customers (confirming that you can receive payment electronically, or by cash or cheque).	3
22.	Please confirm that you understand and will meet the expectations and requirements of the Council in respect of Safe and Well Checks as detailed in the tender document 2.5.10-2.5.13. How will your delivery drivers do this, and how will they alert you or the Council in the event of any concerns?	3

23.	What will your drivers do if they experience a 'no response' situation when attempting to make a delivery to a customer? For example if they could not deliver the meal for whatever purpose, would they drive away and not inform anyone?	3
24.	How will you handle requests which customers may give your drivers in respect of temporary cessation of service (e.g. they may be going out tomorrow, or staying with relatives for a few days)?	1
25.	How will you introduce the service to a newly-referred customer – what form of 'welcome pack' will they receive? What communication would you expect from the Council, and what communication will you have with the customer?	1
26.	What are your observations on personalisation of care services, direct payments and individual budgets? Do you think the 'personalisation agenda' presents threats to the viability of the service, or opportunities to widen its appeal and increase provision?	2
27.	What might you, as a service provider, do to help promote uptake of the community meals services?	2
28.	How will you staff the contract? How and from where will the contract be managed?	3
29.	Do you accept that TUPE is likely to apply in respect of existing staff should you be appointed the new supplier, and do you have any observations on this? If you believe TUPE will not apply, what is your basis for this position, and how would you reassure the Council that contract implementation would not be impeded were your position proved to be incorrect?	2
30.	Assuming that contract award is advised by April 2013, please provide an indicative implementation plan, showing what tasks you would undertake at what times.	2
31.	Do you have any observations on the proposed period of contract (3 +1)?	1
32.	Having read the specification and responded to it in the preceding method statements, do you believe that you can deliver the service in the way envisaged by Brighton & Hove City Council? Do you believe that if you were permitted to deliver the service in a different way, you could bring quality improvement, or lower costs, or other benefits?	2
33.	How do you intend to actively promote and implement social inclusion amongst recipients of the meals which would incorporate the use of volunteers? Please provide examples.	3
34.	Are your drivers permitted to carry out other tasks for meal recipients such as posting a letter?	3
35.	Do you have business contingency plans for all elements of supply of this service including food supply? The service needs to be carried out 365 days of the year.	2
36.	How do you monitor ongoing customer satisfaction?	2

37.	Please provide a comprehensive list of meals, puddings etc. that will be offered as part of this contract.	3
------------	------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------	---



4.2 Evaluation Panel

In order to establish a robust evaluation process, an evaluation panel was created with selected panel members across the Council with varying skill bases to establish a robust scoring system for the quality submissions and the financial assessment. The overall evaluation process took approximately 13 weeks from November 15th 2012. The results were generated with a joint decision of the panel members by following a robust process set down within the Tender Evaluation Guideline document.

The Evaluation Panel consisted of the following members:

Debbie Greening	Commissioning Manager, Commissioning Support Unit Adult Social Care
Catharine Robinson	Contracts Officer, Commissioning Support Unit Adult Social Care
Michael Bentley/Sophie Warburton	Accountant
Helen Spiers	Procurement Advisor
"Betty"	A member of Patient Engagement Group

4.3 Price Evaluation

- 4.3.1 The price element of the tender submission was allocated 30% of the total marks available for each contractor. The technical evaluation of the pricing is summarised in the 'Financial Evaluation of Tenders' document.
- 4.3.2 The submitted prices will be compared using the methodology whereas the lowest price is awarded the full 10% and the higher priced bids receive a relative score in proportion to the lowest bid. This happens for each of the evaluated areas before the scores are added together to get an overall score.
- 4.3.3 Any qualifications and clarifications were addressed as part of the evaluation process.
- 4.3.4 The resulting scores are summarised in Section 5 below.

4.4 Quality Evaluation

- 4.4.1 The Quality element of the tender submission equated to 70% of the total marks available to each contractor.
- 4.4.2 The 37 quality questions were evaluated by the panel listed in Section 4.2 above against a series of model answers prepared by the panel in advance of the tender return date.
- 4.4.3 Each answer was marked on a scale between 0 and 3 points, using the guide outlined in the table below, and weighted in accordance with the details set out in the tender documents.

Score	Performance	Judgment
3	Good response suggesting the specification will be satisfactorily met in all relevant respects.	Good
2	Adequate response suggesting that the specification is likely to be met, albeit only just.	Satisfactory
1	Weak response suggesting there may be shortcomings of a less serious nature in the relevant aspect of the service.	Doubtful
0	Poor or unsatisfactory response giving rise to serious concerns about the relevant aspect of the service.	Not worth considering

5. Evaluation Results

- 5.1 The final evaluated weighted scores are:

Contractor	Price Score/ 30	Quality Score/ 70	Total Score
1 WRVS	26.02%	67.25%	93.30%
2 Agincare	30%	58.47%	88.47%
3 Apetito	26.58%	59.02%	85.63%

- 5.2 With regards to the above scores the following were awarded provisional preferred bidder status:

- WRVS

- 5.3 References have been sought for the provisional preferred bidder.

6. Value for Money

6.1 Cashable Savings

6.1.1 The total value of the contract, if awarded to the Tenderer given provisional preferred bidders status, is £430,215. This is a £53,710 saving on current annual figures (based on a direct comparison of 82.500 meals) which equates to an 11% reduction in costs.

6.2 Non cashable Savings

6.2.1 Service delivery is also deemed to improve as they aim to provide a new model of food supply and social impact which reduces social isolation. New local suppliers for certain elements are to be implemented thus reducing food miles.

7. Recommendations

7.1 The recommendation of the Tender Evaluation Team is that a contract be awarded to WRVS.

7.2 Subject to approval, a standard Award Letter covering Alcatel will be issued to Successful Tenderers and an Unsuccessful Letter covering Alcatel will be issued to unsuccessful Tenderers.

7.3 Both successful and unsuccessful Tenderers will be provided with the opportunity to receive a debrief in accordance with the ITT Debriefing Guidance.

8. Approval

8.1 The Tender Evaluation Team seeks to obtain approval from the Denise D'souza to award the Agreement to the Tenderer(s) identified in 7.1.

Recommendation Supported:

Signed:

Name:

Date:

Title:

