

Local Government Act 2000 and the Local Authorities (Executive Arrangements) (Access to Information) (England) Regulations 2000

	RECO	RECORD OF DECISION OF EXECUTIVE MEMBER OR KEY DECISION OF OFFICER
-	Name of decision maker	Jenny Hannaby
2	Type of decision (Please □ as appropriate)	Key Other Yes No
ω	Date of decision (This should be the same as the date form signed)	14 March 2011
4	The decision	 To award a joint contract for South Oxfordshire and Vale of White Horse District Councils to Jade Security Services for the collection, counting and banking of cash from council car parks up to 31 December 2011.
		2. To authorise the head of service, in consultation with the relevant cabinet/executive member, to agree an extension to the contract for a further two years up to 31 December 2013 if officers are satisfied with the service delivery.
51	Reasons for decision	For the past three years, both councils have employed the current contractor, Jade Security Ltd, who has provided a good service. From 1 January 2011 Jade agreed to work under the terms and conditions of both contracts whilst the new joint contract tender process and contract award was completed.
		A joint tender process was led by Oxfordshire County Council (OCC). The combined tender included cash collection from parking machines and libraries for OCC plus cash collection from car park machines for Oxford City Council, Cherwell District Council, South and the Vale. Due to the overall value of the contract, it was advertised in the European Journal on 17 August 2010.
		OCC received four compliant bids. Officers across all participating councils evaluated the bids separately according to OCC procurement rules of price (40 per cent) and quality (60 per cent). The quality sub-criteria were technical 33 per cent, staff and management 21 per cent, technical support three per cent and security three per cent. The tender weighting is contrary to South and the Vale procurement rules, which require tenders to

 ∞ ത options rejected implications implications **Alternative** Resource into, but with separate break clauses for each council decision because it was a joint tender and the total contract value only other alternative would be to carry out the service in-house. and Cherwell District Council, which terminate at the same time. Officers propose that one set of terms and conditions is entered is over the EU threshold equipment to do the task, this was ruled out an early stage. As the councils have neither the secure vehicles nor the counting bidder and officers are very happy with the current service, the As the incumbent contractor for both councils is the preferred Oxfordshire-wide tendering process. the shared procurement hub officer to help carry out an and Vale only, but decided that there were benefits from using Officers considered tendering the contract jointly between South December 2013. agree an extension to the contract for a further two years up to consultation with the relevant cabinet/executive member, to Jade, then officers recommend authorising the head of service, in 2011. This will bring it in line with similar contracts let by OCC cash from council car parks from 15 March 2011 to 31 December Jade Security Services for the collection, counting and banking of Officers recommend awarding a joint contract for both councils to received, as shown in appendix 1. per collection for both councils and this is the cheapest tender Under the new contract procured by OCC, Jade will charge £5.43 Vale. Jade currently charges £5.70 per collection per box. Jade Security Services is the current supplier for both South and supplied by OCC as part of the tender process. Cherwell has contract with the successful tenderer in the terms and conditions their respective decision to award will enter into a separate formal the districts but this was not the case. Each council following was drawing up a formal contract to include the county and all of but for OCC services only. Officers initially understood that OCC scored the best. OCC has already awarded Jade the contract shows a break down of the tender evaluation scoring. ahead as preferred tenderer. Appendix 1 attached to this report be evaluated on price weighted as 60 per cent and quality 40 percent. However, as Jade submitted the lowest priced bid, The matter is referred to the cabinet/executive member for a In the event that officers are satisfied with service delivery by now entered into such a contract with Jade In terms of cost and technical ability, Jade Security Services increasing the weighting on the price puts them even further

18		17	16	15	14	13	12	<u></u>	10	9
This form must be physically		Signature and date	"Call in" waived?	Is this decision confidential and if so, under which exempt category?	Dispensations	Declarations of interests	Date of receipt of reports	Reports and background papers considered	consultees (See guidance below)	Financial implications
Note: The date and time at which this form is received will be recorded by the democratic services manager. The decision will	Decision maker Dated		N/A	Zo	N/A	NA	N/A	The tender documents submitted by all tenderers are held by the technical and acting facilities manager.	Officers consulted email on 22/2/2011 requesting replies by 28/2/2011 Health and safety (Sarah Minns) – Sarah is happy with the health and safety information supplied by Jade Legal (Sarah Commins) – no comment (Pat Connell at South is acting for both South and Vale in preparing the contract and her comments have been included in this report) Finance (Julie Bartlett) – requesting clarification on cost breakdown which is in the tender docs which form part of the background papers HoS (Chris Tyson) – Comments included Strategic Director (Matt Prosser) – Comments included	Jade Security Services is the current supplier for both South and the Vale. The current charge of £5.70 per collection per box, equates to an annual cost of £15,515 for South and £12,882 for the Vale. Under the new contract the new charge of £5.43 per collection for both councils equates to an annual price of £14,780.46 for South, which is an annual saving of £734.54. At the Vale, the reduced price per collection equates to £12,271.80, which is an annual saving of £610.20.

• •

Appendix 1 Tender evaluation of cash collection companies

Tenderer			A Score	B Score	Jade Security Score	D Score
Evaluation Criteria		Weighting				
Local authority						
1			£1,154.50	£807.00	£895.40	£892.50
2			£7,841.60	£6,656.00	£6,528.60	£6,949.80
3			£980.20	£980.20	£725.40	£741.00
4			£78,945.62	£67,810.60	£74,527.96	£79,523.75
5			£1,326.21	£997.95	£809.73	£1,110.53
South/Vale Car Parks			£35,238.08	£47,989.20	*£31,021.59	£34,835.77
* includes price to empty machines on behalf of Henley Town Council						
Total including all councils			£125,486.21	£125,240.95	£114,508.68	£124,053.35
	Total Score for Cost (out of 100)		91.25	91.43	100	92.31
COST		40%	36.5	36.572	40	36.924
TECHNICAL						
Question A parts i,ii,iii,iv,v	55		45	55	55	35
Staff / Management						
Α.	10		10	0	10	10
В	5		5	0	5	5
С	10		10	0	10	10
D	10		10	0	10	10
Technical Support Question A	5		5	5	5	5
Security Question A	5		5	5	5	5
	Total Score for Technical out of 100		90	65	100	80
TECHNICAL		60%	54	39	60	48
TOTAL SCORES			90.5	75.572	100	84.924

Guidance Notes:

(divide the lowest price by the next offer and multiply by 100 to work out score out of 100)