



Vale of White Horse

District Council

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

RECORD OF DECISION OF CABINET MEMBER OR KEY DECISION OF OFFICER			
1	Name of Decision maker	Yvonne Constance	
2	Type of Decision (Please <input type="checkbox"/> as appropriate)	Key Yes	Other
3	Date of Decision (This should be the same as the date form signed)	25 January 2013	
4	The Decision	To award a new CCTV maintenance and support contract to Supplier number five with effect from 1 April 2013 on the basis of price level one, call out level one.	
5	Reasons for Decision	<p>The South and Vale CCTV control room maintenance contract is due for renewal on 31 March 2013.</p> <p>South and Vale have taken the lead on a joint procurement in partnership with Cherwell, West and Oxford City Councils as their contracts also expire on the 31 March 2013. The new contract will run for an initial period of two years with a possible extension for a further two.</p>	
6	Alternative Options Rejected	<p>Due to the size of the contract, we posted the invitation to tender on the Southeast portal using the Official Journal of the European Union (OJEU) process. The authorities were inviting tenders for a four-year framework agreement for the provision of maintenance and repair of public space CCTV cameras and control room equipment.</p> <p>The project management team received nine tender documents.</p> <p>Firstly, each tender was evaluated against the eligibility criteria. For example, was the tender documentation received on time, were all relevant questions answered and information provided. The tenders that met the eligibility criteria were then evaluated against the selection criteria, which included issues such as health & safety, equalities, technical capacity expertise and experience. Finally, the tenders that met the eligibility and</p>	

selection criteria were evaluated against the award criteria. The aim of this section was to identify each potential provider's ability to perform the requirements of the specification and at what price. The award criteria were evaluated 60% financial and 40% technical proposal.

For the nine tenders received the following final scores were recorded:

Supplier 1 = rejected immediately, not received by deadline

Supplier 2 = 67.95

Supplier 3 = 69.60

Supplier 4 = 78.30

Supplier 5 = 83.25

Supplier 6 = 51.16

Supplier 7 = 45.95

Supplier 8 = 36.30

Supplier 9 = rejected incomplete tender supplied

The project team met on the 28 November 2012 to evaluate the award criteria. The team agreed unanimously to award the contract to supplier 5.

The prices provided for each authority were illustrated according to the level of service required.

There are two price levels:

1. level one, price for maintenance where irreparable items are replaced at the Contractor's expense with like for like items.
2. level two, price for maintenance where irreparable items over £250 are replaced at the Council's expense.

In addition, there are two call out levels:

1. level one is defined as 24x7x365 call out and 8 hour attendance
2. level two is defined as 09:00 to 17:00 Monday to Friday excluding Bank Holidays, next working day attendance

Officers recommend price level 1 call out level 1 for the following reasons:

- it carries less operational risk because it is a fully repairing contract with 365 day per year cover.
- under level two, the councils would be required to cover the cost of items that cannot be repaired and cost more than £250. Conversely, level one allows the councils to budget accurately.
- It reduces the volume of invoicing and negotiation between the contractor and the council during the term of the contract

		Full details of the pricing structure are detailed on a separate confidential sheet, appendix a
7	Resource Implications	n/a
8	Legal implications	Contracts Procedure Rules were adhered to Tenders were invited via the Official Journal of the European Union (OJEU).
9	Financial implications	<p>The existing contract was awarded in March 2010. At this time the councils made a saving on contract costs of £13,800 pa. The new contract will save the councils a further £1310 pa.</p> <p>The South & Vale contract is for an initial period of two years with an option to extend for a further two years.</p> <p>The control room monitors 92 cameras of which 61 are South and 31 Vale. The contract costs will be apportioned by camera ratio. Additional charges for work outside the contract will be charged to the corresponding council.</p>
10	List of Consultees (See guidance below)	<p>Finance – Simon Hewings Legal – Pat Connell Equalities Officer – Cheryl Reeves – Supplier 5 response met the equality requirements to an acceptable standard. The company appears to have a good ethos relating to equality. Communications – Shona Ware</p>
11	Reports and Background Papers Considered	Appendix a – pricing structure (confidential)
12	Date of receipt of Reports	n/a
13	Declarations of Interests	None
14	Dispensations	None
15	Is this decision confidential and if so, under which Exempt category?	No
16	“Call in” Waived?	No

17	Signature and Date	<p style="text-align: center;"><i>Constance</i></p> <p>Decision maker Dated <i>25/01/13</i></p>
18	<p>This form must be physically handed to a member of the Democratic Services Team</p>	<p>Note: The date and time at which this form is received will be recorded by the Head of Democratic Services. The decision will then be published and is subject to "call in".</p> <p><i>[Signature]</i></p> <p>Date <i>25-1-13</i> Time <i>11:00</i></p> <p>Head of Democratic Services Date and Time Form Received</p> <p><i>H.</i></p>
19	<p>Details of Publication on the Web and date of expiry of "Call In"</p> <p>Note: This part of the Form will be completed by Democratic Services</p>	<p>Date of Expiry of "Call In" <i>1-2-13</i></p> <p>Date Published <i>25-1-13</i></p> <p>Date hand delivered ^{<i>emailed</i>} to Chair of Scrutiny <i>25-1-13</i></p>