

AVON AND SOMERSET CONSTABULARY

To: John Smith Station: Chief Executive, Office of the Police and Crime Commissioner

Nick Adams Chief Officer – Finance, Resources and Innovation

Stephen Hodgson Head of Procurement

From: Tony Holmes Station: Strategic Procurement Extn No: 66744
Senior Procurement Manager Services

Ref: SPS0699 Date: 14th November 2018

SUBJECT: **[REDACTED VERSION]** Recommendation to Award Contracts for the Provision of Support Services for Victims of Crime and Antisocial Behaviour in Avon and Somerset

1 Introduction

1.1. This report is submitted with the recommendation to award contracts for the following support services for victims of crime and antisocial behaviour in Avon and Somerset. These services have been commissioned by the Office of the Police and Crime Commissioner (OPCC) with the procurement process managed by Avon and Somerset Constabulary (ASP) Strategic Procurement Service (SPS).

- **Lot 1 – A Practical and Emotional Support Service** for adult victims of any crime or antisocial behaviour
Maximum available funding value per annum - £330,000
- **Lot 2 – An Enhanced Adult Support Service** for victims of any crime or antisocial behaviour
Maximum available funding value per annum - £280,000
- **Lot 3 – A Children and Young People’s Support Service** for victims of any crime or antisocial behaviour up to the age of 18 (or 25 where there are additional needs)
Maximum available funding value per annum - £165,000
- **Lot 4 – An Independent Sexual Violence Advisor (ISVA) Service**
Maximum available funding value per annum - £395,000
- **Lot 5 – A Restorative Justice Service** for victims of any crime or antisocial behaviour
Maximum available funding value per annum - £180,000

2 Background

2.1 Historically support services for victims of crime have been commissioned nationally by the Ministry of Justice. In October 2014 this was transitioned so that the OPCC are responsible for commissioning the range of support services for Victims in Avon and Somerset.

- 2.2 Contracts and Grant Agreements are currently in place for the provision of these services, based on procurement exercises undertaken in 2014. Those arrangements are due to expire in March 2019, therefore a recommissioning and new procurement process was required to establish new contracts of supply from April 2019 onwards.
- 2.3 The Services from April 2019 are being funded by the Ministry of Justice Victims Grant with additional funding contributions from the OPCC and NHS England. The total annual funding agreed for services from April 2019 is £1,428,989.

3 Procurement Regulations

- 3.1 At an estimated total contract value of £8,573,934 over an initial contract term of 4 years with the option to extend by up to 2 further years, the Services needed to be tendered in accordance with the Public Contracts Regulations 2015 (PCR15). However, as the Services fall within the categories listed at Schedule 3 of the PCR15, it can be conducted in accordance with the Light Touch Regime (LTR).
- 3.2 The LTR comes with the higher OJEU tender threshold of £615,278 as opposed to £181,302 for all other service contracts. Once this threshold has been reached, Contracting Authorities are required to publish an OJEU notice, which contains details of the conditions of participation, time limits and a description of the award procedure that will be applied. Other than that, Contracting Authorities are free to determine the procurement procedure used, so long as the EU principles of equality and transparency are adhered to.
- 3.3 Due to the limited market for suppliers with the required specialism to deliver the services, the tender process decided upon was a single stage OJEU Open Procedure.

4 Invitation to Tender (ITT)

- 4.1 The contract opportunities were openly published with adverts in OJEU, Contracts Finder and on the Bluelight e-tendering portal. The OPCC also undertook significant pre tender market engagement in order to prepare the supply market (which predominantly consists of third sector organisations) for this opportunity.
- 4.2 The Invitation to Tender (ITT) documentation was published through Bluelight on 17th August 2018 with the tender submissions response deadline of 5th October 2018. The ITT documents detailed how tenderers were required to complete and return their tenders, including details of weightings (including any sub-weighting) being applied, the total annual funding available and scoring methodology **Appendix G** for evaluation. The price/quality tender weightings were as follows:

Price	20%
Response to Quality Questions	70%
Supplier Presentations	10%
Total Weighting	100%

- 4.3 Over 20 Providers submitted an initial expression of interest for the opportunity through Bluelight, however through the tender deadline a total of 6 bids were received:

Lot 1 - ESS	Lot 2 - Adults	Lot 3 - CYP	Lot 4 - ISVA	Lot 5 - RJ
Victim Support	Swan Advocacy	North Somerset YVS	Safe Link	Bristol Mediation
	[REDACTED]			

5 Tender Evaluations

- 5.1 [REDACTED] Despite only Lot 2 receiving more than one bid, the responses for all other Lots were also evaluated against the tender weighted scoring criteria, the aim being to ensure that the supplier is able to provide a quality, best value service. Tender responses were evaluated on the basis of the most economically advantageous tender (MEAT) with the cost and quality evaluation criteria weighted as detailed in 4.2 above.
- 5.2 The evaluation panels for the ITT's and Presentations for each tender lot consisted of: Tony Holmes as Procurement/Moderator from ASP, an OPCC Commissioning representative, an ASP Constabulary representative and an external stakeholder/partner, [REDACTED] OPCC Commissioning Support Officer took Evaluation Panel notes. A detailed breakdown of panel members is included in **Appendix F**.
- 5.3 The purpose of these Evaluation Panels was to discuss the merits of each Tender against the award criteria, and reach a consensus score and justification in accordance with the method of evaluation detailed in the ITT. This process is to ensure a fair and unbiased award decision is made.
- 5.4 The LTR encourages "the involvement and empowerment of users" in the contract award process, in view of this service user representatives were involved in the Evaluation Panels for the presentation stage of the tender evaluation. The Service Users evaluation was highly constructive and was a valuable contribution to the overall decision making process
- 5.5 Responses to the questions were scored and multiplied by its weighting. The scores were totalled and represented as a percentage, with the highest maximum score achievable being 100%. Scores from the price, questionnaire and presentation evaluations were multiplied by their weightings, then added together to arrive at a total score.
- 5.6 The table below summarises the total final evaluation score for each supplier, based on moderated scores (%) and the fixed annual cost submitted by each supplier.

Lot	Supplier	Score (Max 100)	Rank	Fixed Price Per Annum
Lot 1	Victim Support	74.00%	1 st	[REDACTED]
Lot 2	Swan Advocacy	78.50%	1 st	[REDACTED]
Lot 2	[REDACTED]	71.21%	2 nd	[REDACTED]
Lot 3	Young Victims Service	76.00%	1 st	[REDACTED]
Lot 4	Safelink	79.00%	1 st	[REDACTED]
Lot 5	Bristol Mediation	66.50%	1 st	[REDACTED]

5.7 **Appendix A to Appendix E** provides a detailed breakdown of the above scores.

6 Contract Duration

6.1 Contracts for all Lots will come into effect on 1st April 2019 and will have an initial term of 4 years. The contracts include the option to extend for a period of up to 2 years.

7 Early Prevention Fund

7.1 The OPCC has ring fenced a small annual Prevention and Early Intervention Fund of up to £45,000 per year. Through the tender process bidders were asked in the ITT documents to outline innovative ideas for delivering projects designed to reduce victimisation in Avon and Somerset, working across the OPCC provider network.

7.2 The OPCC will utilise the provider forum to initiate this discussion where successful bidders will need to collaboratively agree on a project and a provider to lead delivery for the year. If the OPCC is in agreement with the project proposal then up to £45,000 per annum of additional funding may be provided to one of the successful providers each year, from the overall Victims Services budget.

8 Price Evaluation and Savings

8.1 Evaluation of the Pricing Schedule was completed separately from the main Evaluation Panel. It was conducted based on ASP's standard price evaluation methodology, where the lowest priced Tender received maximum marks available. Any other Tenders submitted then received a mark on a pro-rata basis dependent on how far they deviate from the lowest price.

8.2 The annual savings across all tender lots, based on the fixed price submitted for successful tenderers when compared to the maximum annual budget available totals £34,239. When factored over a total possible contract term of 6 years, which includes the optional 2 year extension period, delivers a total saving of **£205,434**.

8.3 The budget codes that will be used are 111595 50712.

9 Recommendations

9.1 The recommendation is to award the following 4 year contracts for the Support Services for Victims of Crime and Antisocial Behaviour in Avon and Somerset with the option to extend by up to 2 years:

Tender Lot	Supplier	Total fixed Price over 6 year term
Lot 1 – A Practical and Emotional Support Service	Victim Support	REDACTED
Lot 2 – An Enhanced Adult Support Service	Swan Advocacy	REDACTED
Lot 3 – A Children and Young People's Support Service	Young Victims Service	REDACTED
Lot 4 – An Independent Sexual Violence Advisor	Safelink	REDACTED

Tender Lot	Supplier	Total fixed Price over 6 year term
(ISVA) Service		
Lot 5 – A Restorative Justice Service	Bristol Mediation	REDACTED

9.2 Please indicate your agreement or otherwise with the recommendation by completing the reply section below

Kind Regards,

Tony Holmes
Senior Procurement Manager

The above recommendations are ~~AGREED~~/~~NOT AGREED~~ (Please delete as appropriate)

Signed:

Stephen Hodgson – Head of Procurement

Date.

The above recommendations are ~~AGREED~~/~~NOT AGREED~~ (Please delete as appropriate)

Signed:

Nick Adams – Chief Officer – Finance, Resources and Innovation

Date.

The above recommendations are ~~AGREED~~/~~NOT AGREED~~ (Please delete as appropriate)

Signed:

John Smith - Chief Executive, Office of the Police and Crime Commissioner

Date.

Appendix A

Evaluation Scoring Matrix – Lot 1 – Practical and Emotional Support Service

REDACTED

Appendix B

Evaluation Scoring Matrix – Lot 2 – Enhanced Adult Support Service

REDACTED

Appendix C

Evaluation Scoring Matrix – Lot 3 – Children and Young People’s Support Service

REDACTED

Appendix D

Evaluation Scoring Matrix – Lot 4 – Independent Sexual Violence Advisor Service (ISVA)

REDACTED

Appendix E

Evaluation Scoring Matrix – Lot 5 – Restorative Justice Service

REDACTED

Appendix F

Evaluation Panel Members – All Lots

Lot 1 – A Practical and Emotional Support Service		
Name	Position / Org	Role
Tony Holmes	Senior Procurement Manager – Avon and Somerset Constabulary	Procurement / Moderator
REDACTED	Commissioning Support Officer - OPCC	Evaluation Panel Notes
REDACTED	Head of Commissioning - OPCC	Evaluation Panel Member
REDACTED	Head of Victim Care – Avon and Somerset Constabulary	Evaluation Panel Member
REDACTED	External Stakeholder	Evaluation Panel Member

Lot 2 – An Enhanced Adult Support Service		
Name	Position / Org	Role
Tony Holmes	Senior Procurement Manager – Avon and Somerset Constabulary	Procurement / Moderator
REDACTED	Commissioning Support Officer - OPCC	Evaluation Panel Notes
REDACTED	Head of Commissioning - OPCC	Evaluation Panel Member
REDACTED	Senior Commissioning Officer - OPCC	Evaluation Panel Member
REDACTED	Superintendent – Avon and Somerset Constabulary	Evaluation Panel Member
REDACTED	External Stakeholder	Evaluation Panel Member

Lot 3 – A Children and Young People’s Support Service		
Name	Position / Org	Role
Tony Holmes	Senior Procurement Manager – Avon and Somerset Constabulary	Procurement / Moderator
REDACTED	Commissioning Support Officer - OPCC	Evaluation Panel Notes
REDACTED	Senior Commissioning Officer - OPCC	Evaluation Panel Member
REDACTED	Senior Commissioning Officer - OPCC	Evaluation Panel Member
REDACTED	Partnership Liaison Manager - Lighthouse	Evaluation Panel Member
REDACTED	External Stakeholder	Evaluation Panel Member

Lot 4 – An Independent Sexual Violence Advisor (ISVA) Service		
Name	Position / Org	Role
Tony Holmes	Senior Procurement Manager – Avon and Somerset Constabulary	Procurement / Moderator
REDACTED	Commissioning Support Officer - OPCC	Evaluation Panel Notes
REDACTED	Senior Commissioning Officer - OPCC	Evaluation Panel Member
REDACTED	DI – Avon and Somerset Constabulary	Evaluation Panel Member
REDACTED	External Stakeholder	Evaluation Panel Member

Lot 5 – A Restorative Justice Service

Name	Position / Org	Role
Tony Holmes	Senior Procurement Manager – Avon and Somerset Constabulary	Procurement / Moderator
REDACTED	Commissioning Support Officer - OPCC	Evaluation Panel Notes
REDACTED	Head of Commissioning - OPCC	Evaluation Panel Member
REDACTED	Business Development Manager – Avon and Somerset Constabulary	Evaluation Panel Member
REDACTED	External Stakeholder	Evaluation Panel Member

Appendix G

SCORING MODEL

Responses to questions and Supplier Presentations will be given any score between 0 and 10, the score for each response will be determined in accordance with the following methodology. In each case, the overall strength/quality of the response will be evaluated in order to determine whether the response should be categorised as Unacceptable, Poor, Weak, Adequate, Good or Excellent and, for these purposes, an indicative (but not necessarily exhaustive) list of the characteristics that will be taken into account are those set out below:

SCORE	MARKING GUIDELINES
Score 0	Unacceptable. No response or response which is irrelevant to question or unacceptable.
Score 2	Very Poor. Response only partially answers question, with major deficiencies apparent. Little relevant detail.
Score 4	Weak. Response almost meets question requirements but remains basic and missing some detail.
Score 6	Adequate. Response is adequate and meets the question requirements but remains basic and could have been expanded upon. Response is sufficient but does not inspire.
Score 8	Good. Response satisfies question requirements and includes a level of detail which adds value to the Customer.
Score 10	Excellent. Comprehensive and useful response which exceeds the question requirements. The response is innovative and adds value to the tender. It includes a full description of techniques / methods to be employed and the benefits that will be delivered.