# OFFICER DELEGATION SCHEME RECORD OF OPERATIONAL DECISION



## TO BE UPLOADED TO THE E-MEETINGS MANAGER

<b>Date:</b> 9 April 2019		Ref No:	1914 (PUR411)	
Type of Operational De	cision:	,		
<b>Executive Decision</b>	Х	Council Dec	cision	
Status: For Publication	วท			
<b>Title/Subject matter:</b> Contract for the Provision 2021.	of a Food Hygiene	Inspection Se	ervice - 1 April 2019 to 31 March	
Budget/Strategy/Police	y/Compliance – Is	s the decision	n:	
(i) within an Approved			Yes	
(ii) not in conflict with			Yes	
(iii) not raising new issu			Yes	
Equality Impact Assess [Does this decision change procedure or working practimpact on a group of peop complete EIA and summaridentified and recommend EIA to Corporate HR]	e policy, ctice or negatively ble? <b>If yes</b> – rise issues			
Details of Operational D	Decision Taken [w	vith reasons]:		
An Invitation to quote opportunity was issued on The Chest on in accordance with the Council's Contract Procedure Rule 4.1. The closing date for receipt of bids was set at 12.00 noon on Thursday 14 February 2019 with three submissions being received by the required deadline. Following an evaluation of the bids it is recommended that:				
Osborne Richardson Ltd, 4 <sup>th</sup> Floor Circus House, 26 Little Portland Street, London W1W 8BX				
are nominated as the provider who offers best overall value to the Council.				
See attached note for d	etails.			

Decision taken by:	Signature:	Date:	
Interim Executive Director – Resources and Regulation	SUL	24/4/19	
Interim Executive Director - Communities & Wellbeing	touck	2514119	
Head of Workforce – Communities & Wellbeing	NA		
Members Consulted [see note 1 below]		3	
Cabinet Member/Chair		2/5/2019	
Lead Member	NA		
Opposition Spokesperson			

#### **Notes**

- 1. It is not generally a requirement to consult with any Members on Operational Decisions but where a Chief Officer considers it necessary to consult with the appropriate Cabinet Member and/or Lead Member, they must sign the form so as to confirm that they have been consulted and that they agree with the proposed action. The signature of the Opposition Spokesperson should be obtained to confirm that he/she has been consulted.
- 2. This form must not be used for urgent decisions.

### Background Information - not for publication (DP1914)

# Contract for the Provision of a Food Hygiene Inspection Service - 1<sup>st</sup> April 2019 to 31<sup>st</sup> March 2021

The Council currently has approximately 1500 registered food businesses which are routinely inspected under food hygiene legislation according to a risk based programme laid down in the Food Standards Agency's statutory code of practice.

Due to limited internal resource the Council now finds itself in a position of having approximately 600 outstanding (300 per annum over two years) category D inspections that require completion before 31<sup>st</sup> March 2021 in order to meet with the requirements set by the Food Standards Agency's requirements. Therefore bids were sought from suitably qualified third party organisations to undertake the work on the Council's behalf.

The Invitation to quote opportunity was issued on The Chest on Friday 25<sup>th</sup> January 2019 in accordance with the Council's Contract Procedure Rule 4.1 with the three organisations listed below being invited to submit a bid

The closing date for receipt of bids was set at 12.00 noon on Thursday 14<sup>th</sup> February 2019 with all three organisations submitting bids by the required deadline:

- Buckingham Futures
- Food Safety Solutions
- Osborne Richardson Ltd

The companies were evaluated in accordance with the following evaluation criteria specified in the tender documentation

Criteria				lax Ittain	Score able
Financial Standing Pass / F		ass / Fail (Risk Assessed)			
Insurances	Pass / Fail				
Health & Safety	Pass / Fail				
Confirmation of meeting					
requirement specifications	Pass / Fa	il			
(Section 4, Sub Section 1)					
Price				40	
Overall quality, based upon response to requirements (Section 4 Sub Section 2 of this document)				60	
		Score Available	Weight (H,M,L)		Max Score
2.1 - Proposed Provision of Service		10	Н		30
2.2 - Proposed Use of Personnel		10	М		20
2.3 – Demonstration of Project Experience <b>10 H</b>			Н		30
2.4 - Demonstration of Quality and Procedures 10 M			М		20
3.1 - Social Value		10	L		10
Total Quality Score (2)			110		
Overall % Total (1) + (2)					

Where weighting is shown the score achieved will be multiplied by one of the following factors:

 $\mathbf{H} = \text{High} = 3$ ;  $\mathbf{M} = \text{Medium} = 2$ ;  $\mathbf{L} = \text{Low} = 1$ .

The evaluation team consisted of the following Officers:

Natasha Franklin: Unit Manager Health Protection

Steve Hoyle: Principal Environmental Health Officer (Food)

Russell Starkie: Principal Procurement Officer

#### **Price**

With regards to the price evaluation, the lowest priced submission scored the highest marks and the others scored on a pro-rata basis i.e. the lowest price divided by their price multiplied by the number of marks available which in the case was 40.

The figure shown below is the annual indicative cost based on the following calculation of 300 visits per annum.

Bidder	Total Price
Buckingham Futures	£12715.00
Food Safety Solutions	£14250.00
Osborne Richardson	£12660.00

#### Quality

The quality aspect of the evaluation were allocated individual weightings and scored on an individual basis using a scoring matrix with a value of up to 10. The total score achieved by each bidder was divided by the maximum score available and multiplied by the relevant percentage score which in this case was 60.

The scores achieved by the bidders in relation to both price and quality are shown in the table below

Organisation	Price	Quality	<b>Total Score</b>
Buckingham Futures	39.83	32.73	72.56
Food Safety Solutions	35.54	14.29	49.83
Osborne Richardson	40.00	46.91	86.91

The leading bidder, was then assessed in terms of health and safety and financial standing in relation to the work being undertaken. The Technical Officers on the evaluation panel are satisfied that the appropriate measures are in place to allow the leading bidder to undertake the work.

The report received from the Corporate Accountancy Team stated that:

The leading bidder would be regarded as low risk from a financial perspective for this contract.

Therefore it is recommended that Osborne Richardson is nominated as the provider who offers best overall value to the Council.

Lorraine Chamberlin, Head of Health and Environmental Protection Department for Communities and Wellbeing, 9<sup>th</sup> April 2019