

Classification: Open	Decision Type: Key
--------------------------------	------------------------------

Report to:	Cabinet	Date: 15 October 2025
Subject:	Approval to Award the contract for Cleaning and Janitorial products	
Report of	Cabinet Member for Finance and Transformation	

Summary

1. To seek Cabinet approval to award the contract for Caretaking and Janitorial Cleaning Materials to Alliance.

Recommendation(s)

2. It is recommended that Cabinet approve the award of the Caretaking and Janitorial Cleaning Materials contract to Alliance at a total cost of £640,000 for a period of 2 years (with an option to extend for 2 additional years).

Reasons for recommendation(s)

3. Following a comprehensive tender exercise in collaboration with Oldham Council to ensure best value through increased economies of scale, Alliance was identified as the best value supplier. Their proposal met all technical and commercial requirements and offered the most competitive pricing structure.

Alternative options considered and rejected

4. Continue with the temporary contract, which would be in breach of procurement act.

Use Star procurement and align with the GMCA contract, however this would have increased the cost of the materials creating financial pressure.

Report Author and Contact Details:

Name: David Catterall
Position: Head of Commercial Services
Department: Place
E-mail: d.catterall@bury.gov.uk

Background

5. In 2019, the Greater Manchester Combined Authority (GMCA), led by Bolton Council, undertook a procurement exercise to source a Janitorial and Cleaning supplier for all GMCA local authorities, including Bury.

During this procurement process, Bury Council's services which order cleaning and janitorial products were not consulted, resulting in some items being missed from the list of products used within some council services, including Building Cleaning and Caretaking.

The contract to the value of £315k for Bury was awarded via the GMCA to Arrow Ltd on a 3 + 1 year contract. The Building Cleaning and Caretaking and Admin Buildings were instructed to start ordering from Arrow for all cleaning and janitorial products.

As some paper products and cleaning materials were not included in the GMCA contract, this caused some items to fluctuate in price during the term of the contract.

The contract with Arrow ended in May 2023. As the contract ended, prices increased considerably, therefore a follow up mini competition was held to award a temporary contract. This temporary contract is in place, however, due to capacity issues within the Procurement team, the full tender process was delayed creating risk to the Council.

The contract value due to price increases and inflation has increased to £640,000 over the time period of the contract 2 years + 2 optional extensions.

Due to the value and duration of the contract, a comprehensive tender process was necessary and received approval. (Appendix 1) This process has now been completed, and cabinet authorisation is required to award the contract to the selected supplier.

To ensure Bury Council received the best value during the procurement process, 3 options to procure were considered:

- Utilise the relationship with STAR procurement
- Work collaboratively with a neighbouring Council with similar requirements
- Procure independently

The option of using STAR procurement was not pursued because their current framework could not meet Bury's requirements for procuring cleaning materials. It was determined that using STAR procurement would likely result in higher prices for cleaning materials and increased financial pressure for Bury Council.

Independent procurement was not pursued, as leveraging the collective purchasing power of two or more Councils offered enhanced pricing opportunities through economies of scale.

Following discussions with neighbouring authorities, it was determined that Oldham Council was scheduled to tender for cleaning materials with requirements comparable to those of Bury Council. Proceeding with this arrangement was deemed to offer the best value.

Tender Process

The objective of the selection process was to assess the responses to the Invitation to Tender (ITT) and then select a preferred bidder.

The evaluation exercise aimed to balance issues of quality and price, ensuring that the chosen bidder offered the most economically advantageous quotation for the Council.

Upon receipt of formal tenders, the Council ensured full compliance with the ITT documents, and all necessary requested information was supplied. The information provided was checked for completeness and compliance before responses were evaluated. The Council was not bound to accept the lowest price of any bid submitted.

The qualitative data was evaluated based on the most advantageous offer to the Council. The evaluation criteria, and the associated weightings, utilised in this assessment were:

- **Technical Capacity 40% Weighting**
- **Social Value (SV) 10% Weighting**
- **Price 50% Weighting**

Scores were awarded based on the percentage variation between the highest and lowest price, with the lowest financial submission receiving the full marks available.

If a bidder's financial submission fell outside of 25% of the budgeted figure for the service, then their financial submission was subjected to additional scrutiny. Should any response to this scrutiny not satisfy the assessment panel, the quotation could be rejected.

Where a question required a descriptive answer with an award of 5 marks, the following marking regime was used:

Score	Acceptability	Criteria for awarding scores
0	Unacceptable	The information is either omitted or fundamentally unacceptable.
1	Poor	The information submitted has insufficient evidence that the specified requirements can be met and / or does not demonstrate acceptable level of quality of the proposed quotation.
2	Somewhat Deficient	The information submitted has some minor omissions against the specified requirements and / or demonstrates only limited level of quality of the proposed quotation.
3	Satisfactory	The information submitted meets the requirements and / or demonstrates an adequate level of quality of the proposed quotation.

4	Very good	The information submitted provides good evidence that the specified requirements can be met and demonstrates a good level of quality of the proposed quotation.
5	Outstanding	The information submitted provides strong evidence of best of sector capability to deliver the specified requirements.

The final scores were:

Alliance				
Quality	Method Statement	%	Moderate d Score	Weighted Score
40%	1A	7%	4	5.6
	1B	3%	4	2.4
	2A	5%	4	4
	2B	15 %	4	12
	3	10 %	4	8
				32

Bunzl				
Qualit y	Method Statement	%	Moderate d Score	Weighted Score
40%	1A	7%	3	4.2
	1B	3%	4	2.4
	2A	5%	4	4
	2B	15 %	4	12
	3	10 %	4	8
Total Quality Score				30.6

Alliance				
SV				
10%				
	SV Score			7.80

Bunzl				
SV				
10%				
	SV Score			4.42

Alliance				
Price			Lowest Price	Tenderer s Price
50%			181,867.33	199,348.56
	Price Score			45.62

Bunzl				
Price			Lowest Price	Tenderer s Price
50%			181,867.33	181,867.33
	Price Score			50.00

Total Score				85.42
-------------	--	--	--	-------

Total Score				85.02
-------------	--	--	--	-------

Based on the final score, Alliance provides the best value and quality.

Item for decision: *[with reasons]*

Following the completion of the procurement process, which identified Alliance as offering the best value and quality for Bury Council, it is recommended that Cabinet approve awarding the contract to Alliance for the specified contract period, with an option to extend for an additional two years.

6. Links with the Corporate Priorities:

Environmental and Economic Impact

The service has changed suppliers, achieving cost savings on chemicals and janitorial supplies, making the service more competitive

Procurement decisions now factor in flexibility in pricing SLAs, allowing service managers to tailor costs to customer needs, especially important as schools face budget pressures due to falling birth rates

The procurement process is designed to appoint local suppliers and consider environmental benefits.

Community and Inclusion

The service maintains high retention rates and has increased hours purchased, indicating strong community trust and demand

The service supports a workforce which are generally unskilled women and people of diverse ethnic backgrounds. Continued commerciality supports ongoing economic benefits and supports the EDI policy. The Bury Council EDI Strategy 2024-2028 explicitly ties the LET'S strategy to inclusive service design, co-production with communities, and equitable outcome.

Equality Impact and Considerations:

The procurement of Cleaning and Janitorial materials create no impact to equality, inclusion or diversity.

Environmental Impact and Considerations:

7. Alliance is a local supplier and therefore their deliveries routes are shorter and have less carbon impact. Biodiversity is not impacted.

Assessment and Mitigation of Risk:

Risk / opportunity	Mitigation
Opportunity – More broad use of the contract across Bury Council will support higher buyer power and lower costs.	None required
Risk – Price increases due to external influences could create a financial pressure	Using procurement processes allows for due diligence. Products can be added and removed as required to ensure the best price is provided.

Legal Implications:

8. Client has confirmed the Procurement team are happy with how this matter was procured and there are no issues with the terms and conditions.

Financial Implications:

9. The costs of the contract award will be met from the caretaking & cleaning service general fund revenue budget.

Appendices:

Appendix 1 - Operational Decision to temporarily award a Janitorial and Cleaning Supplier
15/5/2023

Background papers:

None.

Please include a glossary of terms, abbreviations and acronyms used in this report.

Term	Meaning
GMCA	Greater Manchester Combined Authority
SLA	Service Level Agreement
EDI	Equality Diversity and Inclusion