

Addendum to Executive Sub Board Report –Award of Term Maintenance Contracts -March 29th 2012

Item 3.6

We wish to make it clear that paragraph 3.6 has not been taken into account in the decision making process as current performance did not form part of the Award criteria during the procurement process.

Item 3.7

We wish to withdraw paragraph 3.7 and insert the following:

Within the PQQ submitted by Enterprise they made the statement that:-
‘All responsive, maintenance and servicing will be undertaken by direct operatives. We will subcontract elements of larger project works’.

During the interview and site visit stage of the procurement evaluation process Council officers remained to be substantially convinced that this was actually going to be the case and they felt it highly likely that the use of subcontractors would account for a significant amount of the workload undertaken by Enterprise if they were appointed.

Within the ITT submitted by Enterprise they also made a statement with regards the use of hand held devices, they indicated that:-

“Operatives will receive jobs via handheld devices to ensure an efficient response with the closest operative with the correct skills attending. This will expedite our response to emergency and out of hours jobs and ensure we meet the required timescales and performance standards.” They also went onto say that:- *“The handhelds will also let operatives call ahead to their next job to let them know their estimated time of arrival, once they have completed their current job. We understand proactive communication is important for reactive works especially high priority repairs”*

Again during the interview and site visit stage of the procurement evaluation process it became clear to Council officers that the representatives from Enterprise had little knowledge of the use of hand held devices –and thus officers had little confidence that this technology would be implemented to all staff to allow us to benefit from the advantages that they would bring thus adversely affecting your ability to deliver a quality responsive service from the outset of the contract. We feel this evidence did not confirm their ability to deliver a quality service to us without the use of hand held devices not being embedded into their practices.

The above issues became clear during the interview and site visit stage of the procurement evaluation process, copies of the notes taken at that stage are available to support this. As the interview stage only accounted for 10% of the overall mark, Enterprise’s poor score for this stage did not affect the overall result. This does make us cautious in terms of awarding this contract to Enterprise particularly as their score for price was weighting their overall score to make them a marginal winner and the quality element of their tender

would not result in the award criteria of MEAT principles being delivered to the Council from this contractor.