

# REPORT FOR: **CABINET**

---

<b>Date of Meeting:</b>	21 July 2011
<b>Subject:</b>	Procurement of Temporary Agency Worker Services
<b>Key Decision:</b>	Yes
<b>Responsible Officer:</b>	Tom Whiting, Assistant Chief Executive
<b>Portfolio Holder:</b>	Councillor Graham Henson, Portfolio Holder for Performance, Customer Services and Corporate Services  Councillor Thaya Idaikkadar, Portfolio Holder for Property and Major Contracts
<b>Exempt:</b>	No except for Appendix 2: LB Hammersmith & Fulham Report – ‘Award Of A Framework Agreement For Agency Worker Services Exempt Aspects(E)’ This is exempt from publication under paragraph 3 of part 1 of Schedule 12A to the Local Government Act 1972 (as amended) as it contains information relating to the financial or business affairs of any person (including the authority holding that information)
<b>Decision subject to Call-in:</b>	Yes
<b>Enclosures:</b>	Appendix 1 – Evaluation Model Appendix 2 (Part II) - LB Hammersmith & Fulham Report – ‘Award Of A Framework Agreement For Agency Worker Services : Exempt Aspects(E)’

## **Section 1 – Summary and Recommendations**

### **Recommendations:**

Cabinet is requested to agree:

That Harrow Council award a call-off contract for the supply of temporary Agency worker services under the London Borough of Hammersmith & Fulham Framework for Agency Worker Services Agreement.

That the call-off contract commence on 1 October 2011 for a period of 4 years.

That officers arrange contract mobilisation meetings with the successful tenderer to ensure a smooth implementation.

### **Reason: (For recommendation)**

To provide a cost effective supply of temporary agency workers for the Council

## **Section 2 – Report**

### **Introductory paragraph**

This report recommends Cabinet agree to Harrow Council entering into a call-off contract to access the Framework Agreement for the supply of Agency Worker Services awarded by the London Borough of Hammersmith & Fulham.

### **Background**

- 2.1 Temporary workers represent an important component of the Council's workforce resource enabling it to 'flex' in line with peaks and troughs of overall workloads. Temporary workers are also currently being used to cover vacancies, which may be potential redeployment opportunities for staff at risk of redundancy.

- 2.2 Temporary workers are either employed directly or sourced through contracts with Agency suppliers. Harrow has contracts with a range of Agency and Interim suppliers but primarily sources temporary workers through contracts with the following three suppliers: Matrix; Pertemps and ASAP. The total value of spend against these contracts for 2009/10 and 2010/11 is set out in the table below:

AGENCY		SPEND	
		2009/10	2010/11
Matrix	Technical & Professional Agency Staff	£7,599k	£6,615k
Pertemps	Clerical & Admin Agency Staff	£4,024k	£4,390k
ASAP	'Blue Collar' Agency Staff	£ 375k	£312k
<b>TOTAL</b>		<b>£11,998k</b>	<b>£11,317k</b>

- 2.3 These contracts were due to expire in March 2011 but were extended and the rates re-negotiated to deliver savings of £191K in 2009/10 and additional savings of £112K in 2010/11. However, future savings can best be optimised through re-tendering and by combining the contracts.
- 2.4 In order to seek greater efficiencies, it was considered that a collaborative approach would provide the best opportunity for securing the most cost effective service in the future. Consequently senior officers sought interest from their counterparts in London and in July 2010, HR and Procurement leads from Harrow and LB Hammersmith & Fulham (LBH&F) agreed to proceed with joint procurement of a Framework Agreement for Agency Worker Services, to be led by LBH&F. This significantly increased the value of the contract, as LBH&F spend is approximately twice that of Harrow. It also enabled the sharing of information, risk and resources.
- 2.5 The Framework Agreement for Agency Worker Services will be awarded by LBH&F and Harrow (and other London Councils) can access the Framework Agreement through a call-off contract.

### **Procurement Process**

- 2.6 A joint Tender Appraisal Panel was established lead by the Assistant Director (HR) – Finance & Corporate Services for LBH&F and the Divisional Director HR, Development and Shared Services for Harrow and included HR, Procurement and Legal representatives from both Councils.
- 2.7 In September 2010, contract notices were published on LBH&F and Harrow's websites and also a voluntarily OJEU (Official Journal of the EU) notice.

- 2.8 A total of 81 initial expressions of interest were registered on the e-tendering system (London Tenders Portal), out of which 14 lodged completed application forms (Pre-Qualification Questionnaires – PQQs).
- 2.9 Subsequently in February 2011, following a joint evaluation of applicants by LBH&F and Harrow officers, a shortlist of five (5) companies were invited to tender. The short-listed companies were as follows.

**Adecco Group UK**  
**Hays Specialist Recruitment**  
**Manpower UK Ltd**  
**Morson Human Resources Ltd**  
**Pertemps Recruitment Partnership Ltd**

- 2.10 An Evaluation Tender Model was published with the Invitation to Tender (ITT) documents, which is attached as Appendix 1. This required tenders to be evaluated through a staged approach, with those having passed through the earlier stages being evaluated on the basis of a 60/40 Price/Quality Model.
- 2.11 The five short-listed companies were invited to tender. Two companies withdrew from the tendering process prior to the tender return date, leaving three companies who submitted tenders on or before the deadline of 29 April 2011.
- 2.12 The three organisations who submitted tenders were evaluated in accordance with the agreed Tender Evaluation Model. Each tender submission was checked for completeness and each satisfied the criteria set out in Stage 1 of the evaluation model. Each tender was then subjected to detailed examination of quality at stage 2.
- 2.13 Detailed evaluation of both price and quality were then completed in accordance with the agreed evaluation model. Presentations were made by all three tenderers against a pre-determined format and set of questions. These presentations were evaluated and scored as part of quality.
- 2.14 **Pertemps Recruitment Partnership Ltd** scored consistently highly across all elements of both price and quality. Further details of the tender evaluation process and the scoring results are set out in the enclosed LBH&F Cabinet Report - This report is exempt from publication under paragraph 3 of part1 of Schedule 12A to the Local Government Act 1972 (as amended) as it contains information relating to the financial or business affairs of any person (including the authority holding that information)
- 2.15 The joint Tender Appraisal Panel recommended that the contract be awarded to **Pertemps Recruitment Partnership Ltd** as it considers that their tender submission represents value for money and is

economically advantageous to LBH&F and Harrow (and any other London Council who joins the framework in the future).

- 2.16 At their meeting on 18 July 2011 the LBH&F Cabinet will consider reports which recommend award of the Framework for Agency Worker Services to **Pertemps Recruitment Partnership Ltd**. Their decision will be verbally reported to Harrow Council's Cabinet meeting on 21 July 2011.

### **Key Benefits**

- 2.17 **Pertemps Recruitment Partnership Ltd** is a very well established company with an excellent track record of providing these specialised services to Harrow and a wide range of other Councils.
- 2.18 Reduction in total cost for the provision of all aspects of Agency Worker provision and working towards achieving ongoing cost reductions and savings. The projected savings are set out in the **Financial Implications** section below.
- 2.19 Quality Assurance – ensuring the timely provision of correctly vetted, suitably qualified and experienced Agency workers who have the capability and aptitude to fulfil the requirements of the allocated role.
- 2.20 Service flexibility – the systems and processes implemented by the Provider will provide rapid fulfilment of positions. Provision of transparent and accurate management information to enable improved monitoring of the service, including equality and diversity performance.
- 2.21 Innovation – the Provider will develop a continuous improvement programme designed to constantly improve service, costs and use of technology. This is a key benefit as the Contract will be awarded for a significant period of 4 years. It is vital that the service delivery remains at a “best in market” level.
- 2.22 Transformation Programme – the Provider will be expected to support the Customers in their ambitious transformation programmes and work closely with partners and stakeholders to achieve an efficient and effective workforce for the future.
- 2.23 Added Value – The Provider will support the Council's in their commitment to work with their local community and businesses in economic regeneration activities.

### **Financial Implications**

- 2.24 Based on 2009/10 utilisation of Agency workers, re-tendering was expected to deliver savings for Harrow of £290k in the financial year 2011/12 and a further £210k in 2012/13. These have been incorporated in Harrow's MTFS.

- 2.25 Through the financial evaluation of the tenders, we are able to confirm that subject to the current levels of utilisation of Agency workers being maintained the projected savings in the MTFS will be achieved based on award of the contract to Pertemps Recruitment Partnership Ltd. However, were there to be a significant reduction in the utilisation of Agency workers this would reduce the level of savings that could be delivered through the new contract (see Risk Management Implications below).
- 2.26 Utilisation of Agency workers and delivery of savings will be monitored through the contract management arrangements
- 2.27 The new contract will also deliver financial benefits arising from:
- Containment of costs through application of the tendered tenure discounts, as and when they become available.
  - Future rebates on volume discounts, particularly if other London Councils join the framework.
- 2.28 In their tender Pertemps identified 'one off' implementation costs for Harrow as follows:
- Implementation & IT costs of £5K; which include the integration of the on-line ordering system across all Harrow users, the supply chain and any training required
  - Implementation Team costs of £5K; which cover all elements of the mobilisation plan including:
    - Engagement with the supply chain and signing them onto the new framework
    - Transfer of any workers, TUPE
    - HR support
    - User management meetings / forums to discuss the new framework and processes
    - Implementation of all MI and invoicing processes
    - Legal support
    - Technology implementation and IT support
    - Implementation of 24/7 support function
    - Covering any gaps in the finally agreed delivery teams during implementation

Harrow's implementation costs are lower than those of LBH&F because of Pertemps' existing knowledge of the user base and the lower proportion of potential spend within Harrow. The cost of implementation will be included as part of the net budget savings realisation.

## Performance Issues

- 2.29 Supplier performance against the contract specification will be monitored through the contract management arrangements, The contract specification:
- sets KPI for the supplier, which will be reported separately for each contract and can be incorporated in to the Corporate Performance scorecard if required.
  - requires the supplier to demonstrate value for money and continuous improvement in performance throughout the contract
  - requires the supplier to demonstrate compliance with the Councils' safeguarding standards
  - requires the supplier to ensure local panel vendors have adequate opportunities to supply
  - requires the supplier to provide equalities monitoring data on the diversity of the workers supplied

## Environmental Impact

- 2.30 The contract requires the supplier to operate as a 'neutral vendor' and provide local SME suppliers with an opportunity to supply agency workers to the Council. Local suppliers are more likely to supply local workers, reducing the need the amount of travelling by transport.

## Risk Management Implications

- 2.31 Risk included on Directorate risk register? **No**
- 2.32 Separate risk register in place? **Yes**
- 2.33 Key risks from the risk register and the current controls to mitigate the risks are set out in the table below:

<b>Risk</b>	<b>Mitigation</b>
Legal challenges if the procurement process is not robust.	Legal and procurement officer involvement right from the start.
Projected savings are based on current volumes and utilisation of Agency workers. Financial pressures and Agency Worker Regulations (See 2.34 below) may result in increase costs which in turn may lead to reduced volumes reducing the potential savings	Projected savings must be adjusted in line with projected volumes and closely monitored

Savings will be adversely affected if managers source outside of the contract	Identification of all current 'off contract' spend. Strong messaging on need for compliance and monitoring of non-compliant spend.
-------------------------------------------------------------------------------	------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------

## Agency Worker Regulations

- 2.34 On 1st October 2011 the Agency Worker Regulations come into force which will have a direct impact on the potential cost of Agency workers. After 12 weeks with the Council all agency workers will have to be aligned to the pay and conditions of 'comparator posts'. As a result, there are likely to be pay and charge rate increases for a proportion of agency workers; payment of job-related benefits such as shift, overtime, increments, pay awards etc not currently paid; an increased cost for minimum of 2 days per annum (pro-rata) annual leave for each agency worker, and paid time off for ante-natal care. Agency Workers will also be entitled to day-one benefits such as car allowances, if job related, and access to the job vacancy list.
- 2.35 A cross Council project team has been established to assess the impact that the Agency Worker Regulations will have within Directorates and, in conjunction with the new supplier, identify measures to mitigate any risk to the Council.

## Equalities implications

- 2.36 Was an Equality Impact Assessment carried out? **Yes**
- 2.37 Key issues and actions from the Equality Impact Assessment are set out below:
- The contract requires the supplier to operate as a 'neutral vendor' and provide local SME suppliers with an opportunity to supply agency workers to the Councils.
  - Equality monitoring data from Harrow's current supplier's data has shown that there is better representation of the diversity of the local community amongst Agency workers than amongst permanent Harrow Council employees.
  - Through the tender specification and the evaluation process, prospective suppliers were required to demonstrate, how they will promote equalities and support customers in meeting their equality targets and how they will manage the service in a way that ensures the customers' priorities on equalities are met.
  - Monitoring data from Harrow's current supplier's data has also shown that some Agency Workers are paid less by their employers (the agencies) than the equivalent pay rate for Harrow Council employees. This may indirectly lead to socio- economic inequality.



- The Agency Worker Regulations (see 2.34 above) are intended to ensure that there is appropriate protection of temporary agency workers through the application of the principle of equal treatment, including pay. The supplier will be required to provide Management Information reports on agency workers pay, which will be monitored to ensure compliance with Agency Worker Regulations.

## Corporate Priorities

2.38 The cost effective supply of temporary Agency workers facilitates the delivery of all the corporate priorities.

## Section 3 - Statutory Officer Clearance

Name: Steve Tingle	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	on behalf of the Chief Financial Officer
Date: 20 June 2011		
Name: Linda Cohen	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	on behalf of the Monitoring Officer
Date: 2 June 2011		

## Section 4 – Performance Officer Clearance

Name: Liz Defries	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	on behalf of the Divisional Director Partnership, Development and Performance
Date: 7 June 2011		

## **Section 5 – Environmental Impact Officer Clearance**

Name: John Edwards



Divisional Director  
(Environmental  
Services)

Date: 1 June 2011

## **Section 6 - Contact Details and Background Papers**

**Contact:** Jon Turner, Divisional Director, HR, Development & Shared Services – 020 8424 1225

### **Background Papers:**

Cabinet Information Report – Procurement of Temporary Agency Worker Services - 13 January 2011

**Call-In Waived by the  
Chairman of Overview  
and Scrutiny  
Committee**

**NOT APPLICABLE**

*[Call-in applies]*

## Evaluation Model – Framework for Agency Worker Services

### 1. Introduction

- 1.1. The Authority is committed to providing high quality, value for money services and will evaluate each Tender according to 3 successive stages, as set out below.
- 1.2. *The Authority will award the Framework Agreement fairly on the basis of quality and cost. The Tender Appraisal Panel (TAP) will evaluate the quality of tenders using a weighted model. Quality will account for **40%** (40 points) of the overall evaluation process and price **60%** (60 points).*
- 1.3. The Authority's approach to evaluation will be equitable and transparent and will allow Tenderers to tender on the basis of quality at an affordable price. It allows the TAP to recommend the selection of a tender that meets the key quality requirements and therefore represents best value for money, i.e. the economically most advantageous tender.

### 2. Provision of Additional Information

- 2.1. If at any time during its evaluation of a Tender the TAP forms the view that any matter requires clarification, it may require the same from the Tenderer concerned in writing.

### 3. Stages

There will be a 3-stage evaluation of returned Tenders:-

#### 3.1 Stage 1 - Checking for Validity

- 3.1.1 A valid Tender shall be received in accordance with the ITT. Validity will involve checking that all requisite documents are completed, enclosed and signed where required in accordance with the Instructions to Tenderers.
- 3.1.2 Tenders that do not pass this Stage 1 will be rejected and not considered further except, at the Authority's sole discretion, in the case of minor omissions that can be rectified in accordance with any reasonable request of the Authority (for example missing signature or date etc. - for the avoidance of doubt this is not an exhaustive list).

## **3.2 Stage 2 - Detailed Consideration of Tenders**

- 3.2.1 All Tender submissions reaching this stage will be awarded points in relation to Price and Quality. Presentations will also be scored and comprise part of the Quality evaluation.
- 3.2.2 Tenders reaching this stage will, after evaluation against the detailed criteria set out below (eg Quality/Price), be ranked in order of aggregate score.
- 3.2.3 **Evaluation of Price**
- 3.2.4 **Tenderers are required to tender for each model (1A, 1B, 2A and 2B) contained in the Charges schedule. Failure to do so will result in your tender being rejected.**
- 3.2.5 The maximum score that can be achieved for Price element is **60** points. This will be split, with 50 points awarded for tendered costs as set out below (see 3.2.8), with the remaining 10 points comprised of 5 points for Tenure Discount and 5 points for Volume Discount as set out in paragraph 3.2.9.
- 3.2.6 Tendered costs for the Authority for provision of Off-Site (summary total S and/or T) and On-Site services (summary total U and/or V) will be determined by reference to the completed charges schedule at Schedule 7.
- 3.2.7 The total Annual cost for Hourly charges, Management Fees and One-off costs of service transfer shall comprise each of four (4) options:

### **Total base tender price**

- **hourly pay rates for specified job categories (item A)**

**Added to:**

#### **Option 1 - Model 1A (Off-site)**

**Plus\*:**

- Panel Vendor % Mark-up (item F)
- Neutral Vendor hourly transaction fee (item H)

**Or**

#### **Option 2 - Model 1B (Off-Site)**

**Plus\*:**

- Panel Vendor Fixed £p Mark-up (item J)

- Neutral Vendor hourly transaction fee (item H)

**Or**

**Option 3 - Model 2A (On-Site)**

**Plus\*:**

- Panel Vendor % Mark-up (item F)
- Neutral Vendor £p hourly management fee (item N[a])
- Alternatively
- Neutral Vendor £p Annual management fee (item N[b])

**Or**

**Option 4 - Model 2B (On-Site)**

**Plus\*:**

- Panel Vendor Fixed £p Mark-up (item J)
- Neutral Vendor £p hourly management fee (item N[a])
- Alternatively
- Neutral Vendor £p Annual management fee (item N[b])

**\*In addition, tendered hourly statutory charges (item B, C and D) shall be added to each option. Similarly One-off costs for set up, TUPE, IT systems and transition/migration will also be added to each option.**

3.2.8 Each Tender will be awarded points based on its relationship with the lowest average tendered cost for Model 1A, model 1B, Model 2A and Model 2B

The Tender with the **lowest average tendered cost across all four models** (x) will be awarded a maximum score of **50** Points; each of the remaining Tenders (y) will be awarded points on a pro rata basis in accordance with the following formula:

$$1 - \frac{(y - x)}{x} \times 50$$

Where x = lowest aggregated tender total

y = aggregated tender total other than lowest

For example, if the lowest aggregate tender total (for the Authority) ie x, was £2000k :-

Tender	£ x	£ y	Points Awarded
A	2000		50.00
B		2100	47.50
C		2200	45.00
D		2500	37.50

Please note that the figures are merely examples and are in no way an indication of the contract value.

3.2.9 Finally the tendered Tenure Discount and Volume Discount related to the aggregate value of annual spend by participating Contracting Bodies set out in the Charges Schedule will be evaluated and a maximum of **5** points awarded for **each** element in accordance with the following scoring scheme.

### Tenure Discount

Placement Term	Discount tendered (D)	Probability (P)	(D) X (P)	Tendered Discount offered	Points awarded
3 months/12 weeks		50%		yes/no	0.5/0
6 months/24 weeks		25%		yes/no	0.5/0
9 months/36 weeks		15%		yes/no	0.5/0
12 months/52 weeks		10%		yes/no	0.5/0
Evaluated average discount max 3 points				Max 2 points	

The tenderer tendering the highest average discount taking account of the probability (P) (total discount offered across all categories ÷ 4) will be awarded an additional 3 points. Maximum points awarded will therefore be **5**.

For illustration, a worked example follows. In this example, if discounts offered were as below and the averaged discount (2.5) were the highest value amongst all tenderers, 1.5 points would be awarded for tendering discounts in 3 categories and 3 points would be awarded for the highest average discount = total 4.5 points.

Placement Term	Discount tendered (D)	Probability (P)	(D) X (P)	Tendered Discount offered	Points awarded
3 months/12 weeks	0	50%	0	yes/no	0.5/0
6 months/24 weeks	12	25%	3	yes/no	0.5/0
9 months/36 weeks	20	15%	3	yes/no	0.5/0
12 months/52 weeks	40	10%	4	yes/no	0.5/0
Evaluated average discount max 3 points			2.5	Max 2 points	1.5 points

## £ Volume Discount

Value of Aggregate Spend by Participating Bodies	Probability of event – weighting to be applied	Element to be evaluated with discount	Element with discount and probability weighting applied
£20 - £30 million	50%	The mid point of this value band (ie £25m)	*sub-totals for evaluation to be calculated as below
£30 - £40 million	25%	The mid point of this value band (ie £35m)	ditto
£40 - £60 million	11%	The mid point of this value band (ie £50m)	ditto
£60 - £90 million	8%	The mid point of this value band (ie £75m)	ditto
£90 - £150 million	6%	The mid point of this value band (ie £120m)	ditto
<b>Grand Total</b>			Grand total of all calculated sub-totals

\*A sub-total shall be calculated for each category by applying the average tendered discount (for the annual spend bands shown in the pricing document) to the mid point of the value band shown above. This will then be multiplied by the probability weighting to give the sub-total. The resultant grand total for all categories will be assessed. The tenderer with the highest grand total will score **5** points. The remaining tenderers' grand totals will be scored on a pro-rata basis (other than highest grand total/highest grand total x **5**).

For illustration, a worked example follows.

If tendered discounts for individual spend levels (which together comprise the £20 - £30m band shaded above) were:

Spend Levels	% Retrospective Discount
£20m - £22.5m	2
£22.5m - £25m	2
£25m - £27.5m	4
£27.5m - £30m	4
<b>Average discount</b>	<b>3</b>

The average discount will be applied to mid point of Aggregate spend £20m - £30m and multiplied by the probability of event (50%) giving a subtotal of £375,000.

$$£25m \times 3\% = £750000 \times 50\% = \underline{£375000} \text{ etc}$$

Using this means of calculation throughout, the tenderer achieving the highest resultant total value for the 5 volume discount bands (shown above in the first table) will be awarded **5** points. Remaining tenderer's grand totals will be scored on a pro-rata basis.

## Evaluation of Quality

**Quality shall account for 40% of the total points that can be awarded for your tender (ie max 40 points)**

The TAP will assess each Method Statement submission to determine the degree to which the quality criteria have been met. A score out of 4 will be awarded for each question in the Contractor's Proposals in accordance with Table 1 set out below.

Any tenderer who scores 0 (unacceptable) for any question forming part of the quality submission will be deemed disqualified and its tender submission for price and quality will be rejected and not further considered.

**Table 1**

<b>Marks</b>	<b>Rating</b>	<b>Description</b>
4	Excellent	High quality, fully meeting all the requirements of the Specification, no shortcomings
3	Good	Good quality, meeting requirements of the Specification, robust, few if any shortcomings
2	Fair	Average Quality, meeting most requirements of the Specification, some shortcomings
1	Poor	Well below average, meeting few requirements of the Specification, significant shortcomings
0	Unacceptable	No information provided or so little information provided to prevent a judgement to be formed

Evaluation of Quality shall be conducted through assessment and scoring of your submitted Method Statement Questionnaire. A maximum of **35 points** may be awarded through this process. In addition a maximum of **5 points** may be awarded through assessment and scoring of a Presentation that you are required to provide after tenders have been received. The Method Statement responses comprise the following Sub Criteria with individual weightings.

<b>Sub Criteria</b>	<b>Max points</b>
Service Delivery <i>Evaluated through tender submission only</i>	<b>18</b>
Procedures & Processes in support of service delivery <i>Evaluated through tender submission only</i>	<b>5</b>



Innovation / Continuous Service Development <i>Evaluated through tender submission only</i>	<b>4</b>
Implementation & Marketing the Service <i>Evaluated through tender submission only</i>	<b>4</b>
Existing Suppliers and Local Suppliers <i>Evaluated through tender submission only</i>	<b>4</b>
	<b>35</b>

For illustration, a worked example follows.

In evaluating **Section 5 Service Delivery (max 18 points)**, responses to 17 questions are evaluated (evaluator scoring 0 – 4 for each question). The maximum evaluator scores will therefore be 68.

In the event that a tenderer's submission for this section of the questionnaire achieves a total evaluator score of 51, the points score taken forward and added to scores for other sections will be as follows:

$$51 \div 68 = 75\% \text{ of max score (18)}$$

$$= \underline{13.5}$$

- **Presentations**
- Presentations will be scored and will account for **total 5 points**.

Tenderers reaching this stage will be invited to make a presentation which will comprise:

- an introductory summary by the Tenderer of key elements of its submission. For the avoidance of doubt this summary will not be scored.
- a Q & A session where a set of predetermined questions will be asked of Tenderers. For the avoidance of doubt the same questions will be asked of each Tenderer invited to the Presentation and will be scored in accordance with Table 1.
- Further details of the weighting for each question and the Quality Sub Criteria to which they relate will be forwarded to Tenderers prior to the closing date for receipt of tenders of 29 April April 2011.

## **Overall Evaluation**

Finally the aggregate weighted Price/Quality scores will be combined to obtain the total weighted score for each Tenderer. The Tenderer with the highest total weighted score will be the Tenderer offering the most economically advantageous Tender.

For the avoidance of doubt, evaluation scores will be reviewed by the full TAP and individual scores may be moderated in accordance with Table 1 on page 6.

**Following award of the Framework, each Contracting Body will enter into a Call-off Contract selecting:**

**option 1A – Standard service, Transaction Fee Percentage Mark-up,**

**option 1B – Standard service, Transaction Fee Fixed pence Mark-up**

**option 2A – Management Fee, On Site Support Service Percentage Mark-up  
or**

**option 2B – Management Fee, On Site Support Service Fixed Pence Mark-up**

**as the basis of pricing the provision of the Services.**

If the option is to select either Model 2A or 2B then Contracting Bodies will select

- Neutral Vendor £p hourly management fee (item N[a])
- OR
- Neutral Vendor £p Annual management fee (item N[b])

as a means of payment of the management fee.