

Appendix 3 - Procurement Outcome

This section of the report outlines the outcome of the tender evaluation and breakdown of quality and price scores achieved by each provider for each locality. Further information about the tender evaluation is contained in Appendix 2 (Part B - Exempt Information) of the report.

Sometimes lower ranked bids have been successful because providers may have submitted bids for more than one Bundle and the recommendation was to award the Service Agreement to another bundle within the same locality, providers were successful in a different Locality or Localities or providers were unable to meet the aggregated turnover threshold for two Bundles.

1. East Haringey

1.1. **Bundle E1** – a total of 16 bids received, of which 5 bids were eliminated during the compliance check and 3 bids failed to meet quality threshold. Remaining 8 bids were fully assessed and their quality and price scores are as follow:

Bidder	Quality Scores (out of 400 points)	Price Scores (out of 600 points)	Total Scores (out of 1000 points)	Raking
Provider A	324	567	891	1
Provider B	348	539	887	2
Provider C	282	600	882	3
Provider D	322	549	871	4
Provider E	272	564	836	5
Provider F	254	564	818	6
Provider G	254	548	802	7
Provider H	236	564	800	8

We propose to award the Service Agreement to 6th ranked Provider for Bundle E1 (please see paragraph 6.26 of the main report).

1.2. **Bundle E2** – a total of 10 bids received, of which 2 bids were eliminated during the compliance check and 2 bids failed to meet quality threshold. Remaining 6 bids were fully assessed and their quality and price scores are as follows:

Bidder	Quality Scores (out of 400 points)	Price Scores (out of 600 points)	Total Scores (out of 1000 points)	Raking
Provider A	348	534	882*	1
Provider B	282	600	882*	2
Provider C	272	564	836	3
Provider D	254	564	818	4
Provider E	236	564	800	5
Provider F	242	551	793	6

We propose to award the Service Agreement to 3rd ranked Provider for Bundle E2 (please see paragraph 6.26 of the main report).

Note: *Provider A and B, both achieved the same total scores of 882. However, in accordance with the evaluation criteria stipulated in tender documents, the provider with the highest marks in quality is ranked 1 (Provider A) and allocated rank 2 to Provider B.

- 1.3. **Bundle E3** – a total of 11 bids received, of which 6 bids were eliminated during the compliance check and 1 bid failed to meet quality threshold. Remaining 4 bids were fully assessed and their quality and price scores are as follow:

Bidder	Quality Scores (out of 400 points)	Price Scores (out of 600 points)	Total Scores (out of 1000 points)	Raking
Provider A	324	600	924	1
Provider B	348	570	918	2
Provider C	272	597	869	3
Provider D	254	597	851	4

We propose to award the Service Agreement to top ranked Provider for Bundle E3.

- 1.4. **Bundle E4** – a total of 10 bids received, of which 5 bids were eliminated during the compliance check and 2 bids failed to meet quality threshold. Remaining 3 bids were fully assessed and their quality and price scores are as follows:

Bidder	Quality Scores (out of 400 points)	Price Scores (out of 600 points)	Total Scores (out of 1000 points)	Raking
Provider A	348	577	925	1
Provider B	272	600	872	2
Provider C	254	587	841	3

We propose to award the Service Agreement to top ranked Provider for Bundle E4.

2. Central Haringey

- 2.1. **Bundle C1** – a total of 14 bids received, of which 4 bids were eliminated during the compliance check and 3 bids failed to meet quality threshold. Remaining 7 bids were fully assessed and their quality and price scores are as follows:

Bidder	Quality Scores (out of 400 points)	Price Scores (out of 600 points)	Total Scores (out of 1000 points)	Raking
Provider A	348	546	894	1
Provider B	290	600	890	2
Provider C	322	556	878	3

Bidder	Quality Scores (out of 400 points)	Price Scores (out of 600 points)	Total Scores (out of 1000 points)	Raking
Provider D	306	549	855	4
Provider E	272	571	843	5
Provider F	254	571	825	6
Provider G	236	571	807	7

We propose to award the Service Agreement to top ranked Provider for Bundle C1.

- 2.2. **Bundle C2** – a total of 13 bids received, of which 4 bids were eliminated during the compliance check and 3 bids failed to meet quality threshold. Remaining 6 bids were assessed and their quality and price scores are as follow:

Bidder	Quality Scores (out of 400 points)	Price Scores (out of 600 points)	Total Scores (out of 1000 points)	Raking
Provider A	290	600	890	1
Provider B	348	537	885	2
Provider C	272	567	839	3
Provider D	254	584	838	4
Provider E	254	552	806	5
Provider F	236	567	803	6

We propose to award the Service Agreement to top ranked provider for Bundle C2.

- 2.3. **Bundle C3** – a total of 15 bids received, of which 5 bids were eliminated during the compliance check and 3 bids failed to meet quality threshold. Remaining 6 bids were assessed and their quality and price scores are as follow:

Bidder	Quality Scores (out of 400 points)	Price Scores (out of 600 points)	Total Scores (out of 1000 points)	Raking
Provider A	290	600	890	1
Provider B	348	541	889	2
Provider C	322	556	878	3
Provider D	272	517	843	4
Provider E	254	517	825	5
Provider F	236	517	807	6

We propose to award the Service Agreement to 3rd ranked Provider for Bundle C3 (please see paragraph 6.26 of the main report).

- 2.4. **Bundle C4** – a total of 11 bids received, of which 5 bids were eliminated during the compliance check and 1 bids failed to meet quality threshold. Remaining 5 bids were assessed and their quality and price scores are as follow:

Bidder	Quality Scores (out of 400 points)	Price Scores (out of 600 points)	Total Scores (out of 1000 points)	Raking
Provider A	340	600	940	1
Provider B	348	574	922	2
Provider C	306	574	880	3
Provider D	272	597	869	4
Provider E	254	597	851	5

We propose to award the Service Agreement to top ranked provider for Bundle C4.

3. West Haringey

- 3.1. **Bundle W1** – a total of 13 bids received, of which 4 bids were eliminated during the compliance check and 2 bids failed to meet quality threshold. Remaining 7 bids were assessed and their quality and price scores are as follow:

Bidder	Quality Scores (out of 400 points)	Price Scores (out of 600 points)	Total Scores (out of 1000 points)	Raking
Provider A	322	600	922	1
Provider B	316	582	902	2
Provider C	348	551	899	3
Provider D	272	582	854	4
Provider E	254	599	853	5
Provider F	244	586	830	6
Provider G	242	569	811	7

We propose to award the Service Agreement to top ranked Provider for Bundle W1.

- 3.2. **Bundle W2** – a total of 9 bids received, of which 2 bids were eliminated during the compliance check and 1 bid failed to meet quality threshold. Remaining 6 bids were assessed and their quality and price scores are as follow:

Bidder	Quality Scores (out of 400 points)	Price Scores (out of 600 points)	Total Scores (out of 1000 points)	Raking
Provider A	348	554	902	1
Provider B	322	567	889	2
Provider C	272	583	855	3
Provider D	254	600	854	4

Bidder	Quality Scores (out of 400 points)	Price Scores (out of 600 points)	Total Scores (out of 1000 points)	Raking
Provider E	244	583	827	5
Provider F	254	567	821	6

We propose to award the Service Agreement to 3rd ranked Provider for Bundle W2 (please see paragraph 6.26 of the main report).