

**MINUTES OF THE EXECUTIVE PROCUREMENT COMMITTEE  
TUESDAY, 31 JANUARY 2006**

Councillors Milner (Chair), \*Adje, \*Diakides and \*Hillman.

\*Present

Also Present: Councillor Meehan

<b>MINUTE NO.</b>	<b>SUBJECT/DECISION</b>	<b>ACTON BY</b>
<b>PROC66.</b>	<p><b>APOLOGY FOR ABSENCE</b></p> <p>An apology for absence was submitted by Councillors Milner for whom Councillor Meehan substituted. In the absence of Councillor Milner, Councillor Diakides took the Chair. An apology for lateness was submitted on behalf of Councillor Adje.</p>	
<b>PROC67.</b>	<p><b>DECLARATIONS OF INTEREST</b></p> <p>Councillor Meehan declared an interest in agenda items 9 – 12 Framework Agreement for Construction Works and the exempt information which related to those items and appeared as agenda items 17-20 (see Minutes PROC 72 – 75 below).</p>	HMS
<b>PROC68.</b>	<p><b>MINUTES</b></p> <p><b>RESOLVED:</b></p> <p>That the minutes of the meetings held on 20 December 2005 and 3 January 2006 be approved and signed.</p>	HMS
<b>PROC69.</b>	<p><b>CARERS CENTRE: REQUEST FOR WAIVER OF REQUIREMENT TO TENDER</b></p> <p>(Report of the Director of Social Services – Agenda Item 6):</p> <p><b>RESOLVED:</b></p> <p>That, in accordance with Contract Standing Order 7.2, approval be granted to a waiver of Contract Standing Order 6.4 (Requirement to Tender) in connection with the provision of services to carers by the Haringey Carers Centre.</p>	DSS
<b>PROC70.</b>	<p><b>SEVEN SISTERS SHOP FRONT RENEWALS: AWARD OF CONTRACT</b></p> <p>(Report of the Director of Environmental Services – Agenda Item 7):</p> <p>Details of the tenders received which were set out in Appendices A and B to the interleaved report were the subject of a motion to exclude the press and public from the meeting as they contained exempt information relating to terms proposed or to be proposed by or to the authority in the</p>	

**MINUTES OF THE EXECUTIVE PROCUREMENT COMMITTEE  
TUESDAY, 31 JANUARY 2006**

	<p>course of negotiations for a contract for the acquisition or disposal of property or the supply of goods and services.</p> <p>We noted that the price of the tender recommended for acceptance was more than £50,000 greater than the project budget and that there was no indication of the source of additional funding or comments from the Director of Finance. Arising from our consideration of paragraph 13.4 of the report we also noted that the pre-tender estimate for the works had been significantly lower than the tender submissions received from contractors and we asked that the Head of Procurement seek clarification of this point from the cost consultants.</p> <p>In response to a question about rules governing the use of sub-contractors for schemes of this nature, we were informed that a paper had been produced for consideration initially by the Chief Executive's Management Board (CEMB) which recommended a number of improvements to sub-contracting arrangements. Following consideration by the CEMB a report would be brought forward to the Executive and in the meantime a note of clarification be circulated to Members of our Committee.</p> <p><b>RESOLVED:</b></p> <p style="padding-left: 40px;">That consideration of the report be adjourned until after the special meeting of the Committee on 2 February to enable clarification of the financial implications of the proposals to be provided.</p>	<p>HPr</p> <p>HPr</p> <p>DEnv HPr HMS</p>
<p><b>PROC71.</b></p>	<p><b>SUPPLY, INSTALLATION AND MAINTENANCE OF CCTV CONTROL ROOM AND CAMERAS – AWARD OF CONTRACTS</b></p> <p>(Report of the Director of Environmental Services – Agenda Item 8):</p> <p>Our Chair agreed to accept the report as urgent business. The report was late because of the need to complete necessary consultations. The report was too urgent to await the next meeting because stakeholders had been advised that the report would be considered at this meeting and it also appeared in the Forward Plan for this date.</p> <p>Details of the tenders received and of the tender evaluations which were set out in the Appendix to the interleaved report were the subject of a motion to exclude the press and public from the meeting as they contained exempt information relating to terms proposed or to be proposed by or to the authority in the course of negotiations for a contract for the acquisition or disposal of property or the supply of goods and services.</p> <p><b>RESOLVED:</b></p> <p>1. That, in accordance with Contract Standing Order 11, approval be granted to the award of the contract for the design, supply and installation of the CCTV control room for £305,463.09 and</p>	<p>DEnv</p>

**MINUTES OF THE EXECUTIVE PROCUREMENT COMMITTEE  
TUESDAY, 31 JANUARY 2006**

	<p>£483,150 for maintenance to Siemens Security Systems.</p> <p>2. That the contracts with the fibre transmission suppliers be varied to allow the relocation of circuits from the existing to the new control room for the prices of £100,000 for British Telecom and £25,000 for Telewest.</p> <p>3. That the contract be awarded for a period of five years with an option to extend for a further period of 12 months.</p>	<p>DEnv</p> <p>DEnv</p>
<p><b>PROC72.</b></p>	<p><b>FRAMEWORK AGREEMENT FOR MINOR CONSTRUCTION WORKS - VALUE UP TO £100,000</b></p> <p>(Report of the Director of Finance – Agenda Item 9):</p> <p>Details of the evaluation criteria which were set out in Appendices A-E to the interleaved report were the subject of a motion to exclude the press and public from the meeting as they contained exempt information relating to terms proposed or to be proposed to the authority in the course of negotiations for a contract for the acquisition or disposal of property or the supply of goods and services.</p> <p>Councillor Meehan declared an interest in this item by virtue of being related to the owner of one of the companies which had submitted a tender.</p> <p>In response to a question about rules governing the use of sub-contractors for schemes of this nature, we were informed that a paper had been produced for consideration initially by the Chief Executive’s Management Board (CEMB) which recommended a number of improvements to sub-contracting arrangements. Following consideration by the CEMB a report would be brought forward to the Executive and in the meantime a note of clarification be circulated to Members of our Committee.</p> <p>We noted that the framework would provide a contractual mechanism for all Council Directorates to select Works Contractors without the need to undergo further competition for every construction project, unless a mini-competition was thought appropriate. We also noted that the appointment of companies under this arrangement did not constitute a binding commitment to award, or agreement to carry out work by either party. However, before proceeding to agree the recommendations we wished them to be the subject of wider consultation with other Members of the Executive.</p> <p><b>RESOLVED:</b></p> <p>That consideration of the report be adjourned until after the special meeting of the Committee on 2 February to enable the comments of other Members of the Executive to be obtained.</p>	<p>HMS</p> <p>HPr</p> <p>HPr HMS</p>

**MINUTES OF THE EXECUTIVE PROCUREMENT COMMITTEE  
TUESDAY, 31 JANUARY 2006**

<p><b>PROC73.</b></p>	<p><b>FRAMEWORK AGREEMENT FOR MAJOR CONSTRUCTION WORKS - VALUE £100,000 - £249,999</b></p> <p>(Report of the Director of Finance – Agenda Item 10):</p> <p>Details of the evaluation criteria which were set out in Appendices A and B to the interleaved report were the subject of a motion to exclude the press and public from the meeting as they contained exempt information relating to terms proposed or to be proposed to the authority in the course of negotiations for a contract for the acquisition or disposal of property or the supply of goods and services.</p> <p>Councillor Meehan declared an interest in this item by virtue of being related to the owner of one of the companies which had submitted a tender.</p> <p>In response to a question about rules governing the use of sub-contractors for schemes of this nature, we were informed that a paper had been produced for consideration initially by the Chief Executive’s Management Board (CEMB) which recommended a number of improvements to sub-contracting arrangements. Following consideration by the CEMB a report would be brought forward to the Executive and in the meantime a note of clarification be circulated to Members of our Committee.</p> <p>We noted that the framework would provide a contractual mechanism for all Council Directorates to select Works Contractors without the need to undergo further competition for every construction project, unless a mini-competition was thought appropriate. We also noted that the appointment of companies under this arrangement did not constitute a binding commitment to award, or agreement to carry out work by either party. However, before proceeding to agree the recommendations we wished them to be the subject of wider consultation with other Members of the Executive.</p> <p><b>RESOLVED:</b></p> <p style="padding-left: 40px;">That consideration of the report be adjourned until after the special meeting of the Committee on 2 February to enable the comments of other Members of the Executive to be obtained.</p>	<p>HMS</p> <p>HPr</p> <p>HPr HMS</p>
<p><b>PROC74.</b></p>	<p><b>FRAMEWORK AGREEMENT FOR MAJOR CONSTRUCTION WORKS - VALUE £250,000- £999,999</b></p> <p>(Report of the Director of Finance – Agenda Item 11):</p> <p>Details of the evaluation criteria which were set out in Appendices A and B to the interleaved report were the subject of a motion to exclude the press and public from the meeting as they contained exempt information relating to terms proposed or to be proposed to the authority in the course of negotiations for a contract for the acquisition or disposal of property or the supply of goods and services.</p>	

**MINUTES OF THE EXECUTIVE PROCUREMENT COMMITTEE  
TUESDAY, 31 JANUARY 2006**

	<p>Councillor Meehan declared an interest in this item by virtue of being related to the owner of one of the companies which had submitted a tender.</p> <p>In response to a question about rules governing the use of sub-contractors for schemes of this nature, we were informed that a paper had been produced for consideration initially by the Chief Executive's Management Board (CEMB) which recommended a number of improvements to sub-contracting arrangements. Following consideration by the CEMB a report would be brought forward to the Executive and in the meantime a note of clarification be circulated to Members of our Committee.</p> <p>We noted that the framework would provide a contractual mechanism for all Council Directorates to select Works Contractors without the need to undergo further competition for every construction project, unless a mini-competition was thought appropriate. We also noted that the appointment of companies under this arrangement did not constitute a binding commitment to award, or agreement to carry out work by either party. However, before proceeding to agree the recommendations we wished them to be the subject of wider consultation with other Members of the Executive.</p> <p><b>RESOLVED:</b></p> <p style="padding-left: 40px;">That consideration of the report be adjourned until after the special meeting of the Committee on 2 February to enable the comments of other Members of the Executive to be obtained.</p>	<p>HMS</p> <p>HPr</p> <p>HPr HMS</p>
<p><b>PROC75.</b></p>	<p><b>FRAMEWORK AGREEMENT FOR MAJOR CONSTRUCTION WORKS £1,000,000 - £3,799,99</b></p> <p>(Report of the Director of Finance – Agenda Item 12):</p> <p>Details of the evaluation criteria which were set out in Appendices A and B to the interleaved report were the subject of a motion to exclude the press and public from the meeting as they contained exempt information relating to terms proposed or to be proposed to the authority in the course of negotiations for a contract for the acquisition or disposal of property or the supply of goods and services.</p> <p>Councillor Meehan declared an interest in this item by virtue of being related to the owner of one of the companies which had submitted a tender.</p> <p>In response to a question about rules governing the use of sub-contractors for schemes of this nature, we were informed that a paper had been produced for consideration initially by the Chief Executive's Management Board (CEMB) which recommended a number of improvements to sub-contracting arrangements. Following consideration by the CEMB a report would be brought forward to the Executive and in</p>	<p>HMS</p>

