




**Haringey** Council

Report for:	Cabinet	Item Number:	
-------------	---------	--------------	--

Title:	Security Guarding Services: Award of Contract
--------	---

Report Authorised by:	 Kevin Bartle, Assistant Director - Finance
-----------------------	---

Lead Officer:	Richard Le Donne, Central Procurement Unit
---------------	--

Ward(s) affected: N/A	Report for Key/Non Key Decisions: Key Decision
-----------------------	---

### 1. Describe the issue under consideration

- 1.1 This report seeks approval from Cabinet to enter into a contract for the provision of Security Guarding Services for a period of up to 4 years.

### 2. Cabinet Member introduction

- 2.1 The contract for Security Guarding Services will ensure the Council is able to maintain safety and security in and around the Council's properties, including other areas of the Borough as necessary that are utilised by members of the public for which the Council has a responsibility.
- 2.2 The procurement outcomes confirm that contracted staff employed to provide Security Guarding Services for the Council will be paid the London Living Wage.

### 3. Recommendations

- 3.1 That Cabinet agree to the award of contract for the provision of Security Guarding Services for 2 years with the option to extend for up to a further 2 years with an estimated total maximum value of £1.4m.



#### **4. Alternative options considered**

- 4.1 An existing public sector framework agreement was identified that was accessible to the Council but which contained companies that were based outside of London and that did not have strong presence in North London. This would have presented difficulties in being able to resource ad-hoc work required at short notice.
- 4.2 The option of procuring a multiple-supplier framework agreement was also considered. However, by appointing multiple suppliers and given the annual value to be circa £350k maximum, the potential for economies of scale through the aggregation of work would have reduced.
- 4.3 It was therefore decided to procure a single supplier arrangement using CompeteFor to advertise the opportunity.

#### **5. Background information**

- 5.1 The Council currently operates contracts, procured via the previous framework agreement for Security Guarding Services but which is due to expire. Work is a mixture of full-time appointments and ad-hoc, short term work. Most work involves static guarding, with some mobile requirements for dog-handling and personnel security (e.g. for the Enforcement team).
- 5.2 A tender process was undertaken by the Central Procurement Unit with the opportunity being advertised through CompeteFor.
- 5.3 As security guarding is categorised as a non-priority service under the Public Contract Regulations 2006, an EU procurement (OJEU) exercise was not applicable in this instance.
- 5.4 The tender process comprised of two elements: Company Questionnaire and Tender Evaluation. Respondents that satisfied the Company Questionnaire requirements had their Tender Bids evaluated and assessed on 40% Quality and 60% Price.
- 5.5 Price evaluation was based on indicative examples of work, and used to calculate an overall bid price using the hourly rates provided by each bidder. The lowest priced bid was awarded the maximum price score of 60%, with other bids weighted proportionately lower.
- 5.6 Quality evaluation was based on the responses to questions around the delivery of the contract. The bidder with the highest scoring responses was awarded the maximum quality score of 40%, with other bids weighted proportionately lower.



**Haringey Council**

- 5.7 Competitive bids were received from 19 companies.
- 5.8 Of the 19 bids received, 5 bidders did not satisfy the required minimum turnover and financial capacity for a £350k per annum contract and were therefore not taken forward.
- 5.9 The bids received from the remaining 14 companies were evaluated on the basis of responses to the Company Questionnaire, as well as technical capacity questions relating to their ability to undertake the contract.
- 5.10 Five companies exceeded the minimum threshold of the initial assessment and subsequently underwent a full tender evaluation.
- 5.11 The results of the tender evaluation are shown below. The bidder names are listed in Part B (exempt section of this report) along with the recommendation to award the contract to bidder A

Company	Price	Quality	Total	Rank
A	60.00%	33.58%	93.58%	1
B	59.59%	31.60%	91.19%	2
C	48.83%	40.00%	88.83%	3
D	56.01%	26.17%	82.18%	4
E	57.93%	23.21%	81.14%	5

**6. Comments of the Chief Finance Officer and financial implications**

- 6.1 Where there is a regular requirement for Security Guarding Services, budgets exist; any one-off requirements are met from within overall existing cash limits.

**7. Head of Legal Services and legal implications**

- 7.1 The Security Guarding Service is not considered a priority service under the Public Contracts Regulations 2006 so there is no requirement to carry out a European tendering exercise.
- 7.2 Because the estimated value of the contract is over £100,000, it was necessary to follow a formal tendering process in accordance with the Council's Contract Standing Orders (CSO 9.01). Accordingly, the contract was advertised on CompeteFor and an open tender process followed.



**Haringey Council**

7.3 The contract award is a Key Decision and, as such, needs to be included in the Forward Plan. Corporate Resources Directorate (the Directorate) has confirmed that this has taken place.

7.4 The Council wishes to award the contract to “Bidder A” identified in the exempt part of the report. Because of the value of the contract, the award must be approved by Cabinet in accordance with CSO 9.07.1 (d).

7.5 Further comments from the Head of Legal Services are contained in the exempt part of the report.

## **8. Equalities and Community Cohesion Comments**

8.1 Equalities policies were assessed as part of the procurement exercise. All bidders were asked to submit their Equalities policies, to ensure that they meet Council requirements in demonstrating a commitment to Equal Opportunities and provision of the Equality Act 2012.

## **9. Head of Procurement Comments**

9.1 The exercise of using CompeteFor coupled with the number of bids received demonstrates a transparent and competitive process.

9.2 Usage of man-guarding security has decreased in recent years and will likely reduce further as the Council rationalises its assets and employs alternative means of security e.g. electronic cameras, alarms and systems.

9.3 The outcomes of this tender process provides Value for Money for the Council

## **10. Policy Implication**

10.1 None.

## **11. Reasons for Decision**

11.1 To award a contract for the provision of Security Guarding Services.

## **12. Use of Appendices**

12.1 Part B – Exempt Information



**Haringey** Council

### **13. Local Government (Access to Information) Act 1985**

13.1 This report contains exempt and non-exempt information. Exempt information is contained in Part B and is not for publication. The information is exempt under the following category (identified in the amended Schedule 12A of the Local Government Act 1972):

- Information relating to the financial or business affairs of any particular person (including the authority holding that information) (Ground 3).

