



Reference No: 007322

# THE POLICE & CRIME COMMISSIONER FOR CLEVELAND

## DECISION RECORD FORM

**REQUEST:** For PCC approval.

**Title:** Procurement report for the Commissioning of a Reporting Application

**Executive Summary:**

The PCC during the 2021 elections included the introduction of a reporting application as part of his manifesto.

In order to find a supplier to work with the PCC to develop an application a competitive procurement exercise was required.

A decision was made to utilise an open tender via the EU Supply Tender Portal. An open tender is a competitive exercise whereby a tender is advertised and all bidders whom express an interest can access the tender documentation and submit a bid.

An advert was placed in the European Journal and the Bluelight E-tendering system inviting suppliers to bid for the service. An open tender was carried out using EU Supply as the tender portal, advertising the contract in Contract Finder as per the Public Procurement Regulations 2015.

Details of the Procurement Process are included in the appended report.

**Decision:**

That the Police and Crime Commissioner note the procurement process used to appoint a contract for the Commissioning of a Reporting Application.

The Police and Crime Commissioner accept recommendation of the Evaluation Team to award the contract to Bidder 2.

**OPCC Lead Officer:** Denise Holian

**Contractor Details (if applicable):** Alt Labs Agency Ltd

**Implications:**

Has consideration been taken of the following:	Yes	No
Financial	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
Legal	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
Equality & Diversity	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
Human Rights	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
Sustainability	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
Risk	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>

(If yes please provide further details below)

### Decision Required – Supporting Information

Financial Implications: (Must include comments of the PCC's Chief Finance Officer where the decision has financial implications)

An estimated budget of £50,000 was allocated to this project which will be funding from within the previously set 2021/22 OPCC budget.

Bidder 2 pricing was within budget for a 3 year period, with costs of £44,000 for Development, Engagement and Integration and a further £2,000 per year for support.

Legal Implications: (Must include comments of the Monitoring Officer where the decision has legal implication)

None arising.

### Equality and Diversity Implications

Diversity and Equality Implications have been considered as part of this tender and specification development. The OPCC will work with the bidder to ensure the application meets Diversity, Equality and Inclusion matters and engagement with hard to reach areas of the community will take place.

### Human Rights Implications

There are no Human Rights Act implications arising from this report.

### Sustainability Implications

Social Value Questions and Sustainability were included within the scored area of the tender. No implications arise from this procurement.


### Risk Management Implications

There are no risks associated with this procurement.

**OFFICER APPROVAL**

**Monitoring Officer**

I have been consulted about the decision and confirm that financial, legal, and equalities advice has been taken into account. I am satisfied that this is an appropriate request to be submitted to the Police and Crime Commissioner.

Signed  Date 3/12/21

**Police and Crime Commissioner:**

The above request HAS my approval.

Signed  Date 3/12/21





## **Report of the Chief Constable to the Police and Crime Commissioner for Cleveland.**

**Status: For Decision**

### **Procurement report for the Commissioning of a Reporting Application**

#### **1 Purpose**

- 1.1 The purpose of this report is to advise the Police and Crime Commissioner of the procurement process undertaken during the recent exercise to award a contract for the Commissioning of a Reporting Application.

#### **2 Recommendations**

- 2.1 That the Police and Crime Commissioner note the procurement process used to appoint a contract for the Commissioning of a Reporting Application.
- 2.2 The Police and Crime Commissioner accept recommendation of the Evaluation Team to award the contract to Bidder 2.

#### **3 Reasons**

- 3.1 The PCC during the 2021 elections included the introduction of a reporting application as part of his manifesto.
- 3.2 In order to find a supplier to work with the PCC to develop an application a competitive procurement exercise was required.
- 3.3 A decision was made to utilise an open tender via the EU Supply Tender Portal. An open tender is a competitive exercise whereby a tender is advertised and all bidders whom express an interest can access the tender documentation and submit a bid.

- 3.4 An advert was placed in the European Journal and the Bluelight E-tendering system inviting suppliers to bid for the service. An open tender was carried out using EU Supply as the tender portal, advertising the contract in Contract Finder as per the Public Procurement Regulations 2015.
- 3.5 39 suppliers expressed an interest in the Tender, however only 9 submitted a tender response by the closing date on the 29<sup>th</sup> October 2021.
- 3.6 In addition to a number of mandatory pass/fail questions such as mandatory/discretionary exclusion/financial viability/ Insurance etc., the evaluation criterion was 60% Quality and Service Delivery and 40% Price. There was a further 20% allocated for a presentation to which the top 3 scoring bidders would be invited to.
- 3.7 The evaluation team, which consisted of key members from both Force and Office of the Police and Crime Commissioner, evaluated the bid in line with the criteria set out within the Tender document as per the table below:

Pass/Fail										
Question	Pass/Fail	B1	B2	B3	B4	B5	B6	B7	B8	B9
EU Supply Part 2	Pass/Fail	Pass	Pass	Pass	Pass	Pass	Pass	Pass	Pass	Pass
Eu Supply Part 3	Pass/Fail	Pass	Pass	Pass	Pass	Pass	Pass	Pass	Pass	Pass
Financial	Pass/Fail	Pass	Pass	Pass	Pass	Pass	Pass	Pass	Pass	Pass
Equality and Diversity	Pass/Fail	Pass	Pass	Pass	Pass	Fail	Pass	Pass	Pass	Pass
Ethical Procurement	Pass/Fail	Pass	Pass	Pass	Pass	Fail	Pass	Pass	Pass	Pass
Infosec	Pass/Fail	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
Quality										
	60%	B1	B2	B3	B4	B5	B6	B7	B8	B9
Social Value	10%	6.00%	6.00%	9.00%	4.00%	0.00%	3.00%	4.00%	3.00%	4.00%
Experience	5%	0.50%	3.50%	3.00%	3.00%	0.00%	3.00%	3.50%	2.00%	3.50%
Locality	5%	0.00%	3.00%	3.50%	3.00%	0.00%	2.00%	3.00%	3.50%	3.00%
Project Management	5%	0.50%	3.00%	3.50%	3.50%	0.00%	2.00%	2.00%	1.50%	3.00%
Engagement	5%	0.50%	2.00%	2.00%	3.50%	0.00%	2.00%	3.00%	0.50%	3.00%
Operating Platforms	5%	1.50%	3.50%	3.50%	3.50%	0.00%	0.50%	2.00%	1.50%	3.00%
Functionality	5%	0.50%	3.50%	4.50%	4.50%	0.00%	3.00%	4.50%	2.00%	3.50%
Data Analytics	5%	1.50%	3.00%	3.50%	3.50%	0.00%	3.00%	3.00%	1.50%	3.00%
Design Features	5%	0.50%	3.50%	3.50%	3.50%	0.00%	0.50%	3.00%	0.50%	3.00%
Compatibility	5%	0.50%	3.00%	4.50%	3.00%	0.00%	0.50%	1.50%	1.50%	2.00%
Quality Standards	5%	1.50%	3.00%	3.50%	3.50%	0.00%	1.50%	3.00%	2.00%	2.00%
<b>Total Quality</b>	<b>60%</b>	<b>13.50%</b>	<b>37.00%</b>	<b>44.00%</b>	<b>38.50%</b>	<b>0.00%</b>	<b>21.00%</b>	<b>32.50%</b>	<b>19.50%</b>	<b>33.00%</b>
Price										
	40%	B1	B2	B3	B4	B5	B6	B7	B8	B9
		0.00%	34.30%	8.43%	35.73%	0.00%	0.00%	9.53%	0.00%	40.00%
<b>Total Price</b>	<b>0.00%</b>	<b>0.00%</b>	<b>34.30%</b>	<b>8.43%</b>	<b>35.73%</b>	<b>0.00%</b>	<b>0.00%</b>	<b>9.53%</b>	<b>0.00%</b>	<b>40.00%</b>
Total										
	100%	B1	B2	B3	B4	B5	B6	B7	B8	B9
		13.50%	71.30%	52.43%	74.23%	0.00%	21.00%	42.03%	19.50%	73.00%
Presentation - Top 3										
	20%	B1	B2	B3	B4	B5	B6	B7	B8	B9
		0.00%	18.00%	0.00%	14.00%	0.00%	0.00%	0.00%	0.00%	14.00%
<b>Total</b>	<b>120%</b>	<b>13.50%</b>	<b>89.30%</b>	<b>52.43%</b>	<b>88.23%</b>	<b>0.00%</b>	<b>21.00%</b>	<b>42.03%</b>	<b>19.50%</b>	<b>87.00%</b>

- 3.8 Bidders 1,5, 6 and 8 scored below 30% on the quality evaluation and therefore were not taken forward to the price evaluation as per the tender criteria.
- 3.9 Bidders 2, 4 and 9 were the Top 3 scoring bidders on Price and Quality and were invited to present their solution to the evaluation Team.
- 3.10 Bidder 2 scored the highest overall once the presentation score had been added to the Price and Quality.

## **4 Implications**

### **4.1 Financial**

An estimated budget of £50,000 was allocated to this project.

Bidder 2 pricing was within budget for a 3 year period, with costs of £44,000 for Development, Engagement and Integration and a further £2,000 per year for support.

### **4.6 Diversity & Equal Opportunities**

Diversity and Equality Implications have been considered as part of this tender and specification development. The OPCC will work with the bidder to ensure the application meets Diversity, Equality and Inclusion matters and engagement with hard to reach areas of the community will take place.

### **4.7 Human Rights Act**

There are no Human Rights Act implications arising from this report.

### **4.8 Sustainability**

Social Value Questions and Sustainability were included within the scored area of the tender. No implications arise from this procurement.

### **4.9 Risk**

There are no risks associated with this procurement.

## **5 Conclusions**

- 5.1 The Evaluation Team is confident that the procurement exercise has been conducted in a fair, comprehensive, thorough and transparent process.
- 5.2 The Recommended Bidder has submitted the Most Economically Advantageous Tender and the evaluation team are confident they will be able to deliver a successful product.

Richard Lewis  
Chief Constable

Evaluation Team:

Head of Procurement and Fleet – Cleveland Police  
Commissioner's Officer for Consultation and Engagement – OPCC  
Service Improvement Inspector – Cleveland Police  
Police and Crime Commissioner – OPCC  
Mobile Specialist – Cleveland Police  
E-Cins project Manager