Report to: **Hub**

Date: **14th July 2015**

Title: Leisure Service Procurement

Portfolio Area: Customer First

Wards Affected: All

Relevant Scrutiny Committee: Overview and Scrutiny (External)

Committee

(Note. the Committee has requested an update on this matter at its

meeting on 7 July 2015)

Urgent Decision: N Approval and Y

clearance obtained:

Author: Ross Kennerley Role: Lead Specialist - Place &

Chris Brook Strategy

Lead Specialist - Assets

Contact: 01803 861379 | Ross.Kennerley@swdevon.gov.uk

01803 861170 | Chris.brook@swdevon.gov.uk

Recommendation:

1. To approve the award criteria for the joint leisure service procurement project for West Devon Borough Council and South Hams District Council as set out in paragraph 3.

1. Executive summary

The Council has been working on a strategic leisure review for the past 3 years and is now preparing to place a formal tender advert for the procurement of its new leisure services contract and management of its leisure centres. The current leisure contract runs to November 2016 and the Council will be seeking to appoint a new operator to provide a long term approach to its leisure services.

Members considered, and agreed, the leisure procurement process at Council in February (Minute CM 79). This set the overall parameters of the procurement and agreed to delegate details to officers in consultation with the joint Leisure Member Board and relevant members. Councillors Sampson, Oxborough and Musgrave are the WDBC representatives on the board.

The agreed timetable established an opportunity for "sign off" for any key residual matters in July. Following intervening work with stakeholders, consultants and the joint board it is considered that the matter of the award criteria to be applied during the evaluation of bids is a matter requiring further member approval. This is a brief report to highlight the award criteria which will be set out in the tender documents. Members are asked to consider and agree the award criteria.

2. Background

The report to Council earlier in the year set out the background and context to the strategic leisure review and procurement project. Approval was granted for the outcome of the project to be brought back to Council following the tender evaluation but allowed for any key issues to be brought back to Members for sign off in July. Other details of the procurement and evaluation are delegated to Officers in consultation with the Leader, Portfolio Holder, Board Members and relevant Ward members.

To ensure clarity and greater awareness of the process for appointing a new leisure service operator, the contract award criteria are seen as a key issue warranting member consideration.

The Council is using a competitive dialogue procedure under the Public Contracts Regulations and are using Sport England procurement information for guidance.

3. Outcomes/outputs

The Council is seeking to achieve a new leisure management contract for the delivery of the provision of Services, to include investment in, operation and management of the Facilities as set out in the tender documents.

The intention to let a contract across both Councils to a single contractor for a minimum of 20 years and a maximum of 25 years.

The purpose of the evaluation process will be to;

- Check bidders understanding of the tender requirements
- Determine areas of risk and exposure
- Review bids for alternative approaches and solutions
- Establish value for money proposals
- Select bidders for the final tender stage 'Invitation to Submit Final Tenders (ISFS)'.
- Identify areas for further dialogue

Tenders will be evaluated against the award criteria set out below;

Level 1 Criteria	%	Level 2 Sub Criteria	Level 3 Sub Criteria
Services	40%	Outcomes Quality/Customer Care Operational Delivery	Specific areas, such as Sports Development, Health and Wellbeing, Staffing, Health & Safety
Technical	10%	Development/ Design Planning Risk Maintenance	Design and maintenance proposals
Commercial	50%	Usage, Expenditure & Revenue Affordability Contract Acceptance Capital Costs Delivery & Risk	Deliverability of financials, financial, risk

An Evaluation Scoring Model will be used to assess the various Tiers indicated above with overall weightings and with specific areas being linked to method statements and tender submissions.

Evaluation scoring will use the following 1-10 scale;

Score	Rating	Criteria for Awarding Score	
0	Unacceptable	Does not meet any of the Council's requirements.	
1-2	Very Weak	Insufficient information provided / unsatisfactory.	
3-4	Poor	Fails to meet the minimum standard, some major concerns	
5-6	Acceptable	Satisfactorily achieves the minimum standard, acceptable, no major concerns	
7-8 Very Good		Exceeds the requirements, good, full and robust response, gives confidence and will bring added value/benefit to the Council	
9-10 Excellent		Considerably exceeds requirements, outstanding, and will bring significant added value/benefit to the Council, shows innovation and the Council has full confidence in response.	

Affordability will be based purely on a final submission and weightings used will be the same throughout the tender process.

The Evaluation Model (including detailed criteria and weightings) will be applied to determine the most economically advantageous tender.

An Evaluation Team shall be responsible for evaluating the Detailed Solutions and raising any clarification issues with Bidders and then making short listing recommendations.

4. Options available and consideration of risk

Council received a report in February on the various procurement options available and scope of the proposed tender contract. Additionally the consultants supporting the procurement and evaluation of the service produced a detailed *Leisure Options Review* report. This outlined service outcomes, current provision, development options, delivery and procurement options, stakeholder discussions and key recommendations for the future delivery of the service.

The work will proceed as a joint procurement exercise. A joint Memorandum of Understanding (MoU) will address the governance issues for the procurement and this will be established within the measures set out in the Collaboration Agreement dated March 2015 signed between the Councils. Both councils will need to agree and adopt the MoU for the purposes of this procurement under the umbrella of the Collaboration Agreement.

5. Proposed Way Forward

This report sets out the details around the leisure procurement award criteria as highlighted above and seeks approval for this process.

6. Implications

Implications	Relevant to proposals Y/N	Details and proposed measures to address
Legal/Governance	Y	Leisure services are a discretionary service. The procurement process will involve due diligence and governance throughout the tender period. Procurement will be undertaken in accordance with Public Contracts Regulations 2015 and the Lead Councils contract procedure rules

Financial	Y	The Evaluation Model will be applied to assess and determine the most economically advantageous tender.		
Risk	У	The Evaluation Process will identify areas of risk and exposure and how these can be assessed and managed.		
Comprehensive Impact Assessment Implications				
Equality and Diversity	У	None – all leisure facilities are intended to remain open. At this stage no reduction or loss of service is anticipated.		
Safeguarding	У	None - future operators will be required to have comprehensive Safeguarding policies		
Community Safety, Crime and Disorder	У	Access to local affordable leisure facilities to continue.		
Health, Safety and Wellbeing Other implications	У	Access to local leisure facilities and services will maintain and improve health and wellbeing None identified		

Supporting Information

Background Papers:

[under provisions of the Local Government Act 1972]

Council Report – Leisure Services Procurement, 17th February 2015

Approval and clearance of report

Process checklist	Completed
Portfolio Holder briefed	Yes
SLT Rep briefed	Yes
Relevant Exec Director sign off (draft)	Yes
Data protection issues considered	Yes
If exempt information, public (part 1) report	No
also drafted. (Committee/Scrutiny)	