

Officer Decision Record – Executive Decision

If Key Decision: Decision Ref. No.

B053/21

OFFICER DECISION RECORD ⁱ

Officer Key Decisions are subject to the Council's Call-In Procedure (Annex 9 of the Council's Constitution <https://www.hertfordshire.gov.uk/about-the-council/freedom-of-information-and-council-data/open-data-statistics-about-hertfordshire/who-we-are-and-what-we-do/who-we-are-and-what-we-do.aspx>)

Subject: Contract Award for the delivery of the Hertfordshire Autism Community Support Service

Type of Decision: Executive

Key Decision: Yes

Executive Member: Mark Harvey

Portfolio: Adult Care Services

Officer Contact: Tara Mullaney

Tel: 07910 211 998

1. **Decision**

1.1 To award the contract for the delivery of the Hertfordshire Autism Community Support Service.

1.2 The identity of the successful bidder and the value of the contract awarded to them is included in Annex A which will be uploaded following the expiry of the conclusion of the call in period/call in process.

2. **Reasons for the decision**

2.1 Commissioners are confident that in awarding this contract, the new service will contribute to the County Council's commitment to helping people on the autism spectrum and ensuring they receive the right support to enable them to live happy, healthy and independent lives within their communities.

April 2020

- 2.2 The Provider being recommended for award represents the most economically advantageous tender, offering both a high-quality bid and value for money.
- 2.3 Award recommendations are based on the outcome of a robust procurement exercise.
- 2.4 A steering group consisting of members from the All-Age Autism Coproduction Board including carers and adults with lived experience convened in January 2021. The purpose of the board was to develop the specification and contract monitoring arrangements for the new service. The steering group has been involved at every stage of the process including the evaluation of tenders and will continue to be involved throughout the mobilisation phase and beyond including contract monitoring and significant reviews.

Qualification envelope

- 2.5 The Qualification questions are not scored as they are predicated on compliance with aspects of legal and corporate governance that are deemed essential for an operator of a contract let by the County Council. All Qualification questions are mandatory and providers who fail any of them will be excluded from the rest of the procurement process.

Technical (Quality) envelope

- 2.6 The quality factors were weighted according to their importance, with greater percentage being based on meeting the specification and service outcomes. There were 8 questions in total under the following key themes:
- Service Structure
 - Mobilisation
 - Service Pathway
 - Service Delivery
 - Data recording and reporting
 - Partnership Working
 - Service user involvement and coproduction
 - Supporting Carers

Commercial envelope

- 2.7 The commercial envelope was evaluated on the following criteria:
- Percentage deviation from the Council's allocated funding
 - Any Price higher than the Council's funding will not have a calculated deviation but be allocated 0 points, and any that deviate 5% or more, below this Price ceiling will be allocated 10 points

Quality Evaluation

April 2020

- 2.8 The evaluation panel consisted of commissioners, people with lived experience and carers of adults with autism.
- 2.9 As well as meeting the core components of the service specification, the winning provider has committed to delivering significant added value to the contract.
- 2.10 The winning provider submitted a robust mobilisation plan as part of their bid which reflected their experience in mobilising contracts of a similar nature. The detailed plan outlined tasks, risks and mitigations. This plan will form the basis of mobilisation meetings in which commissioners will focus on key milestones. Key considerations identified within the mobilisation plan include communication to professionals and events for stakeholders.
- 2.11 Overall, the evaluation panel felt that the tender submission evidenced a wide range of relevant experience of managing services for adults with autism. The submission provided clear evidence of promoting good integrated working including a strong ethos of partnership working and linking with a range of partners from health and social care.

Equality Implications

- 2.12 An initial Equalities Impact Assessment (EIA) was carried out by Commissioners and an Equalities Manager when the project was initiated in 2019 and has remained live during the project having been refreshed at key milestones during the process.
- 2.13 The specification outlines the requirement for the Provider to be consistent in their approach to all service users whilst taking account of the different needs of individual adults. The service will respond appropriately to the needs of adults from a variety of social, ethnic, cultural and linguistic backgrounds and with a range of intellectual, physical, emotional and social developmental needs.

3. Alternative options considered and rejected

- 3.1 The opportunity was published on In-Tend, the Council's procurement portal with set qualification, technical and commercial criteria to ensure robust assurance that the contract being awarded can deliver the Council's requirements.
- 3.2 The Provider being recommended for award represents the most economically advantageous tender, offering both a high-quality bid and value for money.

4. Consultation (see Summary of Requirements below)

Was any Councillor consulted? No

April 2020

If yes:

(a) Comments of Executive Member/Committee Chairman (*delete as applicable*)

(b) Comments of other consultees

5. Any conflict of interest declared by a councillor who has been consulted in relation to the decision

No

6. I am proceeding with the proposed decision.

Signed:

Title: Operations Director Adult Disability and Mental Health Services

Date: 14th July 2021

Copies of record to:

- All consultees
- hard & electronic copy (if required to be made available for public inspection) to Democratic Services Manager - Room 213 County Hall.ⁱⁱ

Summary of Requirements to Inform/Consult Councillors

Significance of Proposed Action	Controversial	Relevant Councillor(s) to be Consulted
Technical/Professional/ Routine	No	No need to inform or consult councillors
Technical/Professional/ Routine	Yes	Executive Functions: Consult relevant Lead Executive Member and, where appropriate, Local Councillor Non-Executive Functions: Relevant Committee Chairman and, where appropriate, Local Councillor
Local	No	Executive Functions: Inform Lead Executive Member and Local Councillor Non-Executive Functions:

		Inform Local Councillor
Local	Yes	Executive Functions: Consult Lead Executive Member and Local Councillor Non-Executive Functions: Consult Local Councillor
General or County-wide	No	Executive Functions: Consult relevant Lead Executive Member (s) Non-Executive Functions: Consult relevant Committee Chairman
General or County-wide	Yes	Executive Functions: Consult relevant Lead Executive Member (s) and the Leader of the Council Non-Executive Functions: Consult relevant Committee Chairman/Leaders all Political Groups