

Appendix 1: Competitive Tendering Process

1. An invitation to tender was published on the 16 August and providers were given 42 days to complete and submit their tender for the following lots.

LOT	DESCRIPTION
Lot 1 a	Children aged from 0 – 4 years
Lot 1 b	Children aged from 5 – 10 years
Lot 1 c	Children aged 11+ years
Lot 2	Children with Disabilities
Lot 3	Parent and Child Placements
Lot 4	Alternative to Residential Placements

2. **Stage 1** of the evaluation consisted of fifteen pass/fail questions applied to all four lots.
3. After some clarifications were issued, all questions were passed successfully by all bidders with the exception of the question around economic and financial capacity.
4. **At Stage 2**, Lot 1-3 bidders were evaluated 100% on price and ranked in price order.
5. Offices with an Ofsted outcome of Good or above were placed on Tiers 1 and 2 in price order.
6. Offices with an Ofsted outcome of Requires Improvement were placed on Tier 3 in price order. This was to reflect the demand and differences in placement criteria for the participating authorities. The general practice within Surrey is to make placements with providers with an OFSTED rating of good or above.
7. The tables at Annex 1 in Part 2 of this report list the successful providers in ranked order for each of the separate Lots.
8. Lot 4, Alternative to Residential placements, Evaluation - The Quality/Cost ratio was set at 40% Price / 60% Quality.
9. The 40% Price score was based on price submissions for the 'Stabilisation' phase of the placement which made up the largest element of an anticipated two year placement.
10. The 60% Quality score was based on four method statement questions which explored the following areas:
 - A. How providers would mobilise to deliver this service.
 - B. The underlying therapeutic approach adopted, risk management and placement stability.
 - C. How each 'stage' of the placement described in the Specification would be delivered.
 - D. Training, skills and experience of the workforce.

Scoring was conducted by four members of the Project Board. All submissions were scored individually to start with then moderated at a panel meeting.

This page is intentionally left blank