



## Re: Tender Submission For Provision of a Children's Residential and Accommodation Framework Lot 2 (D, E & F)

Dear 

Thank you for participating in the tender procedure for the above project. Southend-on-Sea City Council has now concluded the evaluation of all the tenders it received and is pleased to inform you that you have been successfully awarded a place on **Lot 2 D, E & F (for those 18+ only) of the Children's Residential and Accommodation Framework**. Please note the award of contract is still subject to the following:

- satisfactory conclusion of the mandatory standstill period
- compliance checks

With regards to the compliance checks, you will be required to provide the following documentation prior to contract commencement:

1. A copy of your insurance certificates (public liability, employer's liability and Professional Indemnity) to the levels required.
2. A copy of your Health & Safety policy.
3. A copy of your Business Continuity Plan.
4. A copy of your Safeguarding Policy.
5. A copy of your Data Protection Policy.

Southend-on-Sea City Council will now observe a mandatory standstill period before consideration of the above and subsequent contract award. Details of the results of the evaluation process for this tender are shown below.

AWARD DETAILS	
Name of the Preferred Bidders (Lot 2 D)	
Name of the Preferred Bidders (Lot 2 E)	
Name of the Preferred Bidders (Lot 2 F)	
Name of Contract	Children's Residential and Accommodation Framework
Contract Duration	01 May 2025 – 30 April 2028 (3 years) Option to extend 2 years.
Date Mandatory Standstill Period Ends	Midnight 28 <sup>th</sup> July 2025.

The evaluation criteria were **20.00% Price** and **80.00% Quality**.

Whilst your total quality score (**48%**) remained the same, your commercial score differed for each lot. Your total score against each lot is as follows:

Lot:	Quality Score:	Price Score:	Total Score:
2D	48%	8%	56%
2E	48%	8.86%	56.86%
2F	48%	7.51%	55.51%

The reasons for the decision, including the characteristics and relative advantages of your technical submission, were as follows:

Q1: Safeguarding	
Technical Question 1	<p><b>Strengths:</b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Detailed multi-agency working (point 3 of the question criteria).</li> <li>Demonstrated good practice by describing the child's involvement in developing their own plans which highlights a person-centred approach.</li> <li>Discussed accessible policies for children and staff.</li> </ul> <p><b>Areas for improvement (and/or a higher score could have been achieved):</b></p>

	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• The example provided related to an adult with learning disabilities but the application to a young person was not clear, this is important given that the framework relates to children.</li> <li>• The example lacked detail on follow-up and lessons learnt (point 5 of the question criteria).</li> <li>• Whilst the 4R model was broadly outlined the application of the model to the example was missing. To demonstrate, Choices Healthcare did not address consent within the response and how this applies in practice.</li> <li>• Whilst legislation was included not all of this was up to date.</li> </ul>
<b>Q2: Data Protection</b>	
Technical Question 2	<p><b>Strengths:</b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• A detailed response.</li> <li>• Referenced breach escalation process, investigation, staff training, records management and transfer of records.</li> <li>• ICO registered.</li> <li>• DP lead identified and named persons.</li> </ul> <p><b>Areas for improvement (and/or a higher score could have been achieved):</b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• DP policy referenced old DP Act 1998 which was superseded by DP Act 2018 which raises some concerns about the review of the policies and the quality assurances.</li> <li>• Aimed at internal employees but must focus on impact to clients too.</li> <li>• More of an internal document as opposed to an organisational document for external use as well.</li> <li>• Limited information regarding data subject rights.</li> <li>• Limited information around technical and operational / organisational security (example - tech - platform ISO27001 compliance framework, pen tests, firewalls, MFA - Operational - clear desk policy/paper records locked cupboards / staff ID badge / fobs/codes).</li> </ul>
<b>Q3: Social Value</b>	
Technical Question 3	<p><b>Strengths:</b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• A clear, well written response with demonstrable experience included such as case studies.</li> <li>• Strong focus on employment (care leavers, retaining staff, employing local people).</li> <li>• Explored how social value would be tracked &amp; monitored (e.g. via tangible metrics and progress reports on a quarterly basis) as per point 3 of the question criteria.</li> <li>• Very good detail was also provided regarding how Choices will support environmental sustainability.</li> </ul> <p><b>Areas for Improvement (and/or a higher score could have been achieved):</b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Whilst the examples regarding other LA's were interesting and promising, further focus was required regarding Southend. The response lacked focus on this specific contract/area and the actions that Choices will take in Southend. Further application of previous experience was needed to show how previous work will translate to SV delivery in Southend.</li> </ul>
<b>Q8: Crisis Intervention and Risk Management</b>	
Technical Question 8	<p><b>Strengths:</b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• De-escalation tactics were strong.</li> <li>• Outlined strong resources such as a mood tracker and crisis coping cards.</li> <li>• Incorporated learning, highlighting the development of the services</li> </ul>

	<p><b>Areas for Improvement (and/or a higher score could have been achieved):</b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• More information required on legislation, did not consider all.</li> <li>• Outlined that Choices host a multi-agency case strategy meeting within 72 hrs, however this was considered a long timescale for a critical incident.</li> <li>• Some responses were unclear and required more detail. For example, risk management pre-admission was listed but required more detail around the process.</li> <li>• Outlined that risk management plans are created within 7 days however it was unclear how Choices respond immediately (e.g. what happens if an incident occurred before the risk management plan was completed).</li> <li>• Whilst many small examples were provided, further detail was required for each and therefore a single, more detailed example could have been utilised.</li> <li>•</li> </ul>
<p><b>Q9: Monitoring outcomes and Evaluation</b></p>	
<p>Technical Question 9</p>	<p><b>Strengths:</b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• A well written and comprehensive response which addressed the question criteria in full.</li> <li>• Contained multiple examples (point 1 of the question criteria) working across different areas which provided assurance.</li> <li>• Referenced key legislation &amp; addressed partnership working with social care and external agencies, demonstrating best practice (point 2 of the question criteria).</li> <li>• Explored the use of systems/performance dashboard &amp; the importance of feedback &amp; coproduction, addressing point 3 of the question criteria.</li> <li>• Described service user led planning sessions.</li> </ul> <p><b>Areas for Improvement (and/or a higher score could have been achieved):</b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>•</li> </ul>
<p><b>Q10: Engagement and Participation</b></p>	
<p>Technical Question 10</p>	<p><b>Strengths:</b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Contained relevant examples throughout (point 1 of the question criteria).</li> <li>• Explored how the needs of different individuals can be met which demonstrates knowledge &amp; experience.</li> <li>• Explored methods of engagement as per the question criteria.</li> </ul> <p><b>Areas for Improvement (and/or a higher score could have been achieved):</b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Whilst legislation was referenced it would have been useful to explore its impact &amp; how this influences the services offered.</li> <li>• Whilst multi-agency working was referenced, further detail was required regarding how Choices intend to engage with &amp; use agencies.</li> <li>• Used the terminology 'key friends' which raised questions re the boundaries of the relationship.</li> <li>•</li> </ul>
<p><b>Q11: Transition Support and Community Integration</b></p>	
<p>Technical Question 11</p>	<p><b>Strengths:</b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• A strong response that evidenced knowledge and experience of the transition process, placing the YP at the centre.</li> <li>• Outlined that transition is co-designed and tailored.</li> <li>• Use of visual timelines and goals was strong.</li> <li>• Referenced legislation.</li> <li>• Example provided was strong and person-centred.</li> <li>• Lessons learned were evidenced.</li> </ul>

	<p><b>Areas for Improvement (and/or a higher score could have been achieved):</b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Lacked detail around cultural diversities.</li> <li></li> </ul>
Q12: Holistic Support Services and Individualised Support Plans	
Technical Question 12:	<p><b>Strengths:</b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>ISP process was strong , referenced additional needs and how the YP is involved in the development of their plan</li> <li>completes a holistic needs and risk assessment within 48 hours of approval</li> <li>Draft support plan within 5 working days and co-designed with the YP.</li> <li></li> </ul> <p><b>Areas for Improvement (and/or a higher score could have been achieved):</b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Examples provided were predominantly for over 18s, different context for under 18's needed re-focussing in relation to supported accommodation and the criteria required within this service.</li> <li>Key legislation was missed, and an act was referenced that wasn't necessarily relevant to this question.</li> <li>Further detail required regarding how plans align with other services.</li> <li>Further detail required regarding holistic aspect.</li> <li>Lack of reference to multi-agency working.</li> <li>Used the terminology 'key friends' which raised questions re the boundaries of the relationship.</li> </ul>

Breakdown of scores

The scores awarded by the evaluation panel to your proposal are set out below:

Criteria	Question Weighting	Your Score	Maximum Obtainable Score	Your Total Weighted Score
Safeguarding	10.00%		5.00	
Data Protection	10.00%		5.00	
Social Value	10.00%		5.00	
Crisis Intervention and Risk Management	10.00%		5.00	
Monitoring outcomes and Evaluation	10.00%		5.00	
Engagement and Participation	10.00%		5.00	
Transition Support and Community Integration	10.00%		5.00	
Holistic Support Services and Individualised Support Plans	10.00%		5.00	
<b>Technical Questionnaire Score (out of 80%)</b>				

Please refer to Addendum 2 (Lot 2 Ranking) which outlines the scores and rank for each successful bidder for the lots in which you bid for. This also outlines your commercial score for each lot you bid for.

We look forward to working with you on this procurement.

Yours sincerely

