



Contact: Nadine Raenke
 E-mail: Nadine.Raenke@bedford.gov.uk
 Our ref: BBC AD 03786

Date: 11/07/2025

Dear 

**Intention to Award: Supported Living and Community Based Support Services Framework Agreement (Ref: BBC AD 03786)
 Find a Tender Ref: 2025/S 000-002884**

We write to inform you that the Council has now completed its evaluation of all tenders received for the above-mentioned framework agreement and we are pleased to inform you of the following:

Your offer of Standard support on the framework has been accepted.
 Your offer of Complex support has been accepted.

The Council received 154 tender submissions; 44 submissions were successful; successful bidders were scored in line with the published evaluation criteria and minimum scoring requirements detailed in the Invitation to Tender (ITT).

The table below shows your overall scores given against the published evaluation criteria detailed in the Invitation to Tender (ITT) document in respect of your tender submission.

SELECTION CRITERIA:

Selection Criteria Case Studies	Required Minimum Score	Your score
Case Study Question 9.1 Standard	50	50
Case Study Question 9.2 Complex Bespoke	50	50

AWARD CRITERIA:

Lot 1 – Standard:

Evaluation area	Maximum Score (%)	Your score (%)
Quality Score	60%	33.75%
Price Score	40%	35.29%
Total Score	100%	69.04%

Lot 1 - Complex:

Evaluation area	Maximum Score (%)	Your score (%)
Quality Score	60%	33.75%
Price Score	40%	35.53%
Total Score	100%	69.28%

Lot 2:

Evaluation area	Maximum Score (%)	Your score (%)
Quality Score	100%	56.25%
Price Score	n/a	n/a
Total Score	100%	56.25%

Appendix A, attached to this letter, provides a more detailed breakdown of your tender scores.

This letter is not, at this stage, a communication of the Council's formal acceptance of your offer. In accordance with Public Contract Regulations 2015 (as amended) and recognised best practice the Council intends to observe a standstill period, during which we will refrain from entering into a contract with the winning tenderers. For purposes of this contract, the standstill period shall commence on **Saturday 12th July 2025** and end midnight **Monday 21st July 2025**.

Subject to the Council receiving no notice during the standstill period of any intention to legally challenge the award process, the Council intends to conclude the proposed contract with [REDACTED] after the standstill period ends.

We will contact you again once the standstill period has expired or should there be a challenge that prevents conclusion of the contract after the proposed date.

In the meantime, could you please confirm that you are happy to proceed with the contract; if so, could you please provide written confirmation of receipt and acceptance of the intention to award letter.

Could you please forward the following documents as soon as possible so that we can complete the due diligence and draft the contract:

- **Contact name and contact detail (email and phone number) for:**
 - **Contract manager in your organisation managing this contract,**
 - **If different, contact details for referrals,**
 - **If different provider portal contact name,**
 - **For remittance.**
- **A signed letter headed paper detailing your companies address, bank details and VAT registration number**
- **A copy of the insurance certificates clearly showing level of insurance for Employer's (Compulsory) Liability, Public Liability and Professional Indemnity.**

Please provide the above information by Monday 21st July 2025.

On behalf of the Evaluation Panel, we would like to thank you for your interest in this project and your tender submission.

Yours Sincerely,

Nadine Raenke
Senior Commissioning Officer (Adults)
Business Transformation & Organisational Development

Appendix A – detailed breakdown of evaluation scores

SELECTION CRITERIA:

Selection Question	Minimum required score	Your score	Reasons for your score
Selection criteria Case study 9.1 standard	50	50	Acceptable response which evidences that the Tenderer will meet most of the Authority's requirements, and provides an acceptable level of detail and accuracy for most elements of the requirements. The general approach to care and support is provided in the response with general case study examples showing what has been achieved around independent living skills.
Selection criteria Case study 9.2 complex	50	50	Case examples given to illustrate the skills and intervention of staff to support individuals with complex needs. MDT approach, adjustment to practice and strategies to support risk management and build resilience are shown and how to develop skills for the individual. Examples weren't tied back to the required subpoints of the questions, therefore not much case evidence for subpoints. Overall an acceptable answer, however detail case evidence missing from some subpoints.

AWARD CRITERIA:

Quality Question	Question Weighting	Minimum required score	Your score	Reasons for your score
Question1 – Service Provision (including Planning and Quality management)	20%	Part of overall weighted score of 50	Score: 25 = 5%	The response failed to evidence that the provider would be able to deliver some of the Authority's requirements; there was unacceptable or unqualified risk that the Authority would have to manage. The evaluation panel had no confidence the Provider would deliver the requirements as the response was composed of generic statements and information without any context for examples to give insight in their practice. The following gaps were also identified: - Service planning lacked rota/staff approach and how flexibility is achieved. The response did not give details on how they screen referrals, assess people and set

				<p>up care plans. They also have not included any information on how staff was planned to ensure a reliable service.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Business Continuity (BC) did not consider BC risk areas and could have been stronger on stress testing. - For Assistive Technology (AT) only headlined information was provided and needed more details or examples for enabling tech and how it would help to reduce care hours. - The response could have included how they would work with other agencies or professionals in emergency situations to ensure safety and continuity of care. - Cost effectiveness lacked use of community resources and only implied Value For Money through increased independence through other points without outlining it. - Co-production lacked in active roles for people in service design. <p>It therefore did not provide the Authority with any confidence that the provider would deliver the requirement.</p>
Question 2 – Quality management and Safeguarding	20%	50 and part of overall weighted score of 50	Score: 50 = 10%	<p>The response evidenced that the Provider would deliver all or the most of the Authority's requirements; and provided an acceptable level of detail and accuracy for all or most elements of the Authority's requirements.</p> <p>The response had a focus on a person centred practice; good outcomes were given, but more details could have been given. Areas to be covered have been answered with an acceptable level of details, however the response lacked details in the following:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - the response to Quality could have been clearer in its adherence to the contract specification - the response to continuous improvement learning could have outlined updating policies and practise guidance. - the response to safeguarding incidents did not outline recording and reporting; escalation procedures were mentioned but not explained. No case example for safeguarding was provided. <p>As such, the response provided some but did not provide the Authority with good confidence that the Provider would deliver the requirement.</p>
Question 3 – Staffing	20%	50 and part of overall weighted score of 50	Score: 75 = 15%	<p>The response evidenced that the Provider would deliver each element of the Authority's requirements; it provided a good level of detail and accuracy for all elements of the Authority's requirements.</p> <p>The areas to be covered have been answered with a good level of details, however the following minor areas lacked details:</p>

				<ul style="list-style-type: none"> - The response did not outline the use of a training matrix or development plans to identify skill gaps in the workforce. It did not explain training methods or how training would be aligned with people's needs. - More details on safe recruitment such as references could have been provided. - Roles and responsibilities/ accountabilities within the management structure were not explained. - Approachability invisibility of management was not outlined. <p>The response still provided the Authority with good confidence that the Provider would deliver the requirement.</p>
Question 4 – Personalisation, Community Participation, and Individual Led Services	20%	50 and part of overall weighted score of 50	Score: 50 = 10%	<p>Acceptable response which evidences that the Tenderer will meet most of the Authority's requirements, and provides an acceptable level of detail and accuracy for most elements of the requirements.</p> <p>The response touched on all points but with lack of detail for most points, but in particular regarding risk approach and how the approach is applied to people with different levels of need and capacity.</p>
Question 5 – Partnerships	15%	Part of overall weighted score of 50	Score: 100 = 15%	Excellent response that met all requirements.
Question 6 – Social Value	5%	Part of overall weighted score of 50	Score: 25 = 1.25%	<p>The Social Value offer and supporting information submitted has some omissions in respect of the relevant Social Value Requirements. The offer and method statement satisfies the basic requirements in some respects but is unsatisfactory in other respects and raises some concerns.</p> <p>Although the response has links to working with local organisations such as local food bank open door and others, the method statement provides high level information with limited details.</p> <p>The provider committed to the creation of apprenticeships and new jobs (both within their organisation and their supply chain), providing work experience and supporting unemployed back into work; the method statement did not include how apprenticeships and new jobs will be created through the supply chain, or provide enough details on the supply chain. There is no explanation what this would be achieved, despite high commitments.</p> <p>Environmental commitments were identified including energy/water efficiency targets, volunteer hours for green initiatives, use of low emission vehicles, recyclable/biodegradable materials and sustainable sourcing. No target identified on the commitments tab for reduction in landfill but this was outlined in the</p>

			method statement. The method statement only provided detail as to how the following environmental commitments would be implemented, monitored and reported back to the Council: use of energy efficient equipment, reduction in landfill waste and use of low emission vehicles. A further commitment was identified in the method statement but not on the commitment tab which was the delivery of community initiatives. The response mentioned the lighting system and appliances in accommodation rather than offices; the accommodation would fall under tenancy and housing, therefore the provider can only encourage clients but cannot decide on or dictate to them what to buy. The evaluation panel would have liked to see instead how the provider would also encourage clients to consider environmental issues.
Total Quality Score			56.25%

Lot 1 – Standard Price Score:

LOT 1 - STANDARD SERVICES			
Support Category	Price Submitted	Weighting	Your Score
Standard	Hourly Rate	Maximum Sub-weighting	Sub-weighting
Core Hours	n/a	n/a	
Day hours / 1 to 1	£20.40	40%	35.29%
Waking Night	£20.40	30%	27.94%
Sleep-in	£12.00	30%	25.00%
Total Score Out of 100%:		100%	88.24%
Total Score Out of 40%:		40%	35.29%

Lot 1 – Complex Price Score:

LOT 1 - COMPLEX SERVICES			
Support Category	Price Submitted	Weighting	Your Score
Complex	Hourly Rate	Maximum Sub-weighting	Sub-weighting
Core Hours	n/a	n/a	
Day hours / 1 to 1	£21.80	40%	35.23%
Waking Night	£21.80	30%	27.11%
Sleep-in	£12.00	30%	26.48%
Total Score Out of 100%:		100%	88.81%
Total Score Out of 40%:		40%	35.53%