

Listening Learning Leading

Record of individual Cabinet member decision

Local Government Act 2000 and the Local Authorities (Executive Arrangements) (Meetings and Access to Information) (England) Regulations 2012

Decision made by	David Rouane
Key decision?	Yes
Date of decision (same as date form signed)	30/08/2021
Name and job title of officer requesting the decision	Jaffa Holland Housing Advice Team Leader
Officer contact details	Tel: 01235 422459 Email: Jaffa.holland@southandvale.gov.uk
Decision	To award the support contract for families accommodated under the UK Resettlement Scheme (UKRS) to Connection Support. The contract will be fully funded by central Government from funding available under UKRS.
Reasons for decision	On the 8 October 2019 South Oxfordshire District Cabinet pledged to resettle three families under UKRS. The government temporarily paused the scheme due to Covid19 however it is now operational again. UKRS resettles vulnerable refugee families in the UK. The families will require specialist support to help them settle successfully in South Oxfordshire. The specialist support is best provided by organisations with experience of supporting refugee families in the UK. In accordance with Contract Procedure Rules, an open invitation to tender for the contract was issued via the South East Business portal. Three tender submissions were received. Officers evaluated the tender submissions and evaluated on a 60 per cent price and 40 per cent quality award criteria basis.

		1	
	Rank	Supplier	Quality Score
		Connection Support	36.00
	2	Supplier A	30.60.
	0	Supplier C	Failed the
			mandatory
			requirements
			section as
			insurance cover
			not adequate
	26 May 2021 procurement sought clarifications from Supplier A and C, Supplier A did not make contact for 8 weeks at which point the democratic process to award was in process. As the UKRS Contract has not been awarded and in line with fairness and transparency, the evaluation was undertaken again for both Supplier A and Supplier B. Supplier B (Connection Support) was evaluated as the successful bidder. Supplier C did not respond to further requests for information so in line with the ITQ their submission was set aside as noncompliant, and no further evaluation was undertaken. Procurement oversaw the process and validated the scoring please see attached Appendix 1 for breakdown of quality scoring and weightings (Confidential document)		
Alternative options rejected	Option One:		
	That the council directly employs staff to provide support for the families.		
	This option was rejected as the council does not have the experience or resources to train, support and manage employees to successfully support families under UKRS.		
	Option Two: Do nothing – this was rejected as the council has already pledged to resettle three families under UKRS and the government funding has been approved.		
Climate and ecological implications	There are no climate the UKRS support of		cations from awarding on Support.
Legal implications			nas been amended by s included within the

	specification and tender documentation.			
	Legal have been instructed to formalise the contract with the winning provider and obtain the necessary signatures.			
	COMMENCEMENT OF CONTRACT As per the council's CPR (para 29) No works, services or supplies shall be commenced until a contract has been completed or an order has been issued to the contractor unless the head of service approves otherwise.			
Financial implications	The total value of the two-year joint contract is £141,847.22.			
	The contract is shared with Vale of White Horse District Council. Vale of White Horse is also resettling three families under UKRS and the contract value is split 50/50 between the councils.			
	There are no financial implications from awarding the contract as it will be fully funded by central Government through the UK Resettlement Scheme.			
Other implications	None			
Background papers considered	Cabinet Report dated 8 October 2019.			
Declarations/conflict of interest? Declaration of other councillor/officer consulted by the Cabinet member?	None			
List consultees		Name	Outcome	Date
	Ward councillors	N/A		
	Legal	Barry Newson	Agreed but because one of the bids was rejected for lack of evidence of insurance cover/confirmation that insurance would be in place at commencement of the contract, evidence of cover should be provided by the successful bidder prior to formally awarding the contract. A data sharing agreement has been prepared after consultation with Information Governance and Data Protection Officer.	26/07/2021
	Finance	Emma Creed	Agreed	28/07/2021
	Procurement	Angela Cox	Agreed	23/07/2021
	Business Risk	Yvonne Cutler Greaves	This approach helps reduce the councils' liabilities in not being skilled and experienced to manage the needs of these families and	11/08/2021

	Human resources Diversity and	N/A Lynne	therefore providing a more favourable outcome for them through the support of a more experienced organisation.	26/07/2021
	equality Climate and biodiversity	Mitchell N/A		
	Communications	Lucy Billen	Agreed	23/07/2021
	GDPR	Sandy Bayley	The data sharing with appointed contractor will need to be detailed within the contract and added to the Record of Processing Activities (RoPA) for housing.	
	Senior Management Team	SMT	UK	18/08/2021
Confidential decision? If so, under which exempt category?	No			
Call-in waived by Scrutiny Committee chairman?	No			
Has this been discussed by Cabinet members?	Yes			
Cabinet portfolio holder's signature To confirm the decision as set	Signature David Rouane			
out in this notice.	Date 30 August 2021			

ONCE SIGNED, THIS FORM MUST BE HANDED TO DEMOCRATIC SERVICES IMMEDIATELY.

For Democratic Services office use only			
Form received	Date: 31 August 2021	Time: 13:40	
Date published to all councillors	Date: 1 September 2021		
Call-in deadline	Date: 8 September 2021	Time: 17.00	