

**Relates to Decision No  
2014/52**



## **Appendix A**

### **THE POLICE AND CRIME COMMISSIONER FOR LANCASHIRE**

#### **TITLE: Acceptance of Tender for a Vehicle Repair Service for vehicles operated by Lancashire Constabulary**

#### **1. Background and Advice**

##### **1.1 Current Contract Details**

The current contract for Motor vehicle body repair work and minor mechanical work for vehicles operated by Lancashire Constabulary expires on 31<sup>st</sup> January 2015.

The existing service is provided by three vehicle repair companies, HB Panelcraft, James Alpe Ltd and John Macadam & Son Ltd.

#### **The Tender Process**

Based on previous spend with the three suppliers it was estimated that approximately £150K per annum was being spent with the suppliers for this work across the county. This provides a total contract value of £600K over 4 years, which is the proposed length of the new contract.

Due to the potential value of this work, it was necessary to embark on a tender exercise for the future provision of this service to ensure the Constabulary's Financial Regulations and Contract Standing Orders were being followed.

Advertisements were placed in the OJEU, (Official Journal of the European Union), the local press and Contrax Weekly asking for expressions of interest and the opportunity was published on the Bluelight e-tendering portal. Companies wishing to register their interest did so by completing and returning tender documents via the Bluelight e-tendering portal.

By the closing date a total of 29 organisations had registered their interest, although only 5 organisations actually completed and submitted tender documents. These were as follows:

HB Panelcraft Ltd  
James Alpe Ltd  
John Macadam & Son Ltd  
Nationwide Accident Repair Service  
Rolds Motor Bodies\*

\*It should be noted that Rolds Motor Bodies submitted the tender in error. They sent in a response to a Greater Manchester Police Tender for the same service which was coincidentally running at the same time. Therefore this bid was not evaluated further.

The remaining four submissions were then assessed and scored against the tender award criteria specified in the tender documents. The assessment was undertaken by representatives from the Fleet Department and Procurement and Contracts Department.

### **The Tender Evaluation**

Companies had to meet an essential selection criteria to be considered for the contract.

They had to be accredited to PAS 125 Category 3, and to provide proof of the accreditation by enclosing a copy of this certification.

All four companies met this criteria and progressed to the next stage of the evaluation process, which consisted of the following;

#### **Price – 40% of the evaluation**

Pricing was calculated by the labour hourly rate each company had submitted for insurance repairs.

#### **Method Statements – 60% of the evaluation**

This comprised of 6 method statements and each statement was scored out of a maximum of 5 points per question, with a weighting of 10% per question.

The method statements covered areas such as service delivery, administration of the contract, the repair process, security of premises, and training methods within the industry.

The four companies were scored based on this methodology and the overall results of this evaluation can be seen in the table below.

<b>COMPANY NAME</b>	<b>Price %</b>	<b>Method Statement Score (out of 30pts)</b>	<b>Method Statement %</b>	<b>TOTAL %</b>	<b>ORDER</b>
<b>John Macadam &amp; Son Ltd</b>	40	24	48	88	1
<b>HB Panelcraft Ltd</b>	32	21	42	74	2
<b>James Alpe</b>	24	24	48	72	3
<b>Nationwide</b>	36	14	28	64	4

### **Award of the Framework**

In the tender documentation it was stated that the the force were seeking to appoint a maximum of 3 contractors in total to perform this work. Ideally the contractors appointed would be able to service any area within the Constabulary and therefore meet a 1 hour response time. This is important as the Constabulary will need to meet operational requirements at all times.

The three companies who achieved the highest scores and can meet this criteria were as follows;

John Macadam & Son Ltd  
HB Panelcraft Ltd  
James Alpe Ltd

All three companies are already known to the Constabulary, as all three currently provide the same service to the Constabulary. They are all locally based S.M.E. companies based in Colne, Preston and Clitheroe in Lancashire.

### **Company visits**

Visits to each of the three companies were made by key stakeholders within the Fleet Department to clarify issues such as their ability to provide minor repairs, their capacity for body repair work, the security of their premises and their estimating/invoicing procedures. All three companies visited provided assurances in all these areas.

### **Recommendations**

In view of the fact that the existing service is carried out by three contractors and the service works extremely efficiently, permission is sought from the Police and Crime Commissioner to accept tenders from John Macadam & Son Ltd, HB Panelcraft Ltd, and James Alpe Ltd, for a contract for the provision of Motor Vehicle body repair work and minor mechanical work for vehicles operated by Lancashire Constabulary for the period 1<sup>st</sup> February 2015 to 31<sup>st</sup> January, 2017 with the option to extend to 31<sup>st</sup> January 2019, renewable annually.

In accordance with the Scheme of Governance, the Police and Crime Commissioner has responsibility for the acceptance of tenders if the total value of a service contract is in excess of £250,000.

## **2. Consultations**

Representatives of the Fleet Department have been consulted and involved in the tender process.

## **3. Implications:**

The existing contract expires on 31<sup>st</sup> January 2015. Therefore there is a need to have a new contract in place to ensure that this essential service continues.

### **3.1 Risk management**

The force will not have a legal contract in place for the repair of operational vehicles if approval is not accepted.

### **3.2 Financial considerations**

There are no direct additional financial implications at this time, or savings identified. The costs associated as set out in the report are covered by existing budgets.

### **3.3 Equality considerations**

Each company's diversity policies and procedures have been assessed as part of the process. There are no equality issues.

#### 4. Background Papers

None

Contact – [REDACTED] – Procurement Officer – [REDACTED]

#### 5. Public access to information

RESTRICTED - This decision contains information which relates to or includes commercial, financial or business interests of the Police and Crime Commissioner or any other person or company.

Officer declaration	Date
<b>LEGAL IMPLICATIONS</b> - The legal services team have been consulted on this proposal	
The Chief Finance Officer has been consulted on this proposal. <b>FINANCIAL IMPLICATIONS – As above</b>	
<b>EQUALITIES IMPLICATIONS – As above</b>	
<b>CONSULTATION - As above</b>	
<b>Chief Executive Officer (Monitoring Officer)</b>  I have been informed about the proposal and confirm that financial, legal and equalities advice has been taken into account in the preparation of this report. I am satisfied that this is an appropriate request to be submitted to the Police and Crime Commissioner for Lancashire.  Signature.....Date.....	