

Delegated Decisions by Cabinet Member for Community & Corporate Services Tuesday, 21 November 2023

ADDENDA

4. GIS software license and maintenance renewal (Pages 1 - 2)

Cabinet Member: Corporate Services

Forward Plan Ref: 2023/264

Contact: Anne Kearsley, GIS Solutions Manager,
anne.kearsley@oxfordshire.gov.uk

Report by Director of Finance

The Cabinet Member is RECOMMENDED to:

- a) **Authorise officers to procure geographic information software**
- b) **Delegate the award of the contract to the Director of IT Innovation and Digital Services for Geographic Information Software licensing and maintenance.**

6. Laptop Refresh (Pages 3 - 6)

Forward Plan Ref: 2023/328

Contact: Alastair Read, Head of IT, alastair.read@oxfordshire.gov.uk

Report by Director of Finance

To approve the contract to Partner with a 3rd party to supply OCC's enduser devices eg Laptops. As agreed in the 19-24 IT Strategy.

This page is intentionally left blank

Agenda Item 4

Geographic Information System Software Procurement

Amendment to paragraph 9:

Legal services have been engaged via completion of a L&P template form to seek assistance in undertaking a review of relevant paperwork for a compliant process once a route to market has been agreed. ~~And at this time no legal issues are anticipated.~~ **Given the proposed contract value, the Public Contract Regulations 2015 (“the Regulations”) will apply in full. Therefore any procurement process chosen must be compliant with the Regulations.**

This page is intentionally left blank

Divisions Affected – N/A

CABINET MEMBER COMMUNITY AND CORPORATE SERVICES

21 November 2023

Laptop / Hardware Refresh Partner Procurement

Report by Executive Director for Resources

RECOMMENDATION

1. **The Cabinet Member is RECOMMENDED** to agree the award of the contract to the winning supplier.

Executive Summary

2. As part of the IT health check and subsequent strategy developed in 2019 (and signed off by cabinet), the council agreed to refresh IT end user devices on a set timetable and to engage a 3rd party partner to ensure we got best price.
3. Following a Gartner consultation, it was understood the industry standard for local government was to refresh laptops every 4 years and desktops every 6 to 7 years.
4. Renewing on these timescales got best value for hardware use, warranty cost and mean time before failure.
5. The ITID service have undertaken a procurement process to engage with a third-party vendor to supply end user devices for the next 3 years.
6. The bids were evaluated on best price, lowest add-on margin, and quality of service.

Summary of scope of Hardware Refresh

7. The third-party would be contracted to supply OCC with a minimum of 1300 laptops, 100 tablets and 325 desktops.
8. All devices were costed against a minimum specification.
 - Laptops - ThinkPad L14 Gen 4 - Intel i5 13Th Gen, 16GB Ram DDR4, 256GB SSD, or equivalent)
 - Tablets - ThinkPad L13 Yoga Gen 4 - Intel i5 13Th Gen, 16GB Ram DDR4, 256GB SSD, or equivalent)
 - Desktops - ThinkCentre M70q Gen 4 - Intel i5 13Th Gen, 16GB Ram DDR4, 512GB SSD, or equivalent)
9. OCC were manufacturer agnostic.
10. The award criteria were: -

Criteria	Weighting (%)	Sub-criteria	Sub-criteria weighting (%)
Quality	70%	Warranty services	15%
		Support and Escalation	15%
		Social Value: Working with the community	10%
		Climate action	10%
		Horizon scanning	10%
		Management and Communication	15%
		Value-added services	25%
Price	30%	P1 – Total Cost	60%
		P2 – Operating Margin	40%

11. The Tenders were evaluated in line with the below marking scheme.

Comment	Judgement	Marks available
Clear, relevant and well detailed response that addresses all the requirements and provides the evaluator with confidence that the service will be provided to an excellent standard. Demonstrates in detail how all the relevant requirements of the specification will be met.	Excellent	5
Clear and relevant response that addresses all the requirements and provides the evaluator with confidence that the service will be provided to a good standard. Demonstrates how all or most of the relevant requirements of the specification will be met. The information may lack relevant detail in areas, but this does not cause the evaluator concern over the future delivery of services.	Good	4
Response addresses all or most of the requirements and provides the evaluator with confidence that the service will be provided to an acceptable standard. Demonstrates how all or most of the relevant requirements of the specification will be met. However, the information lacks some relevant detail and/or raises issues which causes the evaluator minor concern over the future delivery of services.	Satisfactory	3
Response addresses all or some of the requirements but does not provide the evaluator with confidence that the service will be provided to an acceptable standard. Demonstrates how all or most of the relevant requirements of the specification will be met. However, the information is lacking relevant detail and/ or raises issues which gives the evaluator more than minor concern over the future delivery of the services.	Unsatisfactory	2
Response addresses all or some of the requirements but does not provide the evaluator with confidence that the service will be provided to an acceptable standard. Fails to demonstrate how most of the relevant requirements of the specification will be met.	Poor	1
Response does not address any of the requirements. Response fails to provide the evaluator with confidence that the service will be provided to an acceptable standard. Does not demonstrate how any of the relevant requirements of the specification will be met.	Failed	0

12. The evaluators for the Quality Questions evaluated and scored the responses prior to the moderation meeting.
13. The moderation meetings took place on 2nd & 3rd & 4th & 6th of October 2023. During moderation, each evaluator's scores and rationale for the score was documented. Where the final score differed to the other evaluators' scores, the reasons for the change in scores were documented. The evaluators agreed on a final score.
14. Once the scores were added to the pricing score a winning bidder was declared.

Financial Implications

15. The initial order of laptops, desktops and tablets will be circa £950k but the ongoing contract could be up to £3m.
16. The refresh will be funded by capital expenditure which has been allocated to the End User Device refresh programme.

Comments checked by: Prem Salhan, Finance Business Partner (Resources)
prem.salhan@oxfordshire.gov.uk

Legal Implications

17. The value of the contract is such that the procurement was undertaken in accordance with the council's Contract Procedure Rules and the Public Contracts Regulations 2015.
18. The procurement was undertaken, in compliance with the Public Contract Regulations 2015, under a framework agreement established by Crown Commercial Services RM6068 Lot 2. Competition was re- opened under the Framework Agreement for the provision of the supply of the end user devices and, following evaluation, a preferred supplier has been selected.
19. The form of contract will follow that as prescribed under the Framework Agreement, which Legal Services will prepare in accordance with the above recommendation.

Comments checked by: Bede Murtagh, Contracts Solicitor,
bede.murtagh@oxfordshire.gov.uk

NAME: Lorna Baxter, Executive Director for Resources

Contact Officer: Alastair Read Head of Service ITID
alastair.read@oxfordshire.gov.uk Tel 07912483030

November 2023