



COUNTY PROCUREMENT TEAM:
Date 18th November 2011

CONTRACT AWARD RECOMMENDATION REPORT

CONTRACT REF: CPU608

Report for: Recommendation for Preferred Bidder Acceptance

Contract for
The Service & Maintenance of the Oxfordshire Real Time
Information System

Background

Oxfordshire's RTI system has been fully operational since April 2006. A capital investment exceeding £3 million has been made by the 'Oxontime' project partners: Oxfordshire County Council, Stagecoach in Oxfordshire, Oxford Bus Company and Thames Travel Ltd. The existing maintenance contract expires on 30th March 2012.

The approach adopted for the re-tendering of Oxfordshire's RTI requirements reflects the Council's current funding position – i.e. to maintain the existing system at current or higher performance levels, allowing for some limited expansion. A specific focus is being placed upon making RTI more accessible via open RTIG/SIRI data standards and through mobile phone technologies.

The contract specification therefore provides for both ongoing maintenance of all system assets, and scope for limited enhancements to include additional hardware and software. Stringent Service Level Agreements will apply to the maintenance and fault rectification of system assets on a 24/7 basis, 365 days a year.

The Council's intention is to award a four year contract to commence in April 2012, with the option for a two-year extension if required, with an estimated overall value of £1.56 million over five years, assuming a one year extension.

Contract Procedure Rules and Legislation

Contract Procedure Rules 12-18 apply to this procurement, which has been advertised as a Service contract under the restricted procedure of the Official Journal of the European Union (OJEU).

The Council possesses powers under the Local Government (Miscellaneous Provision) Act 1953 Section 4 to delivery public transport infrastructure improvements.

Process

1. Advert calling for expressions of interest was placed in OJEU, on 11th June 2011.
2. Nine expressions of interest were received and all companies sent Pre-Qualification Questionnaires
3. Nine questionnaires were received back and scored against pre-determined criteria.
4. As a result six companies were invited to tender
5. A total of three tender submissions were duly received.
6. All three organisations, after an initial evaluation period which allowed the Project Group to study the bids in detail, were invited to present their service delivery solution to the evaluation panel.
7. The project lead and the Procurement Manager provided the evaluation panel with score sheets detailing the evaluation criteria and the scores scope to aid the tender evaluation process.
8. This allowed the Project Group's evaluation panel to consider the strength of each of the answers provided in relation to the quality criteria, detailed on the Appendix 1 spreadsheet, facilitating an evaluation of the overall strength of the bids.
9. The Pricing elements of the contract had been given a 50% weighting whilst the quality criteria was also given a weighting of 50% to reflect the Project Groups intention to focus on quality as highly as cost.

10. The scores from both elements were added together to calculate the Most Economically Advantageous Tender award recommendation and are detailed on Appendix 1.

Recommendation

1. As a result of this process and evaluation it is recommended that the submission from **Cloud Amber Ltd** should be taken forward to preferred bidder status.

Procurement Manager
..... Name
..... W. GALLIERS Print
..... PROCUREMENT MANAGER Position
..... PROCUREMENT Team
..... 2/12/11 Date

Service Area Representative
..... Signature
..... CHRIS SPRY Print
..... SENIOR TRANSPORT PLANNER Position
..... P.T. DEVELOPMENT Team
..... 2/12/11 Date

Budget Holder on behalf of
S15 Officer
..... Signature
..... JOHN DUFFY Print
..... STRATEGIC MANAGER Position
..... POLYESTRATEG Team
..... 6/12/2011 Date