

CABINET RESOURCES COMMITTEE – 28 JULY 2011

ITEM 4 – PUBLIC QUESTION TIME

Questions asked of the Chairman of the Committee

ITEM 6 – CONTRACT FOR SYSTEMS BASED INTERNAL AUDIT SERVICES

From John Dix:

- 1. Who determined that quality should attract 70% of the scoring for the award of this particular tender and pricing only 30%?**

Reply by the Chairman of the Cabinet Resources Committee

The split between 70% Quality and 30% Price was set by Buying Solutions, whose framework was used to carry out the mini-competition. This contract is let under the terms and conditions of contract of the Buying Solutions Framework RM662/L13.

- 2. How many of the three other firms that were shortlisted are ICAEW member firms?**

Reply by the Chairman of the Cabinet Resources Committee

The accreditation of all three firms was determined by Buying Solutions and was not part of the mini-competition process, as we are calling off from a framework. At least two would be ICAEW accredited based on our understanding of the firms who submitted bids.

- 3. Do the committee believe it is credible that a professional firm bidding for what is a largely standardized service should have scored one fifth of the quality score of the winning bid?**

Reply by the Chairman of the Cabinet Resources Committee

The Invitation to Tender was very specific of what it required from the bidder and each were asked to submit their response to the tender against three method statements. Some did not answer all of the method statements and therefore did not score well, in addition some bidders did not customise their bid to both Council's requirements for example showing innovation. It is therefore debatable that all firms would offer a standardised service. The panel (2 LBE and 1 LBB) evaluated all tenders and the scores were determined by consensus.

- 4. How comfortable do the committee feel awarding this contract to the highest priced bidder (according to the pricing score)?**

Reply by the Chairman of the Cabinet Resources Committee

The Committee should be concerned with value for money - price and quality, in addition high quality assurance is necessary as we go through a period of transformation to ensure all stakeholders have adequate assurance and a service that drives through cultural change in getting the basics right. Previously we received a low cost IA service however they did not engage at appropriate levels within the organisation nor did they have a high profile, as such a focus on quality was viewed as necessary going forward.

ITEM 7 – CHURCH FARMHOUSE, GREYHOUND HILL, NW4 4JR

From Keith Martin:

- 5. I note from 9.11 of the committee papers that planning advice will involve full consultation with English Heritage. Is the Council taking active steps to put Church Farmhouse Museum (sic) on the National Heritage At Risk Register, which English Heritage in conjunction with The Daily Telegraph is promoting?**

Reply by the Chairman of the Cabinet Resources Committee

Currently the Church Farmhouse Museum is not listed on the National Heritage At Risk Register, and at this time is not considered by the Local Planning Authority as a building which would meet the criteria for it to be placed on this list. However, this does not detract from the historic importance of this building which will as a matter of course in relation to its Grade II Listed status, require English Heritage's involvement in terms of any proposals put forward to reuse the building. English Heritage working with the Local Planning Authority will want to find solutions which will keep this property from falling into significant disrepair or being blighted by its permitted use history, and avoid this property from falling into the sort of state where it would need to be listed on the 'at risk register'.

The proposed action will ensure that the future opportunity for the building is considered as a matter of urgency to prevent the deterioration of this important Listed building.