

# Award Recommendation Report

Rotherham Clinical Commissioning Group

Waverley Medical Centre - APMS Contract

Author: Tony Squires

## Contents

|   |                                   |   |
|---|-----------------------------------|---|
| 1 | Introduction .....                | 3 |
| 2 | Procurement Approach .....        | 3 |
| 3 | Tender Documentation .....        | 4 |
| 4 | Tender Evaluation Team .....      | 5 |
| 5 | Evaluation of Tenders .....       | 6 |
| 6 | Potential Provider Responses..... | 7 |
| 7 | Recommendation & Next Steps ..... | 8 |

# 1 Introduction

- 1.1 This is a report detailing the tendering process that has been completed for the Waverley Medical Centre – APMS Contract provision on behalf of Rotherham Clinical Commissioning Group.
- 1.2 This report describes the procurement approach and Invitation to Tender (ITT) documentation, the Potential Provider responses received and how tenders were evaluated in order to reach a recommendation.
- 1.3 A recommendation is provided in Section 7 of this report.

# 2 Procurement Approach

- 2.1 Prior to the procurement commencing discussions were held with the Commissioning team at NHS Rotherham CCG about the size and complexity of the marketplace for these services. A bidder information event was held with potential providers.
- 2.2 Based upon this market intelligence a single stage 'Open' Procurement process was determined to be the best way to reach a recommendation for the Waverley Medical Centre – APMS Contract provision. Potential Providers were invited to submit tenders describing their organisation's suitability, approach to delivering the services, supporting infrastructure and associated commercial terms.
- 2.3 Accordingly, the tendering exercise was carried out as an Open procurement according to Regulation 27 of the Public Contracts Regulations 2015.
- 2.4 An advertisement inviting the submission of tenders was published in the Supplement to the OJEU<sup>1</sup> and ContractsFinder<sup>2</sup>.
- 2.5 The tendering process was carried out via the Bravosolutions e-tendering portal<sup>3</sup>. The AWARD<sup>4</sup> system was used by the evaluation team to remotely and independently evaluate each tender.

---

<sup>1</sup> [http://simap.europa.eu/index\\_en.htm](http://simap.europa.eu/index_en.htm)

<sup>2</sup> <https://www.contractsfinder.service.gov.uk/Search>

<sup>3</sup> <https://www.nhssourcing.co.uk/web/login.html>

## 3 Tender Documentation

- 3.1 The Invitation to Tender (ITT) documentation made available to bidders consisted of seven documents:
- ITT Document 1- Instructions for Completion of a Tender Response providing background and context, an overview of all of the documentation, detailed process steps for bidders to follow, associated deadlines, instructions for bidders on how to complete and submit their tender, and a range of rules governing the procurement;
  - ITT Document 2 - Waverley GP Practice Service Specification
  - ITT Document 3 - Waverley GP Practice Plans from Developers
  - Dashboard performance August 2017
  - Lease - Waverley Medical Centre example
  - Powerpoint - Bidder Information Event held on 16/11/2017
  - Waverley finance specification
- 3.2 The Qualification and Technical Envelopes of the e-tendering portal contained the questions that the bidders were required to complete.
- 3.3 Throughout the Tender, bidders were offered the opportunity through the e-tendering portal to request clarification of the ITT documentation via a formal written question and answer process. Multiple clarification questions were asked and the answers were shared with all bidders.

---

<sup>4</sup> <https://award.bravosolution.co.uk/nhssheffield/web/login>

## 4 Tender Evaluation Team

4.1 The bid submissions were evaluated by a multi-disciplinary team of subject matter experts including Patient representatives, Clinicians and Commissioners. Each evaluator was assigned to score one or more questions of each submission. To avoid any potential clinical conflicts of interest an external clinician was engaged by the CCG to undertake this evaluation. An 'X' in the table below indicates that the evaluators scored one or more questions in that section.

**Table 4.1: ITT Evaluation Matrix**

| Name               | Role  | Clinical & Service Delivery | Performance Management | Facilities Management | Assurance of Supply | Finance and Cost | IM&T | Sustainability |
|--------------------|---|-----------------------------|------------------------|-----------------------|---------------------|------------------|------|----------------|
| George Skinner     | Patient Representative  | X                           |                        |                       |                     |                  |      |                |
| June Walker        | Patient Representative  | X                           |                        |                       |                     |                  |      |                |
| Rachel Garrison    | Senior Contracting & Service Improvement Manager (Primary Care) | X                           | X                      | X                     | X                   |                  | X    | X              |
| Jacqui Tuffnell    | Head of Commissioning   | X                           | X                      | X                     | X                   |                  | X    | X              |
| Dr. Nabeel Alsindi | GP – External Clinical evaluator                                | X                           | X                      | X                     | X                   |                  | X    | X              |
| Andrew Clayton     | Head of IT, IG & BI.  |                             |                        |                       |                     |                  | X    |                |
| Stuart Lakin       | Head of Medicines Management                                    | X                           |                        |                       |                     |                  |      |                |
| Keely Firth        | Deputy Chief Finance Officer                                    |                             |                        |                       |                     | X                |      |                |
| Wendy Allott       | Chief Finance Officer   |                             |                        |                       |                     | X                |      |                |
| Helen Wyatt        | Patient and Public Engagement Manager                           | X                           |                        |                       |                     |                  |      |                |

## 5 Evaluation of Tenders

- 5.1 The written tenders were subjected to a three stage evaluation process:
- i Preliminary Compliance Review – to check for completeness of the tender and compliance with procurement rules.
  - ii Initial Evaluation – to ensure that there were no mandatory grounds for the bidder to be excluded from further consideration.
  - iii Detailed Evaluation – Assessing numerous areas of the bidder’s proposal provided in response to the different sections of the Qualification and Technical envelopes of the ITT.
- 5.2 For the third stage of the evaluation process, the evaluation team members independently evaluated their designated questions from the tender using the Award portal, (as outlined above in the table 4.1). Scores were assigned to responses according to pre-determined, weighted evaluation criteria. The Financial responses were only evaluated by the Finance Director who did not evaluate any other questions. The finance scoring was not shared with the rest of the evaluation team.
- 5.3 Further details relating to the evaluation process, criteria and weightings can be found in the ITT documentation, copies of which are available upon request. At a high level, the following section weightings were agreed:
- |                               |     |
|-------------------------------|-----|
| Clinical and Service Delivery | 55% |
| Performance Management        | 9%  |
| Facilities Management         | 3%  |
| Assurance of Supply           | 15% |
| Finance and Cost              | 10% |
| IM&T                          | 8%  |
- 5.4 All evaluators completed a standard Rotherham CCG Conflicts of interest form prior to being given access to the tender submissions. There were no declared conflicts of interest relating to this tender process.

## 6 Potential Provider Responses

6.1 Although 15 potential providers viewed the documents in the tender portal only the following Bidders submitted tender responses:

Gateway Primary Care CIC

OneMedicalGroup Ltd

Treeton Medical Centre

6.2 The combined scores following the ITT written submission and financial evaluations were:

| Bidder                   | Quality | Finance | Total  |
|--------------------------|---------|---------|--------|
| Gateway Primary Care CIC | 75.30%  | 8.00%   | 83.30% |
| OneMedicalGroup Ltd      | 66.60%  | 5.00%   | 71.60% |
| Treeton Medical Centre   | 64.85%  | 8.00%   | 72.85% |

Gateway Primary Care CIC scored highest in Quality and finance with an overall winning margin of 10.45% greater than the second placed bidder.

## 7 Recommendation & Next Steps

- 7.1 Rotherham CGG Primary Care Committee (PCC) is asked to approve the procurement process which has been undertaken by the South Yorkshire Procurement Service (SYPS). The PCC is further requested to endorse the recommendation of the SYPS to award this contract to:
- Gateway Primary Care CIC
- 7.2 Following ratification of the above, all parties who registered an interest in the procurement (including those who declined to tender) will be notified formally of the decision by the South Yorkshire Procurement Service.
- 7.3 A formal contract will be drafted by NHS Rotherham CCG and finalised with the recommended bidder. The contract will take the form of a NHS Standard APMS Contract.
- 7.4 Once the standstill has completed the Recommended bidder will be asked to mobilise at the earliest opportunity, with an expected Service Commencement Date of 1<sup>st</sup> April 2019.