**Housing Related Support Procurement**

**Questions and Answers – Provider Forum 02/12/2020**

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
| **Question** | **Answer** |
| What will the split be between quality and price? | The Council is in the early stages of planning the procurement and this has not yet been decided. |
| With the combination of City and County funding how will both LA’s be represented, will this differ depending on lots, will there be officials with sector specific knowledge represented on the panel/s? | Both the County and City Councils will contribute to all elements of the procurement, from developing specification to evaluating bids. Those with lived experience will also be involved in the evaluation process, and the Councils will also seek to invite other relevant partners / organisations with relevant knowledge. |
| For the Streets to Homes model (and any other grouped contracts) will the composition of the individual lots/grouping be published in advance of the tender process?  This is important to allow existing providers the additional time needed to arrange potential partnership arrangements and structures. | NOTE – there’s no procurement reason why not, it depends whether the timetable allows for this. |
| Would any partnership structures need to be declared at PQQ stage or if all organisations in any partnership pass PQQ could a partnership then enter at ITT? | The procurement is in the early stages of planning and we have not yet determined which procurement process we will use. However, it is unlikely that there will be a separate selection stage (i.e. PQQ). |
| How would any partnership need to be formed/recognised by procurement, legal status/structure etc.? | There are a number of options for collaboration and the Council does not currently have a preference. For example, partners may form a consortium, or there may be a prime provider who then sub-contracts to other partners, or they may wish to form a different legal arrangement.  Whatever arrangements are put in place, providers will need to demonstrate clear governance arrangements and demonstrate that they meet all of the selection and evaluation criteria. |
| For providers who have services that fall into two separate lots, would this require two separate tender processes? | This has not yet been decided. The Council will endeavour to make the process as straight forward as possible and avoid duplication. |
| Are they looking for one provider or are they looking for collaborations? | The Council is open to both options. Providers will need to demonstrate that they can meet all of the selection and evaluation criteria. |
| Have they considered TUPE and the implications this might bring.  Are they asking every provider to share TUPE information. | The Council recognises that TUPE is likely to apply to this procurement. Incumbent providers will be asked to share employee liability data which will then be available as part of the tender documentation. |
| Are they considering 24 hour support or is the tender for day time support only? | This will be clarified within the tender specification, but we would expect bidders to consider how different levels of support might be used to deliver all elements of the service. |
| Do they want to think about how they are going to measure success in future? | We are intending to work with providers to develop an outline monitoring framework, which can then be developed further with the successful bidders. |
| What are their long term plans? | We are keen to see services evolve and develop, hence we will be seeking a longer contract period of 5+2 |
| Are submissions to be electronic? | Yes, tenders will need to be submitted via an online procurement portal. |
| The tender(s) for Cambridge may look very different from the past, and may well only be appropriate for either a large company with national resources, or a consortium or partnership of local providers to respond to.  How will the process ensure that local knowledge and expertise is retained, especially, if not particularly, to avoid existing relationships between current service users and support workers to be broken? | Part of the evaluation criteria will be the appropriate skills and knowledge of the client groups and local area.  There will be a carefully planned implementation period and transition which will take account of client needs. |
| What form of consortium or partnership will be able to bid? Could it be just a lead partner, with MoUs with other delivery partners set out in the bid, and an expectation of sub-contracts to be issued by the lead partner? Or some form of special purpose vehicle or limited liability partnership? | The Council is open to any of these options, as long as the provider can demonstrate clear governance arrangements that enable the successful delivery of the service. |
| Could the tender documents be issued earlier, or the response date put back, to allow proper time for a) a consortium to be formed and b) time for a multi-partner bid to be developed | This is something we’re happy to review. |
| The service architecture could also look very different, with support workers no longer linked to accommodation provision. The change may entail the re-purposing of existing hostel provision, perhaps because not all the current models will be viable in the new scheme, or even needed. But re-purposing accommodation with 20 to 30 people with embedded support, often addressing high levels of need, could be lengthy.  Would it be possible to set out in the bid documents a timetable for the transition, starting form 1/1/22, especially in terms of the element that is securing accommodation? | There will be a planned transition period that will include the needs of clients.  Elements of transition may be included in the tender documents, but we will also expect bidders to outline their own approach. |
| Would it be appropriate to seek that the tender(s) are split down the lines of key competencies, such as support provision, coordination of accommodation on behalf of support, coordination of voluntary sector (including the re-purposing agenda) on behalf of support, and learning/skills etc? So in each case there is only one door and centre of expertise? | We are considering how the Lots will be structured and seeking feedback from providers. |
| Although the accommodation coordination is a small piece, might it also include coordinating the development and planning of the required accommodation as well? And perhaps re-purposing existing accommodation if needed? And have access to some of the requisite budget? | Providers will have the opportunity to outline their approach in their bids. |
| At the present time there is no service architecture as such in the various documents, other than looking at what is in or out of spec overall. Could we ask that work is done to agree some outline service architecture, even it that gives big clues as to the tender lots, so that providers can begin to work out what the transition will look like? We know that something between the existing hostel system and Housing First is the goal, but how far and how fast is the key question. | The models are currently being developed and we will share information when it is available. We are planning market engagement events in February where we share more detail and invite further feedback. |
| Alternatively, could the bid be open to an Alliance framework, with specific high level and long term goals, and some clear waypoints, and tenders be based on competence and commitment to make the necessary changes, but with service re-design to be left to the successful bidder(s)? If this is done, some time will be needed for a consortium to be formed and negotiate the high level goals, and also the group would need to include some aspects of the services delivered by local authorities as well. | We will consider this as one of the procurement options. |
| Will those organisations who are submitting a tender be interviewed as part of the procurement process? | This has not yet been decided. All of the evaluation criteria, including any interviews or presentations will be published in the tender documents. |
| Will there be cross group lots  (i.e. adults and young people). For example, feedback in the soft market testing was that there should be HRS services for women which would cross adult and young people HRS services. | We are still considering lot structures, however, it is not likely that there will be a specific lot for women across services due to geography. |
| Would a successful provider be expected to work with current accommodation providers to use their facilities or look for additional properties? | Providers will need demonstrate how they will source any accommodation elements of their bid. |
| What guarantees would be needed to ensure additional accommodation will actually be available if needed? | The Council does not have any accommodation, hence this needs to be considered as part of bids. |
| What measures would be in place to ensure additional accommodation will be available within the timeframe and the expectations if not? | The evaluation process will consider the feasibility of bidders’ proposals, in particular the sourcing of accommodation. |