Meeting:	Executive
Date:	15 September 2009
Subject:	Dog Warden and Pest Control Services
Report of:	Cllr David McVicar - Portfolio Holder for Stronger and Safer Communities
Summary:	The report requests the Executive to award the Dog Warden and Pest Control Services Contract.

Gary Alderson, Director of Sustainable Communities
Steve Whittaker, Assistant Director - Waste
Public
ALL
Executive
Yes
Expiration of existing contracts on 25 October 2009.

## **RECOMMENDATIONS:**

That the Executive award the contract for Dog Warden and Pest Control Services to Tenderer B

Reason for	Part I, Section 5 of the Constitution states that any contract with a
Recommendations:	value in excess of £200,000 shall be awarded by the Executive. That, following full evaluation, Tender B represents best value for
	the Council. This will be funded from the £181,000 existing
	approved revenue budget for Dog and Pest Control within the
	Sustainable Communities Directorate.

### 1. Background

1.1 The Prevention of Damage by Pests Act 1949 imposes a statutory duty on Local Authorities to take such steps as are reasonably practicable to keep their district free from rats and mice. Where vermin are found on privatelyowned land or premises, it is the responsibility of the owner to deal with them. However, it is possible for the Local Authority to carry out the work and recharge the costs to the landowner.

- 1.2 The Environmental Protection Act 1990 imposes a duty on the Local Authority and the Police to nominate a person to deal with Stray Dogs and the Local Authority has a duty to seize straying dogs in a public place.
- 1.3 In 2005 the Clean Neighbourhoods and Environment Act 2005, terminated the responsibility of the police with regard to the above duty and this responsibility transferred wholly to Local Authorities with effect from April 2006.

### 2. Current position and environment

- 2.1 These services are currently being provided through three separate contracts. These contracts were extended last year to be co-terminus and currently expire on 25 October 2009.
- 2.2 These services have been tendered as a single contract for three years with a one year extension.
- 2.3 As the combined contract will now be in excess of the European Union threshold of £139,893, it has been tendered in accordance with The Public Contract Regulations 2006, and the Council's Financial Regulations using the full Official Journal of the European Union open procedure.

### 3. Evaluation Summary

- 3.1 Seven companies initially expressed an interest in this contract and ter documents were despatched to all interested parties with three returning comple submissions.
- 3.2 Evaluation was carried out using pre-determined quality and cost criteria. Qualissues included statements of the contractors environmental and health and sa standards together with an operational plan of how they intend to carry out the w Cost comparison was based on a specimen schedule of quantities. Members will aware that actual levels of demand fluctuates between seasons and clim conditions.

### Tenderer A

- 3.3 This operational plan and resources only allowed for a single dog warden operat where section 1.8 of the specification documents states:
- 3.4 'The minimum resource provision shall be two qualified and experienced operations suitably equipped and with adequate resources to carry out the specified duties regard to Dog Warden Services and such resources to adequately cover the provide the control requirements'.
- 3.5 Although it was considered that the requirements of the brief were not fully met, tenderer was given an opportunity to recheck his submission on this single is and subsequently revised the price for this item.

### Tenderer B

- 3.6 The submission initially appeared to be qualified with regard to the provision of out of hours services and administrative resources required to adequately discharge the specification with regard to work-flow of service requests to and from the Council's contact centre.
- 3.7 The Tenderer has subsequently clarified that the tendered price has no hidden costs and out of hours work and the administrative functions are included in the total price.

### Tenderer C

3.8 The submission was accepted and the evaluation team found that the operatic plan had taken careful consideration of the specification and, combined with lo knowledge, were able to produce an operational plan which in the opinion of evaluation team was satisfactory for the quality of service required.

3.10	Contract Evaluation	Contract Weighting	A	В	С
		60.0%	46.43	49.30	54.52
	Financial Evaluation	40.0%	30.22	40.00	35.25
	Total Points Awarded	100%	76.65	89.30	89.77

### 3.11 **Financial Evaluations**

Using the specimen quantities given in the Schedule of Rates the tendered total costs were:-

Tenderer A	- £167,436.00 pa	ł
Tenderer B	- £126,517.50 pa	ł
Tenderer C	- £143,549.00 pa	ł

All the tenders are within the current budget for these services.

## 4. Conclusion and Next Steps

The evaluation process is points based and Members will see in the table above that Tenderers B and C were very close with Tenderer C being ahead by a small margin. However, the difference in cost is around £17,000 p.a. which, in the opinion of officers, is of sufficient significance to recommend that Tenderer B is awarded the contract.

# **CORPORATE IMPLICATIONS**

### **Council Priorities:**

To create safer communities.

## Financial:

This will be funded from the £181,000 existing approved revenue budget for Dog and Pest Control within the Sustainable Communities Directorate **Legal:** 

N/A

## **Risk Management:**

N/A

Staffing (including Trades Unions):

N/A

# Equalities/Human Rights:

N/A

# Community Safety:

Promoting responsible dog ownership and public protection from pests.

## Sustainability:

N/A

## Appendices: None

Background Papers (open to public inspection): None