

Mark Edmunds

From: [REDACTED] ← Ronke Martins-Taylor
Sent: 04 July 2016 15:42
To: Mark Edmunds; Claire Belgard
Subject: RE: Evaluation outcome and comments ([REDACTED] (29th June 2016).xlsx
Attachments: FINal Evaluation Template [REDACTED] 30th June 2016).xlsx

Dear Mark and Claire

Please see the attached spreadsheet which contains the scoring for the evaluation of the contract to provide summer programme. As previously noted we have 4 organisations that we can work with that meet or surpass the 60% threshold:

- [REDACTED] - 73%
- [REDACTED] - 69%
- [REDACTED] - 66%
- [REDACTED] - 60%

You will note that your original individual scores differ from those on the spreadsheet; although the total percentages add up to those as set out in the list above. This has situation has arisen because I was advised on 27th June by Commissioning to score each question out of 5. I finally received the spreadsheet template for the evaluation on 30th June and discovered that scoring out of 5 did not apply to questions 7 and 8 which are scored on a different set of criteria. Our only other option was to either run the evaluation exercise all over again; or to ensure that the total score for each organisation matched the original scores that we gave. I have opted for the latter option.

Please note that you will still need to sign the front sheet of the attached spreadsheet so that it can be sent to commissioning. However, before you do this we have agreed that Mark is going to contact colleagues in the Police or [REDACTED] to find out if they have any intelligence on the above organisations before we proceed to award the contact.

Regards

Address: Tower Hamlets Town Hall, Mulberry Place, 5 Clove Crescent, London E14 2BG

From: Mark Edmunds
Sent: 04 July 2016 13:02
To: [REDACTED] ← Ronke Martins-Taylor
Cc: Claire Belgard
Subject: FW: Evaluation outcome and comments [REDACTED] (29th June 2016).xlsx
Importance: High

Hi Ronke

Poplar Papers PDF Bundle - 1054

Before I come up can you send me a copy of the individual panel member scores please?

Many thanks,

Mark

Ronke Martins-Taylor

From: Mark Edmunds

Sent: 30 June 2016 09:16

To: [REDACTED] Claire Belgard

Subject: RE: Evaluation outcome and comments [REDACTED] (29th June 2016).xlsx

Importance: High

Hi [REDACTED] and Claire,

Thanks for this. I have added a couple of comments relating to specific organisation in the spreadsheet attached.

In relation to the 60% threshold I believe you will need a rationale (if you have not thought of this already) – just in just it is challenged.

However, as discussed we will need to ensure the following prior to award:

- Site visit to all organisations prior to final decision.
- Clarification sent to successful bidders regarding the organisation being a sole provider – with no subcontracted arrangements (i.e. [REDACTED] and [REDACTED]).
- Written confirmation from the organisations that they had no contact or dealings with LBTH officers regarding the bid submitted (to refer to later if required).
- A list of all organisation staff and DBS and Risk Assessment details

Also, this process highlighted the importance of the DBS referrals (for those removed by the Council from regulatory activities) as there is a clear risk that previous YS employees could be employed by third sector organisations. May be Legal Services should advise on the position of pending DBS referrals to close the risk?

More generally, I suggest that in future it would be best to conduct a thorough review the organisations prior to the tender panel meeting to allow more detail to be considered.

Hope this assists.

Regards,

Mark

Ronke Martins-Taylor

From: [REDACTED]

Sent: 29 June 2016 18:42

To: Mark Edmunds; Claire Belgard

Subject: Evaluation outcome and comments [REDACTED] (29th June 2016).xlsx

Hello Claire and Mark

As promised please see the attached spreadsheet with comments including any additional information required of the organisations that bid and their scores.

I think that we have 4 organisations that we can work with that meet or surpass the 60% threshold:

- [REDACTED] - 73%

Poplar Papers PDF Bundle - 1055

- [REDACTED] - 69%
- [REDACTED] - 66%
- [REDACTED] - 60%

There is some additional information required, as set out in the comments, of the above organisations but nothing too serious.

If you want to add to the comments box in the spreadsheet then please do as you make have a different take on what I have written.

We have no submissions for the SE or the NE quadrant so, Claire, we will have to go to plan B and can discuss tomorrow.

Thank you both. It was good working with you today.

With regards



Address: Tower Hamlets Town Hall, Mulberry Place, 5 Clove Crescent, London E14 2BG

Mark Edmunds

From: Mark Edmunds
Sent: 12 July 2016 08:32
To: markedmunds[REDACTED].com; Kathy McTasney (kathymctasney[REDACTED]@aol.com)
Subject: FW: Formal Information Request
Importance: High

From: Mark Edmunds
Sent: 06 July 2016 13:59
To: [REDACTED] Claire Belgard
Subject: FW: Formal Information Request
Importance: High

Ronke/Claire

FYI.

Regards,

Mark

From: [REDACTED]
Sent: 06 July 2016 11:08
To: Mark Edmunds
Subject: RE: Formal Information Request
Importance: High

Dear Mark,

Apologies for the delay in responding however I have had difficulty in reaching the team as one is on leave and another on a course.

Today I have managed to speak to their manager, [REDACTED] but he was not actually at work today.

I asked as requested if any of the organisations below were of concern or known to [REDACTED] and the reasons for my request. I also stated that I appreciated that I do not have details of the persons working or involved in the organisations so I understood that this may not be a request that can ever be fully answered.

I read through the organisations and I will note below what was said.

1. [REDACTED] – The organisation in itself has not been raised as a concern and has also been funded by Prevent. Of course as I have not given any names of individuals in the organisation (as not available to me) then further checks could not be made.
2. [REDACTED] – Name of organisation not known
3. [REDACTED] – Name of organisation not known
4. [REDACTED] – Name of organisation not known

It should be noted that [REDACTED] had no access to police indices to check the information as given and his colleagues were away from the office. [REDACTED] made it clear that there was not enough detail within the request as a whole,

Poplar Papers PDF Bundle - 1058

for example there could be Intel on an individual who may be within any of the said organisations however, there is no means of checking without having full information and access to the Police database, he himself does not receive and review every piece of intelligence received.

██████ did say that he was back in the office tomorrow and would try to ask one of his staff to make contact today (if he is able as on a course), but again without names etc., it's not something that could be properly checked.

I don't believe we have any further details of the persons who will be delivering the work so it really would not be possible to get a definitive answer anyway.

Hope this is of use and if I hear anything else today then I will tell you immediately.

Regards
Lorraine

From: Mark Edmunds
Sent: 04 July 2016 16:09
To: ██████
Subject: Formal Information Request
Importance: High

Ronke Martins-
Taylor

Hi ██████

I've met with ██████ and Claire and explained the fluidity of the organisations and personnel which we have investigated over the last couple of years. I also explained that we have reported a number of organisations to the MPS ██████ which we were concerned about.

Therefore, they have agreed not to proceed with the commissioning of the Summer Programme until we have clarity that the below organisations are not prescribed as being of concern to the MPS.

As such, could you assist and ask the local MPS ██████ officers to provide a formal view on the four listed organisations below please:

- ██████
- ██████
- ██████
- ██████

Could you ask that they turn it around quickly due to the commissioning timetable governed by the need to procure before the school summer holidays.

Many thanks,

Mark

Mark Edmunds

From: Mark Edmunds
Sent: 27 February 2017 09:50
To: [REDACTED]
Subject: FW: Documents relating to the Evaluation Panel for the Summer 2016 Youth programme

Ronke Martins-Taylor

[REDACTED]

FYA – regarding item 2 (RED text) below:

As discussed, I was informed by [REDACTED] (on 6th July 2016) via verbal communication that my signature was not required. This was communicated in the presence of Claire Belgard.

Regards,

Mark.

Ronke Martins-Taylor

From: [REDACTED]
Sent: 23 February 2017 16:35
To: Mark Edmunds
Subject: Documents relating to the Evaluation Panel for the Summer 2016 Youth programme

Hello Mark

Thank you for your time today.

The additional email trails that we discussed which you suggested that you may be able to locate are as follows:

- Additional emails in a chain beginning on 5 July 2016, entitled “URGENT: Update on potential providers” between yourself and [REDACTED] copying in Claire Belgard;
- An email (possibly from [REDACTED]) saying that your signature was no longer required on the evaluation panel scoring form; and
- Possibly an email discussing the averaging of the scores included in the evaluation matrix.

Kind regards

Mark Edmunds

From: Mark Edmunds
Sent: 27 February 2017 10:55
To: [REDACTED]
Subject: FW: Evaluation outcome and comments ([REDACTED]) (29th June 2016).xlsx
Attachments: FINal Evaluation Template ([REDACTED] 30th June 2016).xlsx

Ronke Martins-Taylor

[REDACTED]

FYA – regarding item 3 (RED text) below:

Emails show me requesting (4th July 2016) the individual panel scores from [REDACTED] and her response (4th July 2016) confirming my scores had been changed from those I gave at the panel without a moderation meeting or any discussion.

Please note that I gave a number of relatively low scores which was commented on at the panel. These are not reflected in the scores provided in the spreadsheet.

Regards,

Mark.

From: [REDACTED]
Sent: 23 February 2017 16:35
To: Mark Edmunds
Subject: Documents relating to the Evaluation Panel for the Summer 2016 Youth programme

Hello Mark

Thank you for your time today.

The additional email trails that we discussed which you suggested that you may be able to locate are as follows:

- Additional emails in a chain beginning on 5 July 2016, entitled “URGENT: Update on potential providers” between yourself and [REDACTED], copying in Claire Belgard;
- An email (possibly from [REDACTED]) saying that your signature was no longer required on the evaluation panel scoring form; and
- Possibly an email discussing the averaging of the scores included in the evaluation matrix.

SUPPLIER NAME:

Evaluator 2 -
Claire BelgardEvaluator 1
Ronke Martins-
TaylorEvaluator 3 -
Mark Edmunds

SCORING TABLE	
0	No Response
1	Completely fails to address the requirement (Poor)
2	Unsatisfactory response to the requirement (Weak)
3	Generally addresses the requirement - some omissions (Fair)
4	Substantially addresses all the requirement (Good)
5	Response is over and above the requirements (Excellent)

Question		Criteria Weighting	Max Score for question	NOTES if available	Evaluator 1 Score	Evaluator 2 Score	Evaluator 3 Score	Average	Total Weighting	Feedback	
Section A	Skills, knowledge and experience	35.00%							21.00%	Noted strengths	Noted weaknesses
A1	Please provide details of your organisation's experience of working with young people aged 13 – 19 (and up to age 25 if the young person has a disability) in the provision of positive activity based programmes	10.00%	5		3	3	3	3.00	6.00%	Gave good example of work with Somali boys	No ages specified for young people that they would work with. Did not highlight activities for young girls
A2	How will you ensure that the Summer Programme provides both leisure activities and informal education opportunities to a wide selection of young people; and that the activities are held within each of the wards within the quadrant?	15.00%	5		3	3	3	3.00	9.00%	Good range of activities listed	No ages specified for young people that they would work with
A3	Please explain how you will ensure that the Summer Programme is inclusive facilitating access to a diverse range of young people. Include in your answer how you would ensure publication of the Summer Programme to young people.	10.00%	5		3	3	3	3.00	6.00%	Outline plan provided	Lack of detail and no recognition of challenges
Section B	Managing quality standards	30.00%							16.67%		
B1	Please provide a copy of your organisation's safeguarding policies and procedures. Tell us about how these are applied in your organisation and how you would apply these policies and procedures for the Summer Programme that you would be delivering.	10.00%	5		2	2	2	2.00	4.00%	N/a	Mentions CRB rather than DBS checks; and organisations safeguarding policy not included
B2	Please describe your feedback and complaints policy and procedure, including how you will ensure that young people and their parents/carers know what to do if they wish to provide feedback or make a complaint.	10.00%	5		3	4	3	3.33	6.67%	Outline complaints procedure in place	No mention of complaint escalation
B3	Please explain how you will ensure that young people's details are uploaded to the web based IYSS Management Information System.	10.00%	5		3	3	3	3.00	6.00%	One worker trained	Did not indicate where they would get their additional support from
Section C	Community Benefits	5.00%							5.00%		
C1	The Council works in accordance with the Localism Act and are strong advocates for supporting local businesses and local jobs for local people. please explain your best previous experience/ examples that demonstrate your ability to support us with our aims The Council is committed to improving the local community not only through physical improvements but also through social engagement such as apprentices, new jobs and sponsorships. Please provide specific examples of where you have provided equivalent benefits for your clients and a proposal of how you will deliver this in line with this contract.	5.00%	5		5	5	5	5.00	5.00%	Indication of employment and volunteering opportunities through [REDACTED] Good indication of work on the borough's youth consultation	N/a
TOTAL QUALITY SCORE		70.00%							42.67%		
Section D	PRICE								7.61%		
S1	Annual total cost	30.00%			£14,116.00				7.61%		
TOTAL PRICE SCORE		30.00%							7.61%		
OVERALL SCORE		100.00%							50.28%		