**Form of Tender**

*Scale of Fees*

Please provide your proposed contract fees for the first year 2024/25 of the agreement, acceptable annual increase not to exceed annual RPI. Specifications to the below to be found in ITT1.

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
| Kennelling Boarding charge for the first night including arranging veterinary visit if required (£ per dog/per night) |  |
| Kennelling Boarding charge for each subsequent night (£ per dog/per night) |  |
| Scanning for microchip and attempt to reunite dog with owner or attempt to rehome unclaimed dog (£ per dog) |  |
| Cost of euthanasia and disposal of dogs (£ per dog) |  |
| Cost of out of hours collection of dog from Police or member of the public (£ per hour/per collection) State any extra for bank holidays. |  |
| Cost of daytime collection (£ per hour/ per collection) |  |
| Cost of Bank Holiday collections(£ per hour/ per collection) |  |
| Total annual retainer charged to offer this service |  |

Full history to be kept of each case and be viewable on demand. The Council reserves the right to accept all or part of the above, such as accepting kennelling only or omitting the collection of dogs.

All prices quoted must be **excluding** VAT.

The below figures are taken from March 2023 to July 2024 over a 12 month period and they are historical figures and cannot be guaranteed for future years. An increase in the numbers is anticipated due to availability issues experienced from January 2024 and a best estimate is provided below.

|  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- |
| **Authority** | **Day time numbers** | **Out of hours numbers** | **Total number of dogs** |
| Current figures | 11 | 4 | 15 |
| Estimated increase | 10 | 6 | 16 |
| Total | 22 | 10 | 31 |

*Tender Questions*

1. Please provide evidence of employee competency, i.e. training certificates, evidence of CPD, summary of experience, competency or training such as Dog Legislation Officer training, experience of identifying banned breeds as defined in the Dangerous Dogs Act 1991 (as amended 1997), experience of microchipping or checking microchips.

|  |
| --- |
|  |

1. Please provide confirmation of planning permission, licensing, number of kennels available for the detention of stray dogs and whether exercising areas exist for detained dogs.

|  |
| --- |
|  |

1. Please explain how you would deliver the service through the course of the agreement, highlighting in particular how you would ensure contact and access to facilities available during the required times, and how roaming dogs would be transported to the kennels, how efforts would be made to rehome unclaimed dogs.

|  |
| --- |
|  |

1. Please provide example of Risk Assessments, safe systems of work and proof of insurance cover.

**Tender Scoring**

Completed submissions will be evaluated and scored to the following weightings:

Scale of Fees – 30%

Question 1 – 20%

Question 2 – 20%

Question 3 – 20%

Question 4 – 10%

Questions 1 – 4, will be scored in accordance with the Scoring Matrix below. As an example on Question 1, a score of 5 would obtain the full 20%, whereas a score of 3 would only obtain 12%.

**Scoring Matrix**

**Responses to Questions 2 - 5 will be scored in accordance with the table below and the criteria which most closely matches the quality of the response.**

|  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- |
| **Score** |  | **Definition**  |
| **5**(Very Good) | **COMPLETELY MEETS THE REQUIREMENT** The applicant’s proposal is comprehensive and demonstrates that they fully understand the requirement. They have supplied clear, detailed information and the evidence is unequivocal. The evaluation team is fully satisfied about the applicant’s ability to meet the detailed criteria.  |
| **4**(Good) | **MEETS THE REQUIREMENT** The applicant has demonstrated a good understanding of the requirement. The evidence is clear and convincing with minor reservation(s).  |
| **3**(Satisfactory) | **MOSTLY MEETS THE REQUIREMENT BUT FAILS IN PARTS** The applicant has demonstrated a reasonable understanding of the requirement in most areas with reservation in one key area. The evidence is fairly clear and convincing.  |
| **2**(Poor) | **MOSTLY FAILS TO MEET THE REQUIREMENT** In the majority of the key areas the evidence is unclear and unconvincing. The overall response casts doubt on the applicant’s ability to deliver the full requirement of the service.  |
| **1**(Very Poor) | **SIGNIFICANTLY FAILS TO MEET THE REQUIREMENT** In virtually all key areas, or in one of the major areas, there is a lack of convincing evidence which casts serious doubt about the applicant’s understanding of the requirement.  |
| **0**(No response or irrelevant response) | **TOTALLY FAILS TO MEET ANY OF THE REQUIREMENTS OR FAILS TO PROVIDE A RESPONSE** No response provided or totally fails to address the requirement. |

Each submission will be marked separately, by members of the evaluation panel. The answers will be evaluated based on the relevant responses to the specific questions asked. A moderation process will then be followed to arrive at a consensus score.