LIST No. 13 (12/34/16-17).

1) Reason why decision is being called in:

See Attached.

2) Outline of proposed alternative action:

See Attached

3) Do you believe the decision is outside the policy framework?

See Attached

(3) If **Yes**, give reasons: n/a

For DST USE ONLY:

Checked by Monitoring Officer for validation –

Name of Monitoring Officer: Date:

Asmat Hussain 31/10/2016

(1) Reason why decision is being called in:

a) Contract Procedure Rules of the Council stipulate that for contracts over £500,000 at least five quotations must be obtained. Also at least two of these quotations must be from local firms. The report did not clarify whether two of the bidders were local firms or not. If there were no local bidders the report should have given reasons why this was the case to conform with the Contract Procedure Rules of the council.

On this occasion five contractors were invited to submit tenders. However two pulled out and one was declined due to incorrect submission. That left just two bidders, one bidder scored significantly higher on price and lower on quality and the other, higher on quality but lower on price.

Also it has been highlighted that there were potential anomalies with regards to conversations taking place on London Tenders Portal between Corporate Maintenance and Construction Team and one of the bidders.

In light of the above, it is highly likely that Enfield council tax payers will take the view that the tendering process did not achieve value for money, as competitive tendering is supposed to do.

b) Enfield Council has a statutory duty to provide comprehensive and efficient library services for all persons desiring to make use of Enfield's Libraries. This proposal reduces the floor space available for the library service by 75%. The report did not demonstrate that with this level of reduction the council will continue to provide a comprehensive library service from these premises.

c) The proposed inclusion of a Sexual Health Clinic alongside a Children's Library does not take into account any sensitivity toward the users of both services.

(2) **Outline of proposed alternative action**

The decision to be referred back to Cabinet for reconsideration with a request that:

- due to an insufficient response from invited bidders and the potential anomalies highlighted during the tendering process, a new tendering process is initiated; and
- the new configuration proposed for the library be backed up with more detailed information in order to demonstrate that the new lay out is not going to be detrimental to the library and a comprehensive library service will be provided for residents from these premises.

(3) Do you believe the decision is outside the policy framework?

No

(4) If **yes give reasons:** N/A

FOR DST USE ONLY:

Checked by Proper Officer for validation –

Name of Proper Officer: Date: