

# MUNICIPAL YEAR 2010/2011 REPORT NO. 144

**MEETING TITLE AND DATE:****Cabinet:-****15 December 2010****REPORT OF:**Acting Director of Place  
Shaping and Enterprise

Contact officer and telephone number:

Stuart Simper (x3032)

E mail: [stuart.simper@enfield.gov.uk](mailto:stuart.simper@enfield.gov.uk)**Agenda – Part: 1****Item: 13****Subject: – Security Staffing and Mobile  
Response Contract - tender acceptance  
report**  
**Wards: All****Cabinet Member consulted: Cllr. Andrew  
Stafford**

## 1. EXECUTIVE SUMMARY

- 1.1 Legion Security Ltd provides security services at nine Council properties under the existing contract that commenced in October 2003. This contract has been extended in three stages, to 30 June 2009, to 31 March 2010 and finally until 31 December 2010, whilst the full re-tender took place.

## 2. RECOMMENDATIONS

- 2.1 To authorise a new contract for a period of three years with an option to extend for a further two years with the successful tenderer, Advance, to commence on 25 January 2011. Please also see Part Two.

## 3. BACKGROUND

- 3.1 With effect from October 2003, manned building security has been provided under the term of the existing contract at the following nine Council occupied buildings by Legion Security Ltd (Legion): Carterhatch Depot, Charles Babbage House, Civic Centre, Edmonton Centre, Enfield Homes, Gentleman's Row, John Wilkes House, Thomas Hardy House and Triangle House.

3.2 The existing contract:

- Includes provision of premises mobile alarm response officers and the use of an existing Council vehicle out of hours
- Excludes any ad-hoc requests that may arise

3.3 A site, (The BIC), is not included in the existing contract, so has been included in the re-tender process. Charles Babbage House is not now included in the tender as a Risk Assessment found that the site was safe using the existing on-site Porter, with back-up only as required.

3.4 The terms of the new contract will include:

- Supply of security officers at some LBE properties.
- Supply of two “out of hours” premises mobile alarm response officers and a Council vehicle.
- Flexibility that enables the Council to vary the number of buildings covered by the contract. If the number of buildings is reduced, the hours worked by security guards will be reduced and the cost to the Council will be reduced accordingly.

3.5 Eight companies submitted tender bids. The scoring was on a 40% quality and a 60% cost basis. The quality scoring was based on:

- Relevant expertise for the assignment,
- Capacity and resources to support the contract,
- Provision and evaluation of management performance information,
- Delivery of improvement to services required within the specification.

#### **4. ALTERNATIVE OPTIONS CONSIDERED**

4.1 No provision or reduced provision, of security guards.

- May result with increased risk to Council employees, services and property
- During the re-tender process, consideration was being given to the use of increased technology and a saving has been made. (please see Part Two for savings).

4.2 Security guards employed directly by the Council, for one or more buildings.

- This was reviewed within the re-tender process but has proved to be more expensive. (please see Part Two)

## **5. REASONS FOR RECOMMENDATIONS**

- 5.1 To maintain or improve current service levels
- 5.2 To provide a value for money security staffing function for the buildings.

## **6. COMMENTS OF THE DIRECTOR OF FINANCE AND CORPORATE RESOURCES AND OTHER DEPARTMENTS**

### **6.1 Financial Implications**

Please see Part Two.

### **6.2 Legal Implications**

In awarding a contract, the Council must carry out a competitive procurement exercise in full compliance with UK and EU law and the Council's Constitution, in particular the Contract Procedure Rules. The procurement must be robust, transparent and fair to identify the providers that best meet the Council's needs/priorities for the service.

The legal department has been advised that the services to be procured are valued at approximately £600,000 and therefore are above current EU threshold requirements. However the services are classified as Part B Services under the Public Contracts Regulations 2006. As such, although the full rigour of the Regulations do not apply, the Council must still ensure compliance with certain requirements of the Public Contract Regulations including, but not limited to, requirements relating to technical specifications in the tender documents, contract award notices, statistical and other reports, provision of reports and publication of notices. The Council must further ensure compliance with overriding EU Treaty principles of transparency, equality, proportionality and non-discrimination throughout the process.

Where applicable, the Council must consider carrying out equality impact assessments.

The Council has an overriding duty to ensure value for money in accordance with Best Value principles under the Local Government Act 1999.

The process for taking Key Decisions must also be followed as the anticipated total expenditure under the agreement is to exceed £250,000.

Also refer to the comments in Part Two.

### **6.3 Property Implications**

As stated in the body of this report

## **7. KEY RISKS**

- (a) The risk of not having security guards would be unacceptable. It is noted that there will be no cover in place at Charles Babbage House but that a risk assessment has concluded that the site is safe using the existing on-site porter with back up only as required.
- (b) There is potential for additional financial savings in the duration of the contract given additional decanting of staff.

## **8. IMPACT ON COUNCIL PRIORITIES**

### **8.1 Fairness for All**

None.

### **8.2 Growth and Sustainability**

None.

### **8.3 Strong Communities**

None.

## **9. PERFORMANCE MANAGEMENT IMPLICATIONS**

None

## **10. HEALTH AND SAFETY IMPLICATIONS**

The employer has a duty of care towards his employees and others that may be affected by our work. No provision or a reduced provision of Security Guards may result in the increase risk to the Council, based on a risk management approach.

## **Background Papers**

Cabinet Report 24 March 2010