

This is a published notice on the Find a Tender service: <https://www.find-tender.service.gov.uk/Notice/013556-2024>

Contract

## **SCC APC Individual Placement and Support (Most Suitable Provider Process)**

Surrey County Council

F03: Contract award notice

Notice identifier: 2024/S 000-013556

Procurement identifier (OCID): ocds-h6vhtk-045553

Published 26 April 2024, 10:49am

### **Section I: Contracting authority**

#### **I.1) Name and addresses**

Surrey County Council

Woodhatch Place, 11 Cockshot Hill

REIGATE

RH28EF

#### **Contact**

Andrew Clarke

#### **Email**

[andrew.clarke@surreycc.gov.uk](mailto:andrew.clarke@surreycc.gov.uk)

#### **Country**

United Kingdom

#### **Region code**

UKJ2 - Surrey, East and West Sussex

**Justification for not providing organisation identifier**

Not on any register

**Internet address(es)**

Main address

<https://www.surreycc.gov.uk/>

**I.4) Type of the contracting authority**

Regional or local authority

**I.5) Main activity**

General public services

---

## **Section II: Object**

### **II.1) Scope of the procurement**

#### **II.1.1) Title**

SCC APC Individual Placement and Support (Most Suitable Provider Process)

Reference number

DN2595

#### **II.1.2) Main CPV code**

- 85312500 - Rehabilitation services

#### **II.1.3) Type of contract**

Services

#### **II.1.4) Short description**

Surrey County Council has been awarded funding for two years (2024/25 - 2025/26) for the delivery of an Individual Placement and Support Service, available to those who are:

- in structured treatment for drug and/or alcohol use, and
- of working age.

#### **II.1.6) Information about lots**

This contract is divided into lots: No

#### **II.1.7) Total value of the procurement (excluding VAT)**

Value excluding VAT: £522,016

### **II.2) Description**

#### **II.2.3) Place of performance**

NUTS codes

- UKJ2 - Surrey, East and West Sussex

#### **II.2.4) Description of the procurement**

Surrey County Council are seeking a provider to deliver the IPS model across the county of Surrey for two years.

The population of Surrey is 1,205,616 according to mid-2021 population figures published by the ONS. Surrey's population growth rate between mid-2020 and mid-2021 was 0.3% per year. The working age population was 761,201 (ONS 2019).

Surrey covers an area of 1,663 square kilometres (642 square miles) and has a population density of 725 people per square kilometre (km<sup>2</sup>), based on the latest population estimates taken in mid-2021.

According to the latest 2021 census, the population in Surrey is predominantly white (85%), with non-white minorities representing the remaining 15% of the population.

The median average age in Surrey in 2021 was 42.2, with over 18s representing 82.1% of the population. The sex ratio was 95.3 males to every 100 females.

In 2021, the urban population of Surrey was approximately 980,249 (87%), while the rural population was around 152,141 (13%).

English is spoken as the main language by 93.1% of people in Surrey, and spoken either well or very well by 6% of the population. 0.7% reported having poor English language skills, and the remaining 0.1% spoke no English at all.

In 2023/24, 3718 adults engaged in structured treatment.

This notice is an intention to award a contract under the most suitable provider process.

The approximate lifetime value of the Contract is £522,016.00

This is a new service

This is a new provider

The services will be provided from 09/05/2024 to 08/05/2026

#### **II.2.5) Award criteria**

Price

#### **II.2.11) Information about options**

Options: No

---

## **Section IV. Procedure**

### **IV.1) Description**

#### **IV.1.1) Type of procedure**

Award of a contract without prior publication of a call for competition in the cases listed below

- The procurement falls outside the scope of application of the regulations

Explanation:

This is a Provider Selection Regime (PSR) intention to award notice. The awarding of this contract is subject to the Health Care Services (Provider Selection Regime) Regulations 2023. For the avoidance of doubt, the provisions of the Public Contracts Regulations 2015 do not apply to this award. The publication of this notice marks the start of the standstill period. Representations by providers must be made to decision makers by Midnight (00:00) on 08 May 2024. This contract has not yet formally been awarded; this notice serves as an intention to award under the PSR

#### **IV.1.8) Information about the Government Procurement Agreement (GPA)**

The procurement is covered by the Government Procurement Agreement: Yes

---

## **Section V. Award of contract**

A contract/lot is awarded: Yes

### **V.2) Award of contract**

#### **V.2.1) Date of conclusion of the contract**

28 March 2024

#### **V.2.2) Information about tenders**

Number of tenders received: 2

The contract has been awarded to a group of economic operators: No

#### **V.2.3) Name and address of the contractor**

Westminster Drug Project

18 Dartmouth Street

London

SW1H 9BL

Country

United Kingdom

NUTS code

- UKJ2 - Surrey, East and West Sussex

Charity Commission (England and Wales)

1031602

The contractor is an SME

No

**V.2.4) Information on value of contract/lot (excluding VAT)**

Initial estimated total value of the contract/lot: £522,016

Total value of the contract/lot: £522,016

---

## Section VI. Complementary information

### VI.3) Additional information

This is a Provider Selection Regime (PSR) intention to award notice. The awarding of this contract is subject to the Health Care Services (Provider Selection Regime) Regulations 2023. For the avoidance of doubt, the provisions of the Public Contracts Regulations 2015 do not apply to this award. The publication of this notice marks the start of the standstill period. Representations by providers must be made to the relevant authority by Midnight (00:00) on 08 May 2024 . This contract has not yet formally been awarded; this notice serves as an intention to award under the PSR

key criteria 1. Quality and Innovation - Maximum Score (%) 20.00

Relative authorities must give due consideration to how well providers are able to deliver high quality care when deciding who to arrange services with.

Relevant authorities must ensure they assess the extent to which an arrangement with a provider could generate new and significant improvements in the promotion and adoption of proven innovations in care delivery.

key criteria 2. Value - Maximum Score (%) 20.00

Relevant authorities must give due consideration to the value offered by a service, in terms of the balance of costs, overall benefits and the financial implications of an arrangement.

key criteria 3. Integration, collaboration and service sustainability - Maximum Score (%) 20.00

Relevant authorities must consider the extent to which their decisions are consistent with local and national NHS plans and the importance of services being provided in an integrated and collaborative way, and in a way that improves health outcomes and in a way that seeks to secure the stability of good quality health care services or service continuity of health care services.

key criteria 4. Improving Access, reducing health inequalities and facilitating choice - Maximum Score (%) 20.00

Relevant authorities must consider the importance of accessibility to services and treatments for all eligible patients, the need to tackle health inequalities and the importance of ensuring that patients have choice in respect of their health care.

key criteria 5. Social Value - Maximum Score (%) 20.00

Relevant authorities must consider whether what is proposed might improve economic, social, and environmental well-being of the area relevant to an arrangement.

Rationale for choosing the provider with reference to the key criteria:

key criteria 1. Quality and Innovation

Very good response which provided an explanation about co-location venues, working with partners. The timeline provided an explanation about commencing immediately with the delivery of the IPS service being delivered as part of this timeline. Each stage of the timeline demonstrated what would occur at each stage.

key criteria 2. Value

Very good response which provided detail of experience relating to the County of Surrey. Outreach co-location was provided within the response. Other areas explained were travel vouchers. The response demonstrated existing knowledge and practice of hard-to-reach locations within the County of Surrey. The response provided a very good explanation of preparation with existing partners. The response provided an explanation of the understanding of Surrey's support and treatment systems.

key criteria 3. Integration, collaboration and service sustainability

A very good response providing a focus on the workforce delivering the IPS service. The response provided an explanation about co-location. The response provided was within the financial envelope available for this two-year contract. Evidence was provided with offering the maximum FTE required.

key criteria 4. Improving Access, reducing health inequalities and facilitating choice

A very good response providing an explanation about collaboration of the IPS treatment provider. The response demonstrated additional value and added value for individuals and delivery of treatment. Existing partner relationships was explained which provided an understanding of relationships. The response provided an explanation about data and how this will provide evidence for reporting and reporting mechanisms for sharing this information. The response spoke about a DPIA aligned to care plans. The response spoke about training for staff delivering the IPS service.

key criteria 5. Social Value

A very good response which spoke about staff retention and being aware of team cohesion. The response spoke about carrying out benchmarking of salaries. The



response spoke about experience of working in a similar sized County. The response identified similar locations where this service had been provided elsewhere. The response spoke about the delivery being explored and how it would be applied. The response spoke about challenges and solutions providing examples of this. The response spoke about individuals who are homeless and how to reduce the risk for them. The response spoke about hard-to-reach locations.

This was a very good response. Providing a clear break down of social value. The response provided examples of social value. The response spoke about exciting networks which include recovery cafes, women cafes and a capital card, which provides rewards to individuals as part of their treatment. Explaining that everything within the card is locally sourced. The response spoke about fund raising as part of social value delivery. The response also spoke about existing social value in Surrey and other areas too.

## **VI.4) Procedures for review**

### **VI.4.1) Review body**

High Court of England and Wales

London

Country

United Kingdom