**Query Log – 26 November 2020**

| **Date** | **Query** | **LC response** |
| --- | --- | --- |
| 20/11/20 | Has any evaluation been done on the programme to date and if so could you please share it’s outcomes? | A participants’ survey and evaluation of the last two cohorts of the programme is currently underway and cannot be shared at this time. |
| 20/11/20 | Would you be open to a delivery model that differed from the current solution? | The LLP Board and London Councils are open to proposals that take different approaches. All proposals will be evaluated against the criteria set out in the ITT. |
| 20/11/20 | Are any particular tools and methods used in the Development Centre or wider programme and if so, which ones and would you be open to changing this? | The Development Centre used in previous cohorts formed part of the previous contractor’s approach to the delivery of the programme. The LLP Board and London Councils would welcome proposals that take different approaches. |
| 20/11/20 | You mention requirement for ‘the development of an additional development package for Black, Asian and minority ethnic participants is also required to reflect the unique challenges they face in gaining senior leadership positions and allow those participants to share experiences and knowledge specific to their particular challenges.’ . Is this additional work to be delivered within the budget? | The work described is an integral part of the specification and as such is to be delivered within the price quoted.  Proposals should be clearly costed with any optional elements outlined separately for comparison during the evaluation process. |
| 20/11/20 | Is the budget for this work 30 x £2K per cohort + the GLA funding? Could you please share the value of the additional GLA funding? | As described the LLP has a working balance which comprises LGA grant and participants’ fees.  London Councils policy is not to provide a maximum budget to ensure value for money.  London Councils is open to proposals that are clearly costed and where optional elements are separately outlined for comparison during the evaluation process.  London Councils is not bound to accept the lowest quote, but rather London Councils intends to commission the most economically advantageous quote and reserves the right to accept or reject all or any part of any quote. |
| 20/11/20 | Has the continued involvement of the recruitment agencies who do the pro bono work been secured or will it be down to a new supplier to secure this? | No recruitment agencies have been secured for future cohorts of the programme. The successful bidder is required to secure these. |
| 20/11/20 | Are the recruitment agencies who have supported this work so far pre-determined? Are you open to new partners? | Bidders are free to source and include any partners of their choosing. |
| 20/11/20 | What is the formula/scoring matrix for the 20% of the total score relating to price? | The score for price takes the lowest cost bid and awards it a full 100 points which equates to a weighted score of 20. Each other bid is then awarded a pro rata score in relation to how much more expensive it is than the lowest cost bid. The lowest price is divided by the price of each bid and then multiplied by 100, giving the score out of 100. This is then converted to the weighted score as a percentage of 20. The table below shows how this works in practice.   |  |  |  |  | | --- | --- | --- | --- | |  | **Organisation 1** | **Organisation 2** | **Organisation 3** | | **Programme Development, Management, Delivery** | £100,000.00 | £150,000.00 | £200,000.00 | | **Expenses** |  |  |  | | **Other** |  |  |  | |  |  |  |  | | **Total Cost** | **£100,000.00** | **£150,000.00** | **£200,000.00** | | Score out of 100 | 100 | 67 | 50 | | **Weighted Score** | **20** | **13** | **10** | |