**Rochford District Council**

**Advice Services Tender clarification 2**

Please see below some clarification questions we have received -

1. **Outcomes**

We have concerns regarding the proportionality and practicalities of *measuring* a number of the indicators relating to the outcomes *within the budget envelope* including the knock on impact in delivery capacity and resource.

We believe that these measures have mostly been based on reporting criteria from Essex County Council.

Are we correct in thinking that these measures have now been superseded (by Essex County Council)?

Can you please outline your rationale for the measures?

Can you confirm that there will be room for negotiation for the successful provider to ensure that the final outcome measures are effective in evidencing progress but also proportionate and represent the best value for money as required by the specification?

The reporting criteria has been developed by Rochford District Council as the lead funding body. Essex County Council has agreed that the measures outlined in the specification will satisfy their requirements.

There is an expectation that the new provider will seek additional funding to deliver the service – one of the stated key principles outlined in the specification is to **Maximise the opportunities for securing external funding**

The measures are designed to evidence the work that the new provider undertakes against the stated outcomes. We are conscious that different providers may have varying levels of reporting capability. If there are concerns about proportionality and practicalities then there is room for negotiation prior to the start of the contract.

1. **Outcomes (specialist focus)**

This tender document relates to the general advice service.  However, some of the outcomes can be interpreted as relating to specialist casework e.g. *Reduce Homelessness as a result of interventions made to support people at risk of becoming homeless.*

As above, can you confirm that there will be room for negotiation for the successful provider to ensure that the final outcome measures are effective in evidencing progress with a focus on generalist advice?

Yes there is room for negotiation

1. **Scoring methodology**

As indicated in the specification it is a requirement to provide a response to demonstrate how the outcomes indicated in the outcomes table will be met. As it forms part of the overall response how will this area be assessed in relation to the current scoring breakdown? (As indicated in the previous clarification response covering Q1 through to Q7?)

In addition, what are the word/page limit parameters for the outcomes response?

The individual questions will maintain their weightings, however there will be an overall weighting of 70% for the Questions and 30% for the Outcomes

1. **Pricing Funding from ECC – Section 6**

Can you confirm that the money provided by ECC will be the amount stipulated during year one of the contract? (2016/17) Are the objectives to that element of funding also confirmed as part of the proposed contract?

RDC and ECC have jointly agreed the stated objectives, outcomes and measures in the specification. The objectives relate to the funding package as a whole, not as independent elements.

1. **Education (including meeting literacy needs) specification requirement**

Can you please clarify what the expectation is around the type and level of support needed here?

Providing general help to residents in accessing specific education / literacy courses or additional support in relation to their needs.

This requirement appears in the current CAB SLA so a continuation of current provision would be desirable, should the CAB be the successful future provider.