

**Bolsover District Council**

**Executive**

**30 November 2015**

**Central Control Procurement**

**Report of the Portfolio Holder for Housing and IT**

This report is public

**Purpose of the Report**

- To replace the alarm monitoring equipment used by Central Control.

**1 Report Details**

- 1.1 On 2<sup>nd</sup> November 2015 Executive considered a report from the Portfolio Holder for Housing and IT regarding Derbyshire Careline, and that Derbyshire County Council (DCC) were withdrawing their previous funding offer together with the impact of this on the proposed consortium.
- 1.2 Members had previously given the JAD Community Safety and Head of Housing delegated powers to enter into a contract with the preferred supplier of monitoring equipment; however this was conditional on an agreement with DCC being finalised. As this funding offer has now been withdrawn members gave the JAD Community Safety and Head of Housing delegated powers to negotiate with the preferred supplier, and for this to be reported back to members.
- 1.3 These negotiations have taken place and the system offered is priced at £54,742 with an annual maintenance and licensing cost from year 2 of £13,122. These costs are in accordance with those set out within the original tender process.
- 1.4 This price includes:
- The MAIN system consisting of: - 3 Calls handling workstation (with device licenses) and 8 Analogue telecoms channels.
  - The Disaster Recovery (DR) system consisting 1 Calls handling workstation device licenses and 4 Analogue telecoms channels.
  - All required computer workstations and server hardware.
  - All software (including all the standard software features/modules)
  - A new digital voice recorder, with 8 channels.
  - Installation and commissioning.
  - Project management.
  - Database migration.

- 3 days training.

1.5 The cost of this equipment can be met from an existing reserve which has been set aside for this purpose.

## **2 Conclusions and Reasons for Recommendation**

2.1 The existing equipment is at the end of its operational life and requires urgent replacement

## **3 Consultation and Equality Impact**

3.1 None directly

## **4 Alternative Options and Reasons for Rejection**

4.1 Officers considered the option of a retender, but came to the view that this was neither appropriate nor cost effective. As a result of the previous tender process Jontek had been identified as the most appropriate supplier on both price and quality terms.

## **5 Implications**

### **5.1 Finance and Risk Implications**

As covered in the report

### **5.2 Legal Implications including Data Protection**

None

### **5.3 Human Resources Implications**

None

## **6 Recommendations**

6.1 That the Jontek equipment as outlined in section 1.4 is purchased to enable the continued operation of the Central Control function. .

**7 Decision Information**

<b>Is the decision a Key Decision?</b> (A Key Decision is one which results in income or expenditure to the Council of £50,000 or more or which has a significant impact on two or more District wards)	No  The decision of 7 <sup>th</sup> September which agreed the budget was the key decision. This decision reports to Members the outcome of the procurement process.
<b>District Wards Affected</b>	All
<b>Links to Corporate Plan priorities or Policy Framework</b>	

**8 Document Information**

<b>Appendix No</b>	<b>Title</b>
<b>Background Papers</b> (These are unpublished works which have been relied on to a material extent when preparing the report. They must be listed in the section below. If the report is going to Cabinet (NEDDC) or Executive (BDC) you must provide copies of the background papers)	
Tenders received from potential as part of the procurement process together with the record of the outcome of the tender evaluation process.	
<b>Report Author</b>	<b>Contact Number</b>
Peter Campbell	

Report Reference –