

CONTRACT SCRUTINY COMMITTEE AGENDA



Tuesday 29th June 2010

at 10.00 am

in Committee Room A

MEMBERS: CONTRACT SCRUTINY COMMITTEE:

Councillors Aiken, Ingham, Lawton, London, Maness, Richardson, Simmons, Sutheran and Wells

1. APOLOGIES FOR ABSENCE

2. TO RECEIVE ANY DECLARATIONS OF INTEREST BY MEMBERS

3. MINUTES

3.1 To confirm the minutes of the meeting held on 14th June 2010

4. ITEMS FOR INFORMATION

4.1 Provision of Domiciliary Care Services – *Director of Child and Adult Services*

4.2 Contract for the Provision of Care and Support Services in Extra Care Housing Settings – *Director of Child and Adult Services*

5. ANY OTHER ITEMS WHICH THE CHAIRMAN CONSIDERS ARE URGENT

CONTRACT SCRUTINY COMMITTEE

MINUTES AND DECISION RECORD

14th June 2010

The meeting commenced at 11.00 a.m. in the Civic Centre, Hartlepool

PRESENT: Councillor Frances London (In the Chair);
Councillors Martyn Aiken, Peter Ingham, Trisha Lawton,
Sarah Maness, Carl Richardson, Chris Simmons, Lilian
Sutheran and Ray Wells

OFFICERS: Brian Ayre, Commissioned Services Manager
Dennis Hancock, Senior Engineer (Environmental Issues)
Chris Walker, Senior Legal Assistant
Kate Wachorn, Commercial Solicitor
Jo Wilson, Democratic Services Officer
Jess Coulson, Modern Apprentice

1. Apologies for Absence

None

2. Declarations of Interest

None

3. Minutes of the meeting held on 17 May 2010

Approved

4. Provision for Specialist Domiciliary Care and Support for Adults with Learning Disabilities – Tender Opening *(Strategic Commissioner, Working Age Adults)*

The Commissioned Services Manager provided an update on the delayed tender opening for Contract 436 Provision of Specialist Domiciliary Care and Support for Adults with Learning Disabilities). Members were advised that tenders were originally due to have been opened at the previous meeting however for legal reasons relating to the TUPE regulations 2006 the deadline for submissions was extended and all interested parties offered the opportunity to resubmit their bid in whole or in part. Legal approval had been given for this course of action.

Decision

That the report be noted

5. Local Government Access to Information

Under Section 100 (A)(4) of the Local Government Act 1972, the press and public were excluded from the meeting for the following items of business on the grounds that it convolved the likely disclosure of exempt information as defined in paragraph 3 of Part 1 of the Schedule 12A of the Local Government Act 1972 as amended by the Local Government (Access to Information)(Variation) order 2006

Minute 6 – Provision for Specialist Domiciliary Care for Adults with Learning Disabilities (Contract Reference Number 436) – para 3 information relating to the financial or business affairs of any particular person (Including the Authority holding that information)

Minute 7 – Mental Health Moving Forward Services (Contract Reference Number 434) - para 3 information relating to the financial or business affairs of any particular person (Including the Authority holding that information)

Minute 8 – Demolition of Crown House (Contract Reference number 450) – Para 3 information relating to the financial or business affairs of any particular person (including the Authority holding that information)

Minute 9 – Review of Strategy Study (Contract Reference number 342) – Para 3 information relating to the financial or business affairs of any particular person (including the Authority holding that information)

6. Provision for Specialist Domiciliary Care for Adults with Learning Disabilities (Contract Reference Number 436) Para 3 *(Commissioned Services Manager)*

Eleven tender envelopes had been received in respect of this contract and these were opened in the presence of the Committee.

Decision

That the opening of the tenders be noted

7. Mental Health Moving Forward Services (Contract Reference Number 434) Para 3 *(Commissioning Officer)*

Six tender envelopes had been received in respect of this contract and these were opened in the presence of the Committee.

Decision

That the opening of the tenders be noted

8. Demolition of Crown House (Contract Reference Number 450) Para 3 *(Senior Engineer (Environmental Issues))*

Three tender envelopes had been received in respect of this contract and these were opened in the presence of the Committee.

Decision

That the opening of the tenders be noted

9. Review of Strategy Study (Contract Reference Number 342) Para 3 *(Senior Engineer (Environmental Issues))*

Three tender envelopes had been received in respect of this contract and these were opened in the presence of the Committee.

Decision

That the opening of the tenders be noted

The meeting concluded at 11.55 am

CHAIR

CONTRACT SCRUTINY COMMITTEE



Report of: Director of Child and Adult Services

Subject: Provision of Domiciliary Care Services

1. PURPOSE OF REPORT

- 1.1 To update the Committee on the evaluation of the tenders received for the provision of the above named service.

2. BACKGROUND

- 2.1 A tender exercise was undertaken in 2004 to re-configure the domiciliary care market within the town. The outcome of the exercise was that three successful providers were selected to provide the mainstream services.
- 2.2 The successful providers were the following agencies:
- Community Home Care
 - Allied Health Care
 - Carewatch (formerly Care Concern)
- 2.3 Each provider was allocated a geographical area of the Borough (North, South and Central) which in turn were aligned to the Council's Locality Teams.
- 2.3 The current contractual arrangements commenced in October 2004 and will end on the 30th September 2010. The contracts were initially awarded for 4 years and an option to extend for a further 2 years, following satisfactory performance by providers, was taken.
- 2.4 Collectively, the current three providers have supported older people and vulnerable adults in their own homes for an average 4,500 hours per week in 2008/09 and 4,900 hours per week in 2009/10.

3. PROPOSALS

- 3.1 The Committee to note the report

4. EVALUATION PROCESS

Stage 1 – Compliance with Invitation to Tender

- 4.1 The first stage of the Tender Process was the compliance of tender submissions with the Invitation to Tender.
- 4.2 All submissions passed Stage 1 and proceeded to Stage 2 of the evaluation process.

Stage 2 – Compliance with Primary Qualification Questionnaire

- 4.3 The second stage of the Tender Process was the evaluation of the responses provided to the Primary Qualification Questionnaire. This stage of evaluation judges technical capacity to fulfill the obligations of the contract.

The following areas were considered through this stage:

- Grounds for Exclusion
 - Insurance
 - Financial
 - Health and Safety
 - Equality and Diversity
 - Environment
 - Technical Capacity
 - References and Undertaking
- 4.4 The following Officers of the Council were consulted as part of the process and completed Evaluation Forms relevant to each area considered.
- Leigh Keeble – Equality and Diversity
Kevin Godfrey – Health and Safety
Gareth Corser – Finance
Valerie Hastie – Environment
Tammy Emery – Grounds for Exclusion, Insurance, Technical Capacity and References and Undertaking
- 4.5 Following the evaluation of the Primary Qualification Questionnaire, eight submissions proceeded to Stage 3 of the tender process.

Stage 3 – Performance Evaluation – Tender Questionnaire

- 4.6 The Stage 3 performance evaluation of the Tender Questionnaire took place on 10th and 11th May 2010.

- 4.7 The evaluation panel consisted of Brian Ayre - Commissioned Services Manager, Susan Hurst – Principal Practitioner (South Team), Sandra Leonard – Principle Practitioner (North Team) and Tammy Emery – Commissioning Officer.

Following the evaluation of the Tender Questionnaire, tender submissions who scored 225 points from a total of 300 (75% of the total points) were invited to proceed to Stage 3 Presentation and Interview.

- 4.8 Through the above process, five submissions proceeded to the Stage 3 Presentation and Interview.

Stage 3 – Performance Evaluation – Presentation and Interview

- 4.9 The Stage 2 presentation and interviews were held on 7th June 2010. All five organizations attended.
- 4.10 The interview panel consisted of Phil Hornsby (Strategic Commissioner – Older People), Brian Ayre (Commissioned Services Manager), Bain Nyananyo (Locality Team Manager South), Elaine Armatage (Locality Team Manager North), Danny Weldrake (Service User), Mark Weldrake (Carer) and Julie Clarke (Service User).
- 4.11 The interview consisted of a verbal presentation addressing personalization lasting for 15 minutes and four questions asked by the panel. The points available for each area was as follows:-
- Presentation - 20 points
 - Questions 1-4 – 20 points
 - Overall feel for the organization – 15 points
- 4.12 Following the scoring of the Presentation and Interview all five submissions had their price submission evaluated.

Stage 4 – Price Evaluation

- 4.13 For the purposes of the evaluation of the price submissions, the hourly rates for 1000 hours were compared for each of the five submissions.
- 4.14 The overall points available for the price submission was 200 and these were split into categories which were:-
- £10.50 - £10.75 = 200 points
 - £10.76 - £11.00 = 160 points
 - £11.01 - £11.25 = 120 points
 - £11.26 - £11.50 = 80 points
 - £11.51 - £12.00 = 40 points
 - £12.00+ = 0 points

Overall Evaluation scores

- 4.15 The overall evaluation scores from the Stage 2 Tender Questionnaire and Presentation and Interview and Price Evaluation for the five tender submissions were as follows:-

Organisation	Price Submission Score (out of 200)	Stage 2 Tender evaluation (out of 300)	Stage 2 Presentation and Interview evaluation (out of 55)	TOTAL POINTS (out of 555)
1	0	240	27	267
4	160	245	38	443
7	120	257	42	419
11	160	232	36	428
12	120	226	35	381

- 4.16 Further break down of the above scores are shown in **Appendix 1** and **Appendix 2** of this report.

5. CURRENT POSITION

- 5.1 The tender exercise is now complete and the recommended providers are Community Homecare Services and Carewatch Ltd by scoring the highest points out of 555 for the evaluation process.
- 5.2 The successful Providers will be awarded a four year contract which includes an option to extend for a further two years following satisfactory performance by the providers.
- 5.3 The period of transition will be managed by the Providers, the Commissioned Services Team and the Locality Teams to ensure minimal disruption to the service users before and after the current contract expires.

6. FINANCIAL CONSIDERATIONS

- 6.1 The hourly rate submitted by both providers is in line with the current hourly rate which is paid by the Council for the current contract.
- 6.2 It is not envisaged that there will be an increase financially to the Council for this contract.

7. RECOMMENDATIONS

- 7.1 That Committee note the Director of Child and Adult Services approval to enter into a contract for 4 years with a possible extension of 2 years, subject to satisfactory performance with Community Homecare Services and Carewatch Ltd from 1st October 2010 for the provision of Domiciliary Care Services.

8. BACKGROUND PAPERS

- 8.1 None

9. CONTACT OFFICER

- 9.1 Brian Ayre
Commissioned Services Manager
Child and Adult Services
Level 4, Civic Centre
Brian.ayre@hartlepool.gov.uk
01429 284264

APPENDIX 1 – DOMICILIARY CARE TENDER OVERALL SCORES


**Hartlepool Borough Council - Tender Evaluation Matrix - Overall
PROVISION OF DOMICILIARY CARE SERVICES**

Description of Criteria	Weighting	Tenderer 1	Tenderer 3	Tenderer 4	Tenderer 7	Tenderer 9	Tenderer 11	Tenderer 12	Tenderer 15
Proposal - 40 points	40	38	31	33	37	18	28	36	12
Delivery of Service - 90 points	90	65	51	74	71	64	68	59	21
Quality of Service - 40 points	40	37	24	30	33	28	35	30	12
Service User Outcomes - 80 points	80	54	14	64	69	59	63	61	11
Management and Staff - 50 points	50	46	38	44	47	32	38	40	22
Quality	300	240	158	245	257	201	232	226	78
Price	200	0		160	120		160	120	
Interview	55	27		38	42		36	35	
OVERALL TOTAL	355	267	158	443	419	201	428	381	78

APPENDIX 2 – INTERVIEW SCORES

Tenderer 1	1	2	3	4	5	6	Total	Average Score
Presentation	9	11	10	13	9	9	61	10
Question 1	4	3	2	3	2	2	16	3
Question 2	3	2	2	3	2	2	14	2
Question 3	2	2	2	3	2	3	14	2
Question 4	1	2	2	2	1	1	9	2
Overall Score	8	9	7	10	6	8	48	8
Total Score							27	

Tenderer 4	1	2	3	4	5	6	Total	Average Score
Presentation	17	15	14	15	16	15	92	15
Question 1	3	3	3	4	4	3	20	3
Question 2	3	4	3	5	3	3	21	3
Question 3	3	3	2	4	4	3	19	3
Question 4	4	2	3	4	4	3	20	3
Overall Score	10	12	10	12	11	10	65	11
Total Score							38	

Tenderer 7	1	2	3	4	5	5	Total	Average Score
Presentation	14	18	16	17	14	16	95	16
Question 1	4	4	4	4	3	4	23	4
Question 2	4	4	3	4	3	3	21	3
Question 3	3	4	3	4	4	4	22	3
Question 4	3	4	3	5	4	3	22	3
Overall Score	12	14	12	14	12	13	77	13
Total Score							42	

Tenderer 11	1	2	3	4	5	6	Total	Average Score
Presentation	12	15	18	16	11	17	89	15
Question 1	2	3	3	4	3	2	17	3
Question 2	3	3	2	3	3	2	16	3
Question 3	2	3	2	3	3	3	16	3
Question 4	2	2	2	3	2	2	13	2
Overall Score	10	11	8	12	10	10	61	10
Total Score							36	

Tenderer 12	1	2	3	4	5	6	Total	Average Score
Presentation	9	16	18	15	12	14	84	14
Question 1	2	3	3	3	2	2	15	2
Question 2	4	3	2	3	3	2	17	3
Question 3	3	3	3	3	3	2	17	3
Question 4	2	3	3	3	3	3	17	3
Overall Score	9	12	11	11	10	9	62	10
Total Score							35	

CONTRACT SCRUTINY COMMITTEE

29th June 2010



Report of: DIRECTOR OF CHILD AND ADULT SERVICES

Subject: CONTRACT FOR THE PROVISION OF CARE
AND SUPPORT SERVICES IN EXTRA CARE
HOUSING SETTINGS

1. PURPOSE OF REPORT

- 1.1 To update the Committee on the evaluation of the tenders received for the provision of the above named service.

2. BACKGROUND

- 2.1 The Hartlepool Borough Council Older Persons Housing Care and Support Strategy identified the need for additional extra care housing in the south and centre of Hartlepool.
- 2.2 The Council and partner agencies have been successful in obtaining funding from the Department of Health to develop an extra care scheme at Orwell Walk. The funding will provide a purpose built mixed tenure extra care housing scheme to be known as Laurel Gardens comprising of 60 units (30 x 2 bedroom) of mixed tenure of social rent, part ownership and whole ownership. It is intended that up to 25% of the residents will have low or moderate dementia and up to 4 two person flats will be available for older adults with a learning disability living into older age or living with older carers.
- 2.3 The Council is also working in partnership with Housing Hartlepool to develop a further three extra care housing schemes across the borough. These are Albany Court, Bamburgh Court and Richard Court.
- 2.4 The successful provider will provide care and support to residents of the four schemes in line with the National Minimum Standards for Domiciliary Care. Housing Hartlepool will be responsible for providing all housing related support to residents and the overall co-ordination of services within each setting.

3. PROPOSALS

- 3.1 To note the report

4. EVALUATION PROCESS

- 4.1 Tenders were opened by Contract Scrutiny Committee on 26th April 2010. The Panel rejected two (2) tenders for non-compliance and a further two (2) were found to include additional information rather than tender submissions.

Stage 1 – ITT Evaluation

- 4.2 The first stage of the evaluation process measured compliance with the Invitation to Tender. Three (3) tenders did not comply with the Invitation to Tender and so did not pass to the next stage of evaluation. (see **Appendix 1** for further information)

Stage 2 – PQQ Evaluation

- 4.3 The remaining twelve (12) tenders proceeded to evaluation of the Primary Qualification Questionnaire (PQQ) which consists of the following:
- Organisation Profile Questionnaire
 - Grounds for Exclusion Questionnaire
 - Insurance Questionnaire
 - Financial Questionnaire
 - Health & Safety Questionnaire
 - Equality & Diversity Questionnaire
 - Environmental Questionnaire
 - Technical Capacity Questionnaire

The Organisation Profile and Environment Questionnaire were provided for information only however comments were obtained from the Council's Sustainable Development Team on the Environmental submissions. Tenderers were required to achieve a "pass" for all remaining questionnaires to proceed to evaluation of the Tender Questionnaire.

- 4.4 The following questionnaires were assessed and verified by Commissioning Officers from the Commissioned Services Team :
- Organisation profile
 - Grounds for Exclusion
 - Insurance
 - Technical Capacity

The Finance Questionnaires were evaluated by the Chief Executives Department Accountancy Team, the Health & Safety Questionnaires were evaluated by the Council's Health & Wellbeing Team and the

Equality & Diversity Questionnaires were evaluated by the Child & Adult Services Development Team.

- 4.5 Four (4) tenders failed one or more of the questionnaires contained within the PQQ (see appendix 1 for further information) and the remainder of their submissions were not therefore considered.

Stage 3 – Quality Evaluation

- 4.6 Stage 3 evaluated the performance and quality of each tender submission through the completion of a Tender Questionnaire and interviews.

- 4.7 The Evaluation Panel comprised of :
- Brian Ayre – Commissioned Services Team, Child & Adult Services
 - Dale Owens – Modernisation Team Child & Adult Services
 - Jacqui Tucker - Commissioned Services Team, Child & Adult Services
 - Michelle Summersgill – Housing Hartlepool

Eight (8) tenders were evaluated and were required to obtain a score of 180 points to be invited to interview. The results are detailed in **Appendix 2**.

- 4.8 Four (4) organisations score 180 or more and were interviewed by an interview panel consisted of :
- Phil Hornsby – Strategic Commissioner (Older People), Child & Adult Services
 - Dale Owens – Project Officer, Child & Adult Services
 - Joan Scrafton – Representative from the Older Persons Local Implementation Team and 50+ Forum
 - Jan Weedall – Housing Hartlepool

A total of 55 points were available from the interview stage. **Appendix 3** shows the scores awarded to each tenderer by each member of the panel.

- 4.9 The total scores in the quality assessment of the tender, for the four organisations which proceeded to stage 3 are detailed in appendix 2.

Stage 4 – Price Evaluation

- 4.10 Evaluation of the price submissions represented 40% of the overall score. Submissions were evaluated using a Price Evaluation Tool detailed in **Appendix 4**.

Stage 5 – Selection

- 4.11 The scores from the quality and price evaluations were combined and the organisation which scored the highest number of points was tender no 8, Comfort Call Ltd.
- 4.12 Comfort Call Ltd's head office is based in Hebbum Tyne and Wear which will allow relatively easy access to the Senior Management Team. Although the organisation do not currently provide social care in Hartlepool they are contracted to provide domiciliary care to Durham County Council, Gateshead Metropolitan Council, Newcastle City Council, Sunderland City Council, South Tyneside Borough Council and Rochdale Borough Council and have recently been awarded a contract with Stockton Borough Council for the provision of extra care services.
- 4.13 Comfort Call Ltd's sister company, The Fetteresso Company (trading as Riversley Homecare) is contracted with Middlesbrough Borough Council, Redcar & Cleveland Borough Council and North Yorkshire Council for the provision of domiciliary care.

5. FINANCIAL CONSIDERATIONS

- 5.1 The number of hours required under the contract depends on the care needs of existing residents within each extra care scheme and the needs of residents moving in. At this stage as some of the schemes are still in development stage it is difficult to predict when all four schemes will reach capacity. In order to evaluate and compare price submissions organisations were given an assumed number of hours to calculate their price submission. This assumption was based on each scheme being at full capacity and the needs of residents 1/3 having with little or no care needs, 1/3 having some care needs and 1/3 having significant care needs. It was however clear in the tender documentation that this would take some time to accomplish and further work would be needed with the successful organisation to plan an incremental cost structure.
- 5.2 Based on the above assumptions Comfort Call Ltd costed the service at £1,048,500 per annum and submitted an hourly rate of £10.20 for exceptional circumstances where an individual requires the service to be provided in excess of the hours provided at level 3.
- 5.3 The organisation does not require any start up costs.
- 5.4 The Head of Finance, Child & Adult Services has assessed the financial breakdown provided by Comfort Call Ltd in support of their price submission. It is expected that the financial breakdown will be used in post tender negotiations with Comfort Call Ltd to agree incremental payment bandings, based on the numbers of residents at each level in each setting, until each capacity is reached.

6. RECOMMENDATIONS

- 6.1** That the Contract Scrutiny Committee note the Director of Child and Adult Services support of the views of the Commissioned Services Manager and the award of a contract for 5 years with an option to extend subject to satisfactory performance to provide care and support in extra care settings to Comfort Call Ltd.

7. BACKGROUND PAPERS

- 7.1** None

8. CONTACT OFFICER

Brian Ayre
Commissioned Services Manager
Child and Adult Services Department
Level 4, Civic Centre
brian.ayre@hartlepool.gov.uk
01429 284264

4.2 Appendix 1

	Tenderer 1	Tenderer 2	Tenderer 3	Tenderer 4	Tenderer 5	Tenderer 6	Tenderer 7	Tenderer 8	Tenderer 9	Tenderer 10
Compliant with ITT	Yes	Yes	No submission enclosed	Yes	No	Tender was rejected by Contract Scrutiny Committee	Yes	Yes	Yes	No submission enclosed
PQQ - Environment	Yes	No					Yes	Yes		
PQQ - Equality	Yes						Yes	Yes		
PQQ - Financial	Yes						Yes	Yes		
PQQ - Ground for Exclusion	Yes			No			Yes	Yes	No	
PQQ - Health & Safety	Yes						Yes	Yes		
PQQ - Insurance	Yes						Yes	Yes		
PQQ - Technical Capacity	Yes	No					Yes	Yes		
Passed PQQ Evaluation	Yes	No		No			Yes	Yes	No	

	Tenderer 11	Tenderer 12	Tenderer 13	Tenderer 14	Tenderer 15	Tenderer 16	Tenderer 17	Tenderer 18	Tenderer 19
Compliant with ITT	Yes	No	Yes	Yes	Tender was rejected by Contract Scrutiny Committee	Yes	No	Yes	Yes
PQQ - Environment			Yes	Yes		Yes		Yes	Yes
PQQ - Equality			Yes	Yes		Yes		Yes	Yes
PQQ - Financial			Yes	Yes		Yes		Yes	Yes
PQQ - Ground for Exclusion			Yes	Yes		Yes		Yes	Yes
PQQ - Health & Safety			Yes	Yes		Yes		Yes	Yes
PQQ - Insurance			Yes	Yes		Yes		Yes	Yes
PQQ - Technical Capacity	No		Yes	Yes		Yes		Yes	Yes
Passed PQQ Evaluation	No		Yes	Yes		Yes		Yes	Yes

4.2 Appendix 2

Hartlepool Borough Council – Extra Care Tender Evaluation Matrix (283)

Description of Criteria	Weighting	Tender 1	Tender 7	Tender 8	Tender 13	Tender 14	Tender 16	Tender 18	Tender 19
Proposal - 35 Points	35	26	18	29	8	11	27		21
Delivery of Service - 85 Points	85	30	50	58	18	27	70	Tender Questionnaire was incomplete	57
Quality Assurance - 40 Points	40	27	24	31	11	17	27		25
Service User Outcomes - 80 Points	80	51	42	55	26	19	50		44
Management and Staff - 60 Points	60	46	41	50	12	22	45		48
Total Tender Questionnaire	300	334	332	417	142	181	411		369
Interview Scores	55	32		32			34		43
Total Quality Score	355	366		449			445		412

Price Score									
Contract Price		160		140			40		140
Start Up		6		10			0		4
Hourly rate		15		30			5		20
Total Price Score		181		180			45		164

Total Score		547		629			490		576
--------------------	--	------------	--	------------	--	--	------------	--	------------

4.2 Appendix 3

<u>INTERVIEW SCORES</u>						
TENDER FOR CARE AND SUPPORT IN EXTRA CARE SETTINGS						
	Interviewer 1	Interviewer 2	Interviewer 3	Interviewer 4	Total	Average
Tender 19	39	47	44	40	170	43
Tender 16	36	36	26	39	137	34
Tender 8	26	38	29	34	127	32
Tender 1	28	35	34	30	127	32

PRICE EVALUATION TOOL

Tender for provision of care and support in extra care settings (283)

Part A - Total cost for provision of the service over 7 years (160 points available)

<i>Between</i>	£7,200,000	<i>and</i>	£7,225,000	Score	160
<i>Between</i>	£7,225,001	<i>and</i>	£7,500,000	Score	140
<i>Between</i>	£7,500,001	<i>and</i>	£7,750,000	Score	120
<i>Between</i>	£7,750,001	<i>and</i>	£8,000,000	Score	100
<i>Between</i>	£8,000,001	<i>and</i>	£8,250,000	Score	80
<i>Between</i>	£8,250,001	<i>and</i>	£8,500,000	Score	60
<i>Between</i>	£8,500,001	<i>and</i>	£8,750,000	Score	40
<i>Between</i>	£8,750,001	<i>and</i>	£9,000,000	Score	20
More than			£9,000,001	Score	0

Part B - Hourly Rate (30 points available)

<i>Between</i>	£10.00	<i>and</i>	£10.25	Score	30
<i>Between</i>	£10.26	<i>and</i>	£10.50	Score	25
<i>Between</i>	£10.51	<i>and</i>	£11.00	Score	20
<i>Between</i>	£11.01	<i>and</i>	£11.25	Score	15
<i>Between</i>	£11.26	<i>and</i>	£11.50	Score	5
More than			£11.51	Score	0

Part C - Start Up Costs (10 points available)

		Less than	£10,000	Score	10
<i>Between</i>	£10,001	<i>and</i>	£20,000	Score	6
<i>Between</i>	£20,001	<i>and</i>	£30,000	Score	4
More than			£30,001	Score	0