

**THE PROVISION OF MEDIA PLANNING AND BUYING SERVICES TO
FOOD STANDARDS SCOTLAND**

CONTRACT AWARD RECOMMENDATION REPORT

Prepared by: Tommy McPhelim
Date: 5 May 2016

1 INTRODUCTION

FSS requires a Media Planning and Buying agency to develop and deliver media strategy, planning and buying services for FSS and work collaboratively with the Communications and Marketing Team to help achieve FSS' objectives and strategic priorities.

FSS launched on 1 April 2015. Consumer protection is at the heart of everything we do. All FSS campaign activity must inform consumers of our key messages in relation to food safety and healthy eating. In addition to public information campaigns, we will also run social marketing (behaviour change) campaigns to motivate the public to take action and make change. Moving forward, FSS communications and marketing campaigns will build upon consumer and stakeholder awareness and continue to position the organisation as the trusted public sector food body in Scotland.

Although in draft format and subject to change, key areas of focus for 2016/17 are nutrition and food safety. Anticipated campaign activity is as follows:

Campaign	Budget	Focus	Date
Healthy Eating / Discretionary Foods	£200,000	Nutrition	Sep '16
Teenagers and Sugar	£40,000	Nutrition	Jan '17
Summer Food Safety BBQ / Olympics / Euro 2016	£35,000	Food Safety	Summer '16
Festive Food Safety	£60,000	Food Safety	December '16
Vulnerable Groups Students and Older People	£30,000	Food Safety	Sept '16 / March '17
Food Hygiene Information Service Re-launch	£70,000	Food Safety	March '16
	£435,000	TOTAL MEDIA BUDGET	

Each campaign will require an individual approach but as a minimum should include a media strategy and plan showing recommended channels and target audience reach. Goal setting and evaluation will be pre-requisite.

FSS called off the service from the SG Media Planning, Buying and Associated Services Framework (SP-14-003).

The contract term shall be for a period of on or around 9 May 2016 until 31 August 2017 (Framework expiry date) with an option to extend in line with any extension to the Framework. The contract will commence on or around 9 May 2016.

This recommendation report provides an overview of the procurement exercise undertaken, from tender issue to conclusion of the tender evaluation. **The most economically advantageous tender was received from Republic of Media and it is recommended that it is awarded the contract for the Media Buying services to FSS.**

The contract budget is approximately £300,000 - £450,000 per annum. The variance allows FSS to assess the budgets available for each media buying campaign that may be required during the contract duration.

2 PROCUREMENT PROCESS – INVITATION TO TENDER (ITT)

There are 4 named suppliers on the Media Planning and Buying Framework. The procurement is anticipated to be relatively straightforward. The risk to the procurement process was considered low as it was believed that the requirement would attract sufficient interest from the framework participants.

As the requirement was to be called off from an SG framework, the ITT was issued via Quick Quote on the PCS portal to the 4 named suppliers named – Carat, The Media Shop, Republic of Media and Spirit Media.

The ITT was issued on 15th March 2016 with a return date of 15th April 2016.

The following tenderers submitted a tender response:

1. Carat
2. The Media Shop
3. Republic of Media
4. Spirit media

The evaluation of the tenders was conducted in accordance with the pre-agreed evaluation methodology (most economically advantageous tender – 70:30 in favour of quality) as published in the ITT.

The Framework has 2 routes for procurement – a single order or a duration contract. For this requirement, FSS opted for a duration contract. With this option, the Framework call off requires historical volumes regarding previous media data usage to be included in the tender documentation to allow the framework participants to price against the requirement and populate the Master Pricing Grid. FSS is a new entity and has no historic data of its own to populate the Master Pricing Grid. Therefore, following several discussions with the Framework Manager, FSS were advised to liaise with Scottish Government communications and marketing team and seek to use their data which could be tweaked or altered if required to provide the tenderers with the data needed to proceed. FSS included this data in the tender.

3 TENDER EVALUATION PROCESS

3.1 EVALUATION TEAM

The evaluation team comprised of the following personnel:

Evaluation	Name	Area
Technical	Katherine Goodwin	Head of Marketing and Comms, Food Standards Scotland
	Rich Wilson	Marketing and Comms, Food Standards Scotland
Commercial	Tommy McPhelim	CGPSS

Table 1 - Evaluation Team

The evaluation methodology was pre-determined prior to the issue of the ITT and the evaluation was completed in two parts (technical and commercial). The technical evaluation considered three elements; 1. general understanding; 2. experience and expertise and 3. operational proposal. The commercial evaluation considered the prices for the services as identified in the Master Price Grid submitted by each tenderer as part of the Framework call off process.

3.2 TECHNICAL EVALUATION

Tenderers were required to provide responses to a series of technical criteria within the ITT. The ITT is attached at Annex A.

The technical evaluation (based on 'absolute') took place in Late April 2016. The technical evaluation team were required to assure themselves that the successful supplier would be capable of providing the services in the manner and timescales specified.

It was agreed with the technical evaluation team in advance that tender responses would be evaluated independently in the first instance and, if necessary, a follow-up meeting would be held to discuss and review any scores which differed significantly.

Questions were scored in accordance with the 0-4 scoring matrix provided in the ITT to allow for a moderated average score to be calculated across the evaluation panel.

Once the technical team had concluded their independent evaluations, the scores were submitted to Tommy McPhelim who assessed whether there were any significant differences in the scoring.

Overall technical scores were marked out of 100 and were then multiplied by the technical weighting (70).

Scores are only moderated where there is a difference of two or more steps in the marking regime. In this tender, the individual evaluations were within a point of each other in all criteria for both tenders. Each criterion for each tender response had no

more than 1 mark of a difference and therefore there was no need for a moderation meeting. Details of the scores prior to and after moderation are attached at Annex B.

The final scores were entered into the evaluation model which resulted in an average evaluation panel score for the responses. The technical evaluation team members had to provide commentary to justify the scores allocated to each question response in order to support debrief exercises.

The technical evaluation is summarised in Table 2 (Technical Evaluation Summary). Annex B contains the evaluation scores submitted by each technical panellist and also contains a combined evaluation matrix detailing the average score for each criterion and the pricing scores.

Rank	Organisation	Overall Score (out of 100)	Weighted Score (out of 70)
1	Carat	81.25	56.88
2	The Media Shop	60	42
3	Republic of Media	95	66.5
4	Spirit Media	38.75	27.13

Table 2 - Technical Evaluation Summary

3.3 COMMERCIAL EVALUATION

The commercial evaluation was carried out by Tommy McPhelim from Central Government Procurement Shared Services (CGPSS). A budget of £300,000 - £450,000 (excluding VAT) per annum is available for the project.

The commercial evaluation considered the prices for the delivery of the entire service as specified in the statement of requirements.

The lowest price submitted received the full 30% weighting available. All other tender prices were subject to the following calculation: (lowest price/ tender price x 30%). The lowest price was based upon the summary total identified in the summary sheet of the Master Price Grid submitted by each tenderer.

It was noted during the commercial evaluation that 2 of the tenderers (Carat and Republic of Media) had significantly lower prices than the other 2 tenderers. On investigation, it was noted that both Carat and Republic of Media omitted the FSS volume data contained within the 'Radio' media of their tender response. This led to their bids being significantly lower than the other 2 tenderers. This appeared to be the same clerical error on the part of both companies. There was discussion with the framework manager and consultation with the Procurement Journey which states,

Tender, or bid clarifications may become necessary during the evaluation of tenders. For example, where there are aspects of the bids that are unclear or contain minor errors. The Procurement Officer should consider whether, where a certain aspect of the bid seems anomalous, it might be prudent to request clarification. For example, if

a bid appears abnormally low, or especially high on price, it may be that an arithmetical error has been made.

The volumes are fixed by FSS and were issued to the tenderers in the ITT. Therefore, rather than have both tenderers re-submit their bids, which would potentially infringe equal treatment principles, it was considered that the best option would be to seek a clarification of the bids and ask if they would be content to have the FSS volumes that were already issued to them, inserted into their bid for the commercial evaluation to proceed. Both agreed to this clarification proposal.

3.4 EVALUATION OUTCOME

The weighted technical and commercial scores were combined to identify the most economically advantageous tenderer. The evaluation outcome is detailed in Table 4:

Rank	Organisation	Weighted Technical Score (out of 70)	Weighted Commercial Score (out of 30)	Total Score (out of 100)
1	Republic of Media	66.5	26.5	93.00
2	Carat	56.88	30.00	86.88
3	The Media Shop	42.00	23.21	65.21
4	Spirit Media	27.13	23.83	50.96

Table 4 - Overall Evaluation Outcome

4 RECOMMENDATION

As identified in Table 4, Republic of Media has been identified as having submitted the most economically advantageous tender. It is recommended that Republic of Media is awarded the contract for the provision having submitted a tender that was both technically and commercially compliant. The provision of Media Planning and Buying services to FSS will have a maximum value of £450,000 over the period of the contract. FSS are asked to endorse this recommendation in order to proceed with the award of contract to Republic of Media.

5 ADDED VALUE AND SAVINGS ACHIEVED

Cash Savings

Other than the framework benefits to be reported quarterly by the SG Collaborative teams, there will be no further savings identified from the contract.

BT5 - Introduction of Electronic Tendering – Electronic Issue, Receipt and/or Adjudication of Tenders (Organisation's own tendering activity) – BPI 1A

- tender documentation is downloaded from PCS / other similar solution rather than photocopied, bound, checked and posted out in hard copy (up to 10 participating suppliers). **Savings claimed £400**

Non Cash Savings

The following non-cash savings have also been achieved by making use of PCS:

BT3 - Process Savings from Use of Collaborative Arrangements – BPI 1B

- The most common type of non-price saving is that derived from use of collaborative agreements. This saving is designed to reflect the avoidance of having to do a full tender exercise at the time of the renewal of an existing arrangement or the creation of a new one Claim £6,000 per collaborative agreement where annual expenditure is over £10,000 or a one-off purchase over £25,000, in the year that it is set up or the year the organisation takes up an existing contract. **Savings claimed £6,000**

BT5 - Introduction of Electronic Tendering – Electronic Issue, Receipt and/or Adjudication of Tenders (Organisation's own tendering activity) – BPI 1B

- e-tendering package used for the secure electronic receipt of tender submissions. **Savings claimed £300**
- Secure communication with tenderers via PCS / other similar solution is used for pre-submission correspondence. **Savings claimed £150**
- An e-tendering package used for the secure electronic receipt of tender submissions Receipt of tenders via PCS. **Savings claimed £300**

Cash Savings total: £400 plus those reported quarterly through collaborative team
Non-cash savings total: £6, 750

Total savings: £7,150

6 CONTRACT MANAGEMENT

Rich Wilson of Food Standards Scotland will be directly responsible for the day to day management of the contract.

ANNEX A – PUBLISHED ITT

The tender was issued with a pricing matrix which identified the volumes for each tenderer top price against. The pricing matrix was amended 2 times. One removed data relating to 'Supermarket Trolleys' and 'What's On' magazine as these could not be priced on the Master Grid response by tenderers (this was raised in a question by a tenderer through PCS). The second amendment sought to clarify the dates of columns within the 'Out of Home' tab (also as a result of a query by a tenderer on PCS).

DOCUMENTS REMOVED AS THEY ARE AVAILABLE THROUGH THE PUBLIC CONTRACTS SCOTLAND PORTAL

ANNEX B – SCORES PRIOR TO AND AFTER MODERATION MEETING

No moderation required as scores awarded by both technical evaluators were within a point across all criteria for all tenderers. The scores from each technical evaluator is attached

DOCUMENT REMOVED AS INCLUDED AS SEPARATE DOCUMENT IN FOI RESPONSE

The overall evaluation matrix detailing those both technically and commercially compliant is attached.

DOCUMENT REMOVED AS INCLUDED AS SEPARATE DOCUMENT IN FOI RESPONSE

ANNEX C – CLARIFICATIONS

DOCUMENT REMOVED AS INCLUDED AS SEPARATE DOCUMENT IN FOI RESPONSE

Result of the clarifications in each of the bids are as follows;

DOCUMENT REMOVED AS INCLUDED AS SEPARATE DOCUMENT IN FOI RESPONSE

ANNEX D – TENDERS RECEIVED

Carat Tender Response

DOCUMENT REMOVED AS INCLUDED AS SEPARATE DOCUMENT IN FOI RESPONSE

The Media Shop Tender Response

DOCUMENT REMOVED AS INCLUDED AS SEPARATE DOCUMENT IN FOI RESPONSE

Republic of Media Tender Response

DOCUMENT REMOVED AS INCLUDED AS SEPARATE DOCUMENT IN FOI RESPONSE

Spirit Media Tender Response

DOCUMENT REMOVED AS YOU ARE THE OWNER AND ALREADY HAVE IT

End of Document

