Essex County Council

Our reference: 1038

Unique identifier:

Tender Notice Reference:

Date: 25th September 2025

Dear Bidder,

Re: Invitation to Tender for Live at Home 2025

Thank you for your tender submission by 2nd June 2025 for the aforementioned procurement. Following the conclusion of the assessment process, I am pleased to inform you that your organisation has been successful in its bid to join the Live at Home framework. The lots and the framework tiers that your organisation has been appointed to are:

The bid met the Tier 1 Special Terms and passed stage 2 and stage 3 of the evaluation. However, the bid failed stage 4 because it did not achieve a minimum score of 3 for question 9. The bidder has been awarded a position on Tier 2 in the lots indicated in Appendix 1.

Your assessment summary is provided at Annex A. This sets out your scores, and the rationale for those scores, against each of the assessment criteria. Where you have been unsuccessful in bidding for inclusion on to tier 1, we are also required to provide you with the same information relating to the lowest scoring successful tender for tier 1 in that lot, and this is also set out at Annex A in the section titled the 'Most Advantageous Tender'. The full assessment methodology and award criteria can be found in the Bidder Guidance document.

In accordance with Regulation 51 of the Procurement Act 2023 we are introducing a "standstill" period of eight working days between selecting the successful bidders and

entering into a binding agreement. The standstill period for this requirement will commence on 25th September 2025 and will finish at midnight at the end of 4th October 2025.

Assuming the provisional decision remains unaltered as a result of any representations made during the standstill period, it is our intention to enter into a contract for this requirement by 7th October 2025.

You are strongly advised not to incur any expenses or enter any binding arrangements until such time as the contract has been executed by both parties. The Authority will not be liable for any expenses incurred in connection with the anticipated contract before execution of the contract.

This letter is sent without prejudice to the right of Essex County Council to abandon the procurement, cancel the award procedure or suspend award of the contract for any reason.

I would be grateful for your acknowledgement that you have received and understood the contents of this communication by responding via the Essex Supplier Portal.

We would like to take this opportunity to thank you for the time and effort you have dedicated to this tender process, and we look forward to working with you.

Yours sincerely,



Claire Felton
Procurement Specialist
Essex County Council

Annex A: Assessment Summary

Your Assessed Tier 1 Tender - Lot 1 Basildon

Technical Response Criteria	Relative importance	Scoring scale	Score awarded	Weighted Score	Explanation of score
1A. Safeguarding Policy - Recruitment, legislation, principles, compliance and accountability	3%	0-5	4	2.4	A good response that could have been improved by detailing post-employment checks and controls, and more detail to demonstrate understanding of the Care Act.
1B. Safeguarding Case Study - Understanding of local safeguarding procedures in Essex	3%	0-5	2	1.2	Raising referral to ECC incorrect.
2. Organisational Management, and workforce - Arrangements regarding oversight and management of the service	6%	0-5	4	4.8	A very good response but did not reference external oversight and lacked detail around practical hands on elements and competency in relation to induction to achieve a higher score.
3. Continuous Service Improvement - Continuous service improvement approach	4%	0-5	5	4	Very strong response with good examples.
4. Partnership and integration – Collaboration with other health and social organisations and the community and voluntary sector	4%	0-5	3	2.4	Response covers the process and benefits, but would be improved with more examples of the key organisations they will link with especially around community and voluntary.

Technical Response Criteria	Relative importance	Scoring scale	Score awarded	Weighted Score	Explanation of score
5. Case Study 1	7%	0-5	3	4.2	Good response however emotional, physical and health needs was over wordcount therefore cannot be included in evaluation.
6. Case study 2	7%	0-5	3	4.2	TEC needed linking to Paul's needs/goals more clearly. Therapy brief. Safeguarding - brief. Health section brief and generic. No ref to things like AHC/HAP.
7. Social Value – Social Value Statement	5%	0-5	2	2	Lacking implementation plan and QA detail. Basic milestones and monitoring plan.
8. Climate – Carbon reduction	2%	0-5	3	1.2	Response would be improved with more detail around the strategy for moving to low/zero emission vehicles. Liked the use of the dashboard.
9. Personalisation - Understanding of personalised care, who should be involved, what should be considered in terms of both care planning and service delivery.	5%	0-5	1	1	Only covers a minor element of the requirement - lacks detail, supporting statements and evidence.

Your Assessed Tier 1 Tender - Lot 2 Braintree

Technical Response Criteria	Relative importance	Scoring scale	Score awarded	Weighted Score	Explanation of score
1A. Safeguarding Policy - Recruitment, legislation, principles, compliance and accountability	3%	0-5	4	2.4	A good response that could have been improved by detailing post-employment checks and controls, and more detail to demonstrate understanding of the Care Act.
1B. Safeguarding Case Study - Understanding of local safeguarding procedures in Essex	3%	0-5	2	1.2	Raising referral to ECC incorrect.
2. Organisational Management, and workforce - Arrangements regarding oversight and management of the service	6%	0-5	4	4.8	A very good response but did not reference external oversight and lacked detail around practical hands on elements and competency in relation to induction to achieve a higher score.
3. Continuous Service Improvement - Continuous service improvement approach	4%	0-5	5	4	Very strong response with good examples.
4. Partnership and integration – Collaboration with other health and social organisations and the community and voluntary sector	4%	0-5	3	2.4	Response covers the process and benefits, but would be improved with more examples of the key organisations they will link with especially around community and voluntary.

Technical Response Criteria	Relative importance	Scoring scale	Score awarded	Weighted Score	Explanation of score
5. Case Study 1	7%	0-5	3	4.2	Good response however emotional, physical and health needs was over wordcount therefore cannot be included in evaluation.
6. Case study 2	7%	0-5	3	4.2	TEC needed linking to Paul's needs/goals more clearly. Therapy brief. Safeguarding - brief. Health section brief and generic. No ref to things like AHC/HAP.
7. Social Value – Social Value Statement	5%	0-5	2	2	Lacking implementation plan and QA detail. Basic milestones and monitoring plan.
8. Climate – Carbon reduction	2%	0-5	3	1.2	Response would be improved with more detail around the strategy for moving to low/zero emission vehicles. Liked the use of the dashboard.
9. Personalisation - Understanding of personalised care, who should be involved, what should be considered in terms of both care planning and service delivery.	5%	0-5	1	1	Only covers a minor element of the requirement - lacks detail, supporting statements and evidence.

Most Advantageous Tender, for Lot 1 Basildon

Technical Response Criteria	Relative importance	Scoring scale	Score awarded	Explanation of score
1A. Safeguarding Policy - Recruitment, legislation, principles, compliance and accountability	3%	0-5	4	A good response that covers all areas but could have provided more detail on induction processes and linking legislation to practice to achieve a higher score.
1B. Safeguarding Case Study - Understanding of local safeguarding procedures in Essex	3%	0-5	3	Response meets the criteria. However could be improved by expanding on the information they would share with ECC, including clear reference to the Herbert Protocol (although references may have called police in emergency), being explicit about ability to refer Tom for carers assessment through ASCC portal (with consent), and also the carers/autism community networks that the bidder could refer to in the communities.
2. Organisational Management, and workforce - Arrangements regarding oversight and management of the service	6%	0-5	3	The response was acceptable but did not reference external oversight, competency, shadowing, probationary oversight and business continuity. As well as lacking detail on recruitment, induction, wellbeing, retention and seasonal fluctuations.
3. Continuous Service Improvement - Continuous service improvement approach	4%	0-5	2	Response focusses on collection rather than what they do with it. No clear explanation of the benefits to the adults.

Technical Response Criteria	Relative importance	Scoring scale	Score awarded	Explanation of score
4. Partnership and integration – Collaboration with other health and social organisations and the community and voluntary sector	4%	0-5	4	Strong practical answer. Focusses on very formal relationships but well thought through.
5. Case Study 1	7%	0-5	2	The approach to supporting the adult is largely prescriptive, not working with adults strengths. While all relevant information regarding the provision of support to maintain wellbeing and liaison with key organisations is evident, it would be helpful to define specific, measurable targets to enable the adult to work towards and achieve their goals. Also should have more on person-centred approach and managing risk i.e. risk assessing. Family not involved in care planning in any depth / collaboratively. Equip and tech could have been stronger.

Technical Response Criteria	Relative importance	Scoring scale	Score awarded	Explanation of score
6. Case study 2	7%	0-5	3	Minimal detail given in terms of TEC, therapy and physical needs - no ref to AHCs, local commissioned offer, and limited focus given to expanding Paul's social network. The provider puts forward a clear response but answer lacks detail around local opportunities, does not evidence a full holistic understanding of Paul's wider needs (e.g. health) and safeguarding ideas minimal - how is Paul included? The response misses the opportunity to reference or apply established autism support frameworks (e.g., SPELL, TEACCH). There is no mention of formal risk assessments, safeguarding planning, or staff training in autism or behaviours that challenge. It lacks a structured behavioural support plan—there is no ABC analysis, escalation/de-escalation framework, or reference to Positive Behaviour Support (PBS) until briefly at the end. There is no mention of how health needs would be monitored or how care would be coordinated with primary or secondary care services.
7. Social Value – Social Value Statement	5%	0-5	3	Response lacked evidence in areas such as monitoring and implementation plan, didn't meet criteria for a 4.
8. Climate – Carbon reduction	2%	0-5	4	Good response covering all areas.

Technical Response Criteria	Relative importance	Scoring scale	Score awarded	Explanation of score
9. Personalisation - Understanding of personalised care, who should be involved, what should be considered in terms of both care planning and service delivery.	5%	0-5	4	Good use of examples and person-centred approach and tailoring care to individual needs, also involvement of family and multi-agency approach.

Most Advantageous Tender, for Lot 2 - Braintree

Technical Response Criteria	Relative importance	Scoring scale	Score awarded	Weighted score	Explanation of score
1A. Safeguarding Policy - Recruitment, legislation, principles, compliance and accountability	3%	0-5	2	1.2	The response had some good examples but generally lacked detail in most areas. It did not detail if they checked recruits right to work in the UK. The bidder mentions the 6 safeguarding principles but the response doesn't indicate how each one is managed to ensure compliance. Lack of detail on their process for identifying and escalating safeguards and identifying lessons learned. Some legislation mentioned, but could have included more to demonstrate knowledge. The response seems to confuse whistleblowing and safeguarding.
1B. Safeguarding Case Study - Understanding of local safeguarding procedures in Essex	3%	0-5	3	1.8	Good response. Would have benefited from expanding on the case study and linking it to the rest of the response. Doesn't show awareness of Herbert Protocol /Police/tech options. Misses can make a carers assessment referral vis ASCC portal for T with consent.

Technical Response Criteria	Relative importance	Scoring scale	Score awarded	Weighted score	Explanation of score
2. Organisational Management, and workforce - Arrangements regarding oversight and management of the service	6%	0-5	3	3.6	The response was acceptable and details the EHM system and gives example of monitoring but does not state who / how it is monitored. It covers all areas but in places lacks level of detail regarding who / how for higher score.
3. Continuous Service Improvement - Continuous service improvement approach	4%	0-5	3	2.4	Liked some of the initiatives however response would benefit from more context behind data and more on staff engagement.
4. Partnership and integration – Collaboration with other health and social organisations and the community and voluntary sector	4%	0-5	3	2.4	Response would be improved with detail around the benefits of collaboration.
5. Case Study 1	7%	0-5	4	5.6	Good response, liked review frequency and progress checks and tools to monitor, and EDI considerations, but assistive tech was generic and basic offer.

Technical Response Criteria	Relative importance	Scoring scale	Score awarded	Weighted score	Explanation of score
6. Case study 2	7%	0-5	3	4.2	Safeguarding limited, emotional and physical health limited. Response didn't consistently link back to the case study and relate back to Paul in a personalised way.
7. Social Value – Social Value Statement	5%	0-5	1	1	Lacks detail throughout response. Aspects of response not explained. Lacks relevant evidence regarding competence, capacity and ability to successfully fulfil the requirements of the question.
8. Climate – Carbon reduction	2%	0-5	4	1.6	Good response, would be improved by more detail around how some of the plans will be achieved.
9. Personalisation - Understanding of personalised care, who should be involved, what should be considered in terms of both care planning and service delivery.	5%	0-5	3	3	All areas covered but more evidence and examples needed.

Your Tier 2 Assessed Tender - Lot 1 Basildon

Technical Response Criteria	Relative importance	Scoring scale	Score awarded	Explanation of score
CQC Key Line of Enquiry (KLoE) for individual CQC Locations advised in the Organisation and Branch Details document (validated from published CQC website data) and will be applied for each Branch individually.	35%	0-35	24.5	2 Outstanding and 3 Good KLoEs or higher = 35% 1 Outstanding and 4 Good KLoEs = 28% 5 Good KLoEs = 24.5% 4 Good and 1 Requires Improvement KLoEs = 21% 3 Good and 2 Requires Improvement KLoEs = 10.5% 2 Good and 3 Requires Improvement KLoEs = 7% 1 Good and 4 Requires Improvement KLoEs = 7% 5 Requires Improvement KLoEs = 3.5% Any inadequate KLoE (where a bidder has at least 1 inadequate KLoE) = 0% Unrated = 0%
Registered Manager in post (at close of tender) – either published on the CQC website or evidence of an application to the CQC and will be applied for each Branch individually.	1%	0-1	1	Registered Manager in post at the close of tender – either published on the CQC website or evidence of an application to the CQC = 1% No Registered Manager in post at the close of tender = 0%
Evidence of Electronic Homecare Management system in use by the close of the tender.	3.5%	0-3.5	3.5	Evidence of Electronic Homecare Management system in use submitted with your bid. Contract to be submitted as evidence (where the Bidder is using a bespoke system submit an anonymised sample report) along with a sample CSV file exported from the system to evidence that CSV reports showing care visit data can be exported (this should be up to three lines of test data and must not contain adult data). = 3.5% No evidence of Electronic Homecare Management system submitted with your bid = 0%

Technical Response Criteria	Relative importance	Scoring scale	Score awarded	Explanation of score
Digital Social Care Record system in use by the close of the tender.	3.5%	0-3.5	3.5	Evidence of a Digital Social Care Record system in use submitted with your bid (as defined in the Business Systems section of this document). = 3.5% No evidence of a Digital Social Care Record system in use submitted with your bid. = 0%
Electronic Medicines Administration Records system in use	2%	0-2	2	Evidence of a Electronic Medicines Administration Records system in use submitted with your bid (contract submitted as evidence) = 2% No evidence of a Electronic Medicines Administration Records system in use submitted with your bid = 0%
Geography	5%	0-5	3	Within the district = 5 Within a 5 mile radius of the district = 4 Within a 10 mile radius of the district = 3 Within a 15 mile radius of the district = 2 Within a 20 mile radius of the district = 1 Further than a 20 mile radius of the district = 0
Commercial Response Criteria	**Relative importance**	**Scoring scale**	**Score awarded**	**Explanation of score**
Detailed in Appendix 1	50%	0-50	Detailed in Appendix 1	As detailed in the Price Matrix
Total score Detailed in Appendix 1				

Your Tier 2 Assessed Tender - Lot 2 Braintree

Technical Response Criteria	Relative importance	Scoring scale	Score awarded	Explanation of score
CQC Key Line of Enquiry (KLoE) for individual CQC Locations advised in the Organisation and Branch Details document (validated from published CQC website data) and will be applied for each Branch individually.	35%	0-35	24.5	2 Outstanding and 3 Good KLoEs or higher = 35% 1 Outstanding and 4 Good KLoEs = 28% 5 Good KLoEs = 24.5% 4 Good and 1 Requires Improvement KLoEs = 21% 3 Good and 2 Requires Improvement KLoEs = 10.5% 2 Good and 3 Requires Improvement KLoEs = 7% 1 Good and 4 Requires Improvement KLoEs = 7% 5 Requires Improvement KLoEs = 3.5% Any inadequate KLoE (where a bidder has at least 1 inadequate KLoE) = 0% Unrated = 0%
Registered Manager in post (at close of tender) – either published on the CQC website or evidence of an application to the CQC and will be applied for each Branch individually.	1%	0-1	1	Registered Manager in post at the close of tender – either published on the CQC website or evidence of an application to the CQC = 1% No Registered Manager in post at the close of tender = 0%
Evidence of Electronic Homecare Management system in use by the close of the tender.	3.5%	0-3.5	3.5	Evidence of Electronic Homecare Management system in use submitted with your bid. Contract to be submitted as evidence (where the Bidder is using a bespoke system submit an anonymised sample report) along with a sample CSV file exported from the system to evidence that CSV reports showing care visit data can be exported (this should be up to three lines of test data and must not contain adult data). = 3.5% No evidence of Electronic Homecare Management system submitted with your bid = 0%

Technical Response Criteria	Relative importance	Scoring scale	Score awarded	Explanation of score
Digital Social Care Record system in use by the close of the tender.	3.5%	0-3.5	3.5	Evidence of a Digital Social Care Record system in use submitted with your bid (as defined in the Business Systems section of this document). = 3.5% No evidence of a Digital Social Care Record system in use submitted with your bid. = 0%
Electronic Medicines Administration Records system in use	2%	0-2	2	Evidence of a Electronic Medicines Administration Records system in use submitted with your bid (contract submitted as evidence) = 2% No evidence of a Electronic Medicines Administration Records system in use submitted with your bid = 0%
Geography	5%	0-5	0	Within the district = 5 Within a 5 mile radius of the district = 4 Within a 10 mile radius of the district = 3 Within a 15 mile radius of the district = 2 Within a 20 mile radius of the district = 1 Further than a 20 mile radius of the district = 0
Commercial Response Criteria	**Relative importance**	**Scoring scale**	**Score awarded**	**Explanation of score**
Detailed in Appendix 1	50%	0-50	Detailed in Appendix 1	As detailed in the Price Matrix
Total score Detailed in Appendix 1				