

Survey Results Summary

SLA process consultation

Dates of consultation: Tues 6th Nov – Fri 16th Nov 2012

Method: emailed link to an online survey to 22 participants. The responses were analysed in snap survey software.

Response rate: 11 responses received and 50% response rate

How did you find out about the new commissioning process?

Letter	-
Email	4
Website	3
Word of mouth	4
Phonecall	-
Newspaper	-
I can't remember	-
Base	11

Consultation Stage

Were you aware of the public consultation to determine the priorities for grant funding?

Yes, and it was easy to reply	8
Yes, but I found it difficult to reply	3
No, I did not know about the consultation	-
Base	11

Those who found it difficult to reply did not add any further comments.

Do you think the timescale to respond to the consultation were too short, just right, too long?.

All 11 participants agreed that the timescales were just right.

Any other comments about the consultation stage

Thought the questions were not entirely clear we were quite comfortable once we decided a direction but felt the open nature might have led to the field of responses not being as level as it might have been. . I am aware that colleagues/peers needed extra guidance and that some sample material might have been useful or some suggestions of formatting to help people plan their response. There seemed to be little public interest. As the opinions of the consultees were in part disregarded by the Cabinet it suggests that there will be even interest in the future. I was impressed by the structure and simplicity

Preliminary Qualification Question Stage
--

Did you feel the preliminary qualification questionnaire provided you with a means to self assess your application? (tick all that apply)...

Yes, but I found I gave more detail than was necessary	4
Yes, but I wasn't sure how much detail to give	6
I would have liked feedback on receipt of the questionnaire	1
A deadline to return the questionnaire would have been useful	2
No, I did not understand the purpose of this questionnaire	-
Base	11

Those who found it difficult it difficult to reply to the consultation also replied that they were unsure how much detail to give to the preliminary questionnaire.

Any other comments on the preliminary qualification questions

Its purpose of establishing a threshold for serious tender candidates was important, but e.g Section 3 (Policies, Procedures & Training) seemed to seek more detail than necessary for this. as a preliminary sift it was a useful exercise but it could have had some more questions that led into the ITT stage, perhaps asking for understanding about priorities and locations.

There was a deadline which we met, although it created great pressure on our organisation.

We were then disappointed to find that the deadline was disregarded at the Tender Stage when PQQs were accepted. Why set rules if they are not adhered to?

But appreciated the surgery which Steve provided the guidance which was excellent.

(respondent had previously advised that they weren't sure on how much detail to give)

Tender Notice Stage

Do you think the Tender Notices published by Lichfield District council were clear?

they were too detailed and prescriptive	3
they were about right	7
they were too vague with not enough detail	1

Tender Submission forms were returned by applicants in response to the Tender Notices. Do you feel that the information required in the submission forms was ...? (tick all that apply)

Okay, you had all the information needed to complete the form	8
Too lengthy and detailed, additional information was required to complete the form	3
I did not understand why the information was required	1
Base	11

Those who replied that the tender notices were too detailed or too vague also responded that the submission forms were too lengthy and additional information was required or that they did not understand why the information was required.

Conversely all those who thought the information in the tender notice was about right also thought the submission forms were okay.

Any other comments on the tendering stage

The amount of work involved in tendering did not match the amount of funding available...

The provision of detailed Tender Notices is extremely valuable - but some e.g. 3,4,5 risked appearing written with one probable applicant in mind, and should leave open wider possible ways of achieving the aim in the title

you could create a "shared area" with reading material and support documents [you would also be able to track who looked at what!] so that everyone has access to minimum core library of resources

There was enough information about how to complete the form however, 3 year financial forecasts are difficult when funding is on a year on year basis. The detail required was also in our Strategic and Service plans which were also required and must have made scoring more difficult as we later found that some scores were changed or applied inconsistently across the Tender Submissions

Considering it was a new process for all applicants, it was surprisingly understandable.

The Decision Stage

How do you feel about the information you received in relation to the decision made?

I would have liked more information	2
I had to contact for more information	1
I felt I had all the information about the decision to understand why it was made	8
Base	11

	Total	No reply	Yes, I was aware throughout the process	Yes, on the whole	No, but I knew how to get more information	No, I was not kept informed
you were kept informed about your application	11	-	-	1	5	5
the process was clear and transparent	11	1	1	1	6	2
Base	22	1	1	2	11	7

Any other comments

Difficult to remember the areas we found harder to complete after this length of time. Would have been useful to do this survey earlier .

An open, structured approach of this kind is much welcomed - even by an unsuccessful applicant organisation.

thank you for the opportunity to feedback. i think that the process was well weighted and did not require much more detail. however, i know that some of my peers did not feel the same way and were a bit lost as to how to construct a response or what evidence to use.

the workshop to explain the process included the small grants scheme this was confusing and should have been separated.

During the Tender process we were contacted by other organisations who told us that it had been suggested to them by a DC officer they contact us about a partnership bid. This turned out not to be possible due to the small amount of funding available. Not knowing exactly how much funding was available under each Submission made it difficult to draft bids and not being awarded the amount requested made the whole thing a bit of a waste in time as we had to start again to work out what we could do for the funding.

I was pleasantly surprised at the informal formality of the process. It was not masked in pretension but clear and unambiguous.

There needs to be a mechanism for initiatives that meet the priorities for the District, but do not fit the scale of the commissioning process as currently defined but also do not fit into an annual grant process because of medium/long term planning issues, sustainability and inward matching funding structure and timing.