Agenda 12b)

F+O
30/09/24

Milly Southworth

From:	rebecca.earl@cabinetoffice.gov.uk on behalf of PPRS Mailbox <publicprocurementreview@cabinetoffice.gov.uk>
Sent:	24 September 2024 10:46
To:	clerk@torpointtowncouncil.gov.uk
Cc:	PPRS Mailbox
Subject:	Public Procurement Review Service Case 2213

Good morning Milly,

PPRS has now finished it's review of the concerns raised and the information provided. I would like to thank you for attending a meeting with PPRS to provide an overview of the procurement and award process and for providing the supporting information requested. Please note when we close a case we produce a final report and publish a summary of our findings on GOV.UK. In the interest of transparency please find below our final report including the proposed publication wording. Could you please review and and if you have any comments and/or concerns please let us know by close of play Thursday 26th September.

CASE REVIEW INFORMATION:

The issue that was raised with PPRS

PPRS was contacted by a supplier regarding the Torpoint Town Council procurement "Torpoint Lower Fore Street Community Building Feasibility Study". The supplier was concerned that the contracting authority was not open, fair and transparent in its procurement activities and that decision making was being carried out in closed sessions.

What PPRS did

PPRS contacted Torpoint Town Council to understand their contract award processes and how the process and outcome was recorded.

What PPRS found

Torpoint Town Council shared the process followed and subsequent outcome. The council provided supporting information to demonstrate a thorough and robust procurement process, and provided assurance that the process was captured through record keeping. The minutes to the closed council meeting were offered to PPRS for review.

PPRS therefore does not uphold the complaint.

What PPRS recommend

PPRS has no recommendations.

TEXT FOR PUBLICATION:

Issue

PPRS was contacted by a supplier regarding the Torpoint Town Council procurement "Torpoint Lower Fore Street Community Building Feasibility Study". The supplier was concerned that the contracting

authority was not open, fair and transparent in its procurement activities and that decision making was being carried out in closed sessions.

Outcome Complaint not upheld

Torpoint Town Council shared the process followed and subsequent outcome. The council provided supporting information to demonstrate a thorough and robust procurement process, and provided assurance that the process was captured through record keeping. The minutes to the closed council meeting were offered to PPRS for review.

PPRS therefore does not uphold the complaint.

Kind regards

Rebecca

Public Procurement Review Service
Government Commercial Function
Cabinet Office
publicprocurementreview@cabinetoffice.gov.uk