**FOI reference number – 26823**

**Date response submitted – 14 May 2025**

## REQUEST AND RESPONSE

1. When the organisation last ran a procurement or tender process for language services, including (but not limited to) translation, interpretation, or transcription services.
2. The evaluation weighting used in that tender, specifically the percentage weighting allocated to quality and the percentage weighting allocated to price (e.g., 70% quality / 30% price).
3. The name of the successful bidders.
4. The quality and price scores awarded to each bidder in that tender, including:
    - The quality score for each bidder.
    - The price score for each bidder.
    - The total score for each bidder

**Information disclosed:**

1. The Council last ran a procurement or tender process for language services, including translation, interpretation, or transcription services from 2nd May 2024 with the voluntary standstill ending on 20th June 2026 and a contract start date of 1st July 2024.
2. The evaluation weighting used in that tender, specifically the percentage weighting allocated to quality and the percentage weighting allocated to price was 60% quality, 40% price.
3. The successful bidders were Enable 2 CIC for Interpreting Services and Supreme Linguistic Services for Translation Services.
4. The tables below provide for the quality and price scores awarded to each bidder in that tender, for interpreting services and translation services respectively including:
    - The quality score for each bidder.
    - The price score for each bidder.
    - The total score for each bidder.

**Interpreting services**

| Bidder | Quality 50% | Social Value 10% | Price 40% | Total 100% |
|---|---|---|---|---|
| 1 (successful) | 44.00% | 10.00% | 40.00% | 94.00% |
| 2 | 30.00% | 7.50% | 36.35% | 73.85% |
| 3 | 40.00% | 10.00% | 31.44% | 81.44% |
| 4 | 44.00% | 10.00% | 38.00% | 92.00% |
| 5 | 32.00% | 5.00% | 35.24% | 72.24% |
| 6 | 26.00% | 5.00% | 34.36% | 65.36% |
| 7 | 34.00% | 10.00% | 35.65% | 79.65% |
| 8 | 40.00% | 10.00% | 31.32% | 81.32% |
| 9 | 40.00% | 10.00% | 38.73% | 88.73% |

**Translation services**

| Bidder | Quality 50% | Social Value 10% | Price 40% | Total 100% |
|---|---|---|---|---|
| 1 (successful) | 37.50% | 10.00% | 32.00% | 79.50% |
| 2 | 37.50% | 7.50% | 29.09% | 74.09% |
| 3 | 40.00% | 10.00% | 26.67% | 76.67% |
| 4 | 42.50% | 10.00% | 22.86% | 75.36% |
| 5 | 32.50% | 5.00% | 11.43% | 48.93% |
| 6 | 32.50% | 5.00% | 40% | 77.50% |
| 7 | 42.50% | 10.00% | 22.86% | 75.36% |
| 8 | 30.00% | 5.00% | 21.33% | 56.33% |
| 9 | 42.50% | 10.00% | 26.67% | 79.17% |
| 10 | 32.50% | 10.00% | 16.00% | 58.50% |
| 11 | 37.50% | 10.00% | 24.63% | 72.13% |

However, the Council is withholding the names of the unsuccessful bidders, providing only the redacted information in the tables above.
These are being withheld under Section 43(2) of the Freedom of Information Act 2000, which allows public bodies to withhold information which is likely to prejudice the Council's or third parties' commercial interests. This information will not be published. The tenders were established through a competitive tendering process, and the Council considers disclosure of the names of the bidders who were not successful would be likely to adversely affect the third parties' position in a competitive business environment. It is likely that bidders would suffer reputational damage if the information was disclosed to their competitors and the public at large and their competitive positions in their respective market would be adversely affected. In conjunction with media reporting, customer and investor confidence in the unsuccessful bidders' operations in particular could decline.

**Public Interest Test**
I have considered the public interest in disclosing information in response to this request, which includes the fact that this would aid openness and transparency. There is a strong public interest in facilitating accountability and transparency in how public funds and budgets are spent generally and being secretive and opaque is not in the public interest and may have a negative effect on supplier confidence.

However, although there is a public interest in facilitating accountability and transparency in how public contracts are awarded and public funds are spent generally, there is an overriding public interest in ensuring that commercial and financial interests of third party providers are not disclosed to competitors, as disclosure of the names of the unsuccessful bidders into the public domain in conjunction with other information already available could materially prejudice the third parties' commercial and financial interests. The Council takes the view that there is an inherent public interest in the maintenance of the exemption, and of generally upholding the third parties' expectations that this commercially sensitive information will be protected from disclosure when they engage in public authority tenders thereby avoiding reputational damage. The Council does not view it is in the public interest to discourage prospective tenderers from tendering for its public sector contracts, for fear of disclosure of their commercially sensitive information to competitors. If it were to do so, the Council has concerns that this would adversely affect both the quality of tenders for its contracts, and the Council's ability to negotiate them effectively. The Council believes that it is important to maintain a competitive market and keep driving competition as this benefits both public authorities and consumers and this could be adversely affected by disclosure of providers' commercial information. If this information is disclosed it is likely to undermine the Council's relationships with its third-party providers and risk a shortage of providers in the district and ultimately drive-up costs. This would have a detrimental impact on the public purse which would not be in the public interest. Also information on the successful bidders and redacted information on the unsuccessful bidders is being disclosed. Having weighed the opposing public interest arguments I have concluded that the public interest in maintaining the exemption outweighs the public interest in disclosing the information.