National Non-Domestic (Business Rates)

Lot 1 – Losses and Income Forecasting / Lot 2 – Income Maximisation

For Leicester City Council

**Clarifications 9-10**

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
| **Clarification** | **Leicester City Council Response** |
| Would the Council reconsider its response to question 7 which appears to suggest that the Council proposes to appoint two suppliers to carry out the same Income Maximisation work under Lot 2?  The possibility of two service providers racing to identify the same new or increased business rates liability, but only the first service provider to identify the specific income maximisation to get paid, would seem to incentivise speed rather than quality. This would avoid the need for tenderers to consider the necessity to offset costs for work which would completed but not paid within the percentage fees offered. Also, two suppliers carrying out the same work could potentially lead to complaints from rate payers if two organisations ask them for information when reviewing the same ‘prospect’. | For Lot 2 we are looking to appoint a maximum of two providers.  We have no plans to allocate specific work to each provider but will review this as contract progresses, if it is causing operational difficulties. |

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
| **Clarification** | **Leicester City Council Response** |
| Would the Council consider allowing the service provider to raise an invoice for 50% of the charges once the rateable value is confirmed by the Valuation Office Agency (VOA) (with the other 50% to be invoiced 3 months later / at end of any appeal, as originally proposed)?  Getting paid 50% 3 months earlier would improve supplier cash flows, enabling tenderers to offer their best price without considering the need for financing of their costs for such a long period of time. | The terms are per the ITT issued. |