

## APPENDIX 1 – Option Analysis

Option	Advantages	Disadvantages
<b>1 – Utilise the existing Framework Agreement with a single supplier</b>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Continuation of existing relationship provides greater efficiency without the need to establish new processes</li> <li>Low costs and resources associated with a contract extension</li> <li>Established pricing structure</li> <li>Continuation of effective delivery of level access showers</li> <li>No delays in appointing at the earliest opportunity for each scheme</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Single provider framework without competition can drive up costs where schemes do not fit into the established pricing structure</li> <li>Reduces choice for service users</li> <li>In the event of business continuity issues, we would need to carry out a full procurement process to replace a single supplier, hindering delivery of our service</li> <li>Lack of competitive tension during the life of the contract may lead to complacency</li> </ul>
<b>2 – CEC Framework with three appointed suppliers</b>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Greater market choice when setting up the Framework</li> <li>Ability to benchmark performance, develop ongoing relationships, build specific loyalty to CEC within a clear mechanism for continuous improvement</li> <li>Maintains competitive tension amongst framework contractors</li> <li>Offers protection to vulnerable residents during the mini-competition process by restricting the number of contractors attending their homes</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Time resourceful to set up initially</li> <li>Lack of flexibility to respond to market changes / availability of appointed suppliers</li> <li>May attract the interest of national contractors with consequently higher preliminaries values</li> <li>Need to have sufficient throughput to maintain the interest of the contractors</li> </ul>
<b>3 – Tender each project</b>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Greater market choice</li> <li>Ultimate competition achieved with every project open to the entire market</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Data protection regulations and safeguarding responsibilities prevent open advertising of each project</li> <li>Time delays and resources required to advertise and procure each project would be unacceptable adding significant cost and delay</li> <li>Provides no ongoing relationship, so cannot develop a partnership approach with continuous improvement in line with Government best practice</li> </ul>
<b>4 – CEC Framework with multiple Lots for a range of building services</b>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Tailored to suit CEC's particular requirements</li> <li>Opportunity to shape the Key Performance Indicators to achieve Outcomes in line with the Corporate Plan and deliver social value</li> <li>Ability to benchmark performance, develop ongoing relationships, build specific loyalty to CEC within a clear</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Time resourceful to set up initially</li> <li>Need to have sufficient throughput to maintain the interests of contractors</li> <li>The appetite to bid may be reduced as there is no guarantee of work</li> <li>The appetite amongst micro and small enterprises may be limited due to the procurement process</li> <li>The nature of the building sector can</li> </ul>

	<p>mechanism for continuous improvement</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Maintains competitive tension amongst Framework contractors</li> <li>• Allows the ability to directly appoint in certain circumstances</li> </ul>	<p>result in the loss of businesses from the Framework, resulting in the need for new procurement exercises to recruit replacement contractors</p>
<p><b>5 – External Frameworks</b> (ESPO, YPO, Fusion 21, NHC, etc)</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Maintains competitive tension amongst framework contractors (where more than one contractor)</li> <li>• Allows ability to directly appoint in certain circumstances</li> <li>• Potential for reduced costs by avoiding costly procurement</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Frameworks not tailored to CEC operational requirements</li> <li>• Framework contractor loyalty can be divided or skewed towards the “host” authority</li> <li>• Limited opportunity to build continuous improvement</li> <li>• Contractors tend to be large national companies, ruling out local SMEs</li> <li>• Frameworks operate differently and could introduce consistency issues</li> </ul>
<p><b>6 – Utilisation of the Assets Low Value Construction Services framework</b></p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Established framework</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Differences between commercial and residential projects cannot easily be bridged</li> <li>• Not tailored to suit the needs of Strategic Housing projects</li> <li>• Would need to adapt requirements to accommodate the safeguarding requirements necessary for Strategic Housing projects</li> <li>• The combined value of the Assets Framework and the additional Strategic Housing requirements would exceed the approved value and reduce the term of the Framework</li> </ul>
<p><b>7 – In-house provision, including substantial insourcing</b></p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Direct control over resources and priorities</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Inflexible resource levels with costs incurred even when workload reduces</li> <li>• Recruitment difficulties with specialist staff</li> </ul>