

APPENDIX 1 – Option Analysis

| Option | Advantages | Disadvantages |
|--|---|--|
| 1 – In-house provision, including substantial insourcing | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Direct control over resources and priorities | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Inflexible resource levels with costs incurred even when workload reduces • Recruitment difficulties with specialist staff • Doesn't fit with Strategic Commissioning Council model |
| 2 – Tender each project | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Greater market choice • Ultimate competition achieved with every project open to the entire market. | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Time delays and resources required to advertise and procure each project would be unacceptable adding significant cost and delay. • Provides no ongoing relationship, so cannot develop a partnership approach with continuous improvement in line with Government Best Practice |
| 3 – CEC Framework | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Tailored to suit CEC's particular requirements • Tailored to suit the requirements of the Council's Alternative Service Delivery Vehicles • Ability to benchmark performance, develop ongoing relationships, build specific loyalty to CEC within a clear mechanism for continuous improvement • Maintains competitive tension amongst Framework contractors • Allows the ability to directly appoint in certain circumstances • Of interest to regional companies | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Costs and resources associated with bespoke procurement of CEC framework. • Need to have sufficient throughput to maintain the interests of contractors • The appetite to bid may be reduced as there is no guarantee of work. |
| 4 – External Frameworks (EFA Framework, Fusion 21, LHC Framework, Salford City, SCAPE etc.) | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Maintains competitive tension amongst framework contractors (where more than one contractor) • Allows ability to directly appoint in certain circumstances • Potential for reduced costs by avoiding costly procurement | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Frameworks not tailored to CEC operational requirements • Framework contractor loyalty can be divided or skewed towards the "host" authority • Less chance than option 3 to build continuous improvement • Contractors tend to be large national companies • Frameworks operate differently and could introduce consistency issues |
| 5 – Single Service provider | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • A single point of contact • No delays in appointing at the earliest opportunity for each project • Ultimate opportunity to build partnership working with ongoing relationships and shared objectives | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • May attract the interest of national contractors with consequently higher preliminaries values • Need to have sufficient throughput to maintain the interest of the contractor • Difficult to address complacency by the single |

| | | |
|--|--|---|
| | | provider when competitive tension is not present during the life of the contract |
| 6 – Programme of work through a higher value Framework | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • A single point of contact • No delays in appointing at the earliest opportunity for each project • Good opportunity to build partnership working with ongoing relationships and shared objectives • Opportunity to include competitive tension at the end of each programme of work | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Difficult to address complacency by the single provider when competitive tension is not present during the programme of works • Difficulty in getting departments to agree a programme of works at the outset • Will not provide for one off projects |