

## APPENDIX 1 – Option Analysis

Option	Advantages	Disadvantages
<b>1 – In-house provision, including substantial staff recruitment</b>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Direct control over resources and priorities.</li> <li>• Familiarity and greater understanding of CEC processes, values and ways of working.</li> <li>• Same teams working together, sharing lessons learned into future projects.</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> <li>• Doesn't fit with Strategic Commissioning Council model.</li> </ul>
<b>2 – Tender each project (do nothing option)</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>• Time and resources required to procure each consultant on a project would be cost and programme prohibitive.</li> <li>• Non-compliance with Contract rules and EU regulations regarding sub-division of similar work and aggregated spend.</li> <li>• Provides no ongoing relationship, so cannot develop a partnership approach with continuous improvement in line with Government Best Practice.</li> <li>• Limited transparency where consultants are repeatedly used.</li> </ul>
<b>3 – CEC Framework (Business as Usual)</b>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Tailored to suit CEC's particular requirements, values, Government best practice etc.</li> <li>• Tailored to suit the requirements of the Council's Alternative Service Delivery Vehicles.</li> <li>• Ability to benchmark performance, develop ongoing relationships, build specific loyalty to CEC within a clear mechanism for continuous improvement.</li> <li>• Ability to reopen competition to maintain competitive tension amongst Framework consultants.</li> <li>• Allows the ability to directly appoint consultants, reducing the commissioning period.</li> <li>• Of interest to regional companies as well as SME's.</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Costs and resources associated with bespoke procurement of CEC framework (estimated £80k or 2.8% of Framework fee value).</li> <li>• Need to have sufficient throughput to maintain the interests of consultants.</li> </ul>
<b>4 – CEC corporate consultant contract (Bloom)</b>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Greater market choice.</li> <li>• Competition achieved with every project.</li> <li>• Allows the ability to directly appoint consultants, reducing the commissioning period.</li> <li>• Managed procurement process.</li> <li>• "Approved list" can be established within the contract.</li> <li>• Of interest to regional companies as well as SME's.</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Less chance than option 3 to build continuous improvement.</li> <li>• Limited pre-qualification.</li> <li>• Charge to use Contract included within Consultants overhead charge (Bloom charge 5% of fee value).</li> <li>• Collateral Warranties to be executed for each consultant commission.</li> </ul>
<b>5 – access other frameworks/ contracts e.g. CCS / SCAPE</b>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Maintains competitive tension amongst framework consultants.</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>• Less chance than option 3 to build continuous improvement.</li> <li>• Consultants more likely to be large national companies.</li> <li>• Charge to use Frameworks either direct or indirect (e.g. SCAPE charge 16% of fee value).</li> </ul>

Option	Advantages	Disadvantages
<b>6 – single service provider</b>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• A single point of contact</li> <li>• No delays in appointing at the earliest opportunity for each project</li> <li>• Ultimate opportunity to build partnership working with ongoing relationships and shared objectives</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Would need to attract the interest of large multi-disciplinary consultants/consortia able to provide the full range of services.</li> <li>• Limits opportunities for SME's.</li> <li>• Need to have sufficient throughput to maintain the interest of consultants, particularly if they are a national concern without a local client base.</li> <li>• Difficult to address complacency by the single provider when competitive tension is not present during the life of the contract.</li> </ul>
<b>7 – strategic partner JV for the full range of asset management services</b>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Could provide a catalyst for wider outsourcing of Council asset management functions.</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Long lead-in time including the requirement for a fundamental Service Review, staff consultation and subsequent OJEU Procurement.</li> <li>• Similar transformational projects have required significant consultant support incurring substantial costs.</li> <li>• Usually undertaken as part of a large outsourcing initiative. CEC capital delivery capability is largely already outsourced – hence the requirement for this procurement.</li> </ul>