

OPTIONS APPRAISAL

Option	Description of Option	Advantages	Disadvantages
Option 1 Conduct a full open tender		Compliant with Public Contract Regulations	<p>Would not necessarily provide value for money as several well established frameworks already exist</p> <p>Would take considerable time and hours to resource and take 6 to 9 months to award contract.</p>
Option 2 – Dynamic Purchasing System (DPS)	Create an EEBC DPS with multiple suppliers.	<p>It would be bespoke EEBC needs with multiple <u>local</u> suppliers.</p> <p>“off contract” agencies could be added and open for new suppliers to enter.</p> <p>Option to direct award or conduct further competition.</p> <p>Could provide opportunity to work collaboratively with other Local Authorities</p>	<p>Again resource intensive with a 9 to 12 period to award contract .</p> <p>A DPS needs significant contract management to keep it up to date</p> <p>As a smaller market spend, we may not attract many new suppliers and therefore not achieve better value for money than existing frameworks</p>
Option 3a - <u>Direct award</u> Preferred Option	<p>To Matrix SCM Ltd via ESPO MSTAR3 Framework (653F)</p> <p>Lot specific services to Neutral Vendors (Lot 1a)</p>	<p>Immediately compliant and no disruption to services</p> <p>Well established process EEBC has successfully used this framework previously.</p> <p>Prices will remain fixed and not expected to increase from current contract.</p>	<p>By direct awarding there is no facility to drive any further savings. However the agency fees direct to Matrix are low through a mini-competition. Only minor amendments to the T&C's is permitted.</p> <p>This does not address the issue of “off contract spend “ where we are unable to obtain appropriate staff through Matrix but</p>

		<p>No disruption to service</p> <p>Matrix listed on the framework have already been assessed for their financial stability, track record, experience, and technical & professional ability.</p> <p>ESPO regulate the framework and Matrix are responsible for regulating their suppliers</p> <p>Further work with contract managers can review off contract spend and management</p>	<p>this can be addressed by additional governance controls.</p>
<p>Option 3b – <u>Mini-Competition</u></p>	<p>via ESPO MSTAR3 Framework (653F)</p> <p>Lot specific services to Neutral Vendors (Lot 1a)</p>	<p>There are 10 suppliers on this framework who have already been assessed for their financial stability, track record, experience, and technical & professional ability.</p> <p>ESPO will manage the framework and ensuring consistent service and pricing over all call offs.</p>	<p>The option for further competition is unlikely to drive down costs as within the neutral vend solutions they will use similar suppliers with the same agency fees</p> <p>There would be a significant disruption to service with little gain in terms of service or cost.</p>
<p>Option 4 – EEBC Framework</p>	<p>Create an EEBC Framework with multiple suppliers.</p>	<p>A bespoke EEBC Framework that includes multiple <u>local</u> suppliers.</p> <p>Opportunity would be open to the whole market.</p> <p>Fosters effective competition and a potential opportunity to work collaboratively with other Local Authorities</p>	<p>Significant resources would be required</p> <p>Tender preparation, evaluation and contract management is time consuming and resources intensive.</p> <p>Can be hard to encourage smaller business to sign up.</p> <p>Other frameworks have already been created by several purchasing bodies and local authorities.</p> <p>Significant contract management required.</p>

