

Cambridgeshire County Council - Education Capital Procurement Options - Options Appraisal Summary

	Local Cambridgeshir e Framework final score	Local Cambridgeshir e Framework weighted average score	DfE School Building Framework final score	DfE School Building Framework weighted average score	Pagabo final score	Pagabo weighted average score	Scape final score	Scape weighted average score
Non-financial Benefits	101	60.6	71	42.6	80	48	77	46.2
Financial Impact	7	1.4	7	1.4	0	0	-3	-0.6
Opportunity Costs	16	3.2	9	1.8	14	2.8	12	0
TOTAL SCORE	124	65.2	87	45.8	94	50.8	86	48

	Weightings
Non-financial Benefits	60%
Financial Impact	20%
Opportunity Costs	20%

Cambridgeshire County Council - Education Capital Procurement Options - Options Appraisal Key Findings

1	Re-procurement of a Local Cambridgeshire Framework
a)	Non-financial impact –
	this is that the existing framework has been operating for 8 years and has been used to successfully deliver the Education Capital Programme which comprises a significant number of individual capital projects. The framework has well-developed processes and systems that support its delivery goals. These processes allow consultants and contractors to be clear about how the framework operates and the key success
i.	criteria.
ii.	The framework structure and processes allow local systems and procedures to be integrated into the delivery of projects e.g. town planning, highways and the local policy agenda, particularly the Council's policies on the climate emergency.
	Officers' existing knowledge of the framework mean there is a good understanding of the potential for further improvement and development. This offers the added benefit of efficiency in terms of officer time required on behalf of the P&C Directorate as client. Finally, because it is a locally managed framework, and generally tends to draw on regional and local contractors, the local social value benefits are maximised.
b)	Financial Impact –
	required to achieve the improvements identified, in the areas of performance management, social value and KPIs, the preparation of the tender documents and management of the procurement process. It should be noted that there are also ongoing management costs, which
i.	would need to continue to be found within the existing staff budget.
c)	Opportunity Costs –
	The proposed procurement route would provide a high degree of opportunity to save capital costs on projects. The benefits of having a framework with local overall control would mean that there are greater opportunities for the successful management of risk and costs and how
ii.	best to mitigate the financial impact of these through open dialogue.
iii.	Council's Education Capital Project Officers, delivering social value for the wider community and contributing to the Council's policy agenda on the Climate Emergency.
2	Use of the DfE School Building Framework
a)	Non-financial impact –
i.	The proposed procurement route would partially meet the non-financial requirements but has the lowest score in this area. The main reason for this arises from the framework processes being well established and clear but perceived to be rigid and time consuming.
ii.	The flexibility to respond to some of the major challenges faced with large developments is also more difficult. The specific priorities of the Council will not be reflected in the terms and conditions of the framework and it is difficult, if not impossible, for the framework processes to be adjusted to suit the specific requirements of individual clients.
iii.	framework.
iv.	The framework is also limited in scope as it can only be used to deliver school projects, and does not have the ability to allow for novation of a designer or use of modern methods of construction (MMC – which is offered by the DfE through an alternative framework).

v	It is doubtful as to whether the framework could offer the highest degree of partnership working and social value given that it would draw on a national pool of contractors and contractors are appointed on the basis of 'next off the list', also known as the 'taxi rank'.
b)	Financial Impact –
i.	interfaces with local processes would mean an increase in the amount of officer time to oversee and manage the use of the framework. This would involve the need to procure a suitably qualified and experienced Employer's Representative from an external framework, which in itself hold risks associated with change and lack of knowledge. There would also be a need for some in-service training of Council officers undertaking the client role.
c)	Opportunity costs –
i.	The proposed procurement route would have a low opportunity cost because of the impact on staffing costs and the lack of opportunity to share innovation and professional development.
ii.	Whilst the very structured and rigid performance monitoring system would give the Council re-assurance of the contractor's abilities to deliver, the 'taxi rank' system in place provides little opportunity to develop an on-going working relationship with a contractor.
iii.	One of the areas of great concern is the passing of risks to the contractor through the (bespoke Joint Contracts Tribunal (JCT)) contract. In this event there is not mechanism for negotiation and so the contractor would price this risk, and then this would be passed back to the Council as client via tender costs and ultimately the contract price.

3	Use of the Pagabo Framework
a)	Non-financial benefits –
i.	The proposed framework would meet the majority of the non-financial requirements. However, the interface between the Council process and the complex local planning framework in Cambridgeshire would impact on delivery and available Council officer resource.
ii.	It is doubtful as to whether the framework could offer the highest degree of partnership working as contractors are drawn from a national pool, with no guarantee of repeat business.
b)	Financial impact –
i.	The proposed procurement route would have a high financial impact. This includes a significantly high cost associated with the use of the framework in which a framework fee is charged on each capital project in addition to a more moderate cost associated with set up and on-going management. In reality the Council would not be able to justify the additional cost associated with the use of this framework as well as retain an internal project team, which would still be required to act as the intelligent client role.
c)	Opportunity cost –
i.	The proposed procurement route would have a high financial impact. This includes a significantly high cost associated with the use of the framework in which a framework fee is charged on each capital project in addition to a cost associated with set up and on-going management. In reality the Council would not be able to justify the additional cost associated with the use of this framework as well as retain an internal project team, which would still be required to act as the intelligent client role.

4	Use of the Scape Framework
a)	Non-financial benefits –

i.	This would meet the majority of the non-financial requirements. However, the interface between the Council process and the complex local planning framework in Cambridgeshire could impact on delivery and available Council officer resource.
ii.	It is doubtful as to whether the framework could offer the highest degree of competition and performance as the framework currently offers exclusivity to a 'single supplier'.
b)	Financial impact –
i.	The proposed procurement route would have a high financial impact. This includes a significantly high cost associated with the use of the framework in which a framework fee is charged on each capital project in addition to a cost associated with set up and on-going management. In reality the Council would not be able to justify the additional cost associated with the use of this framework as well as retain an internal project team, which would still be required to act as the intelligent client role.
c)	Opportunity cost –
i.	The proposed framework would provide a minimal opportunity to save money. It's possible that long-term relationships allowing for the professional development of the Council's Education Capital Project Officers, delivering social value for the wider community and contributing to the Council's policy agenda on the Climate Emergency, will develop over time. However, even though the Council has a pipeline of work, these opportunities might be lost as the Council would be one of many clients of the framework.
ii.	There is a concern that because this framework currently only offers a 'single supplier' there would be no competitive

Cambridgeshire County Council - Education Capital Procurement Options - Options Appraisal Non-financial Impact

3 = Fully meets requirement 2 = Partially meets requirement 1 = Does not meet requirement	Local Cambridgeshire Framework	Score	DfE School Building Framework	Score	Pagabo	Score	Scape	Score
Time								
The framework allows CCC to procure projects (including urgent schemes) within required timeframes	Fully met - projects can be procured quickly using both traditional and MMC	3	Partially met - the process of delivery is quite ridged, so alternative DfE MMC Frameworks might be better suited	2	Fully met - Projects can be procured quickly using both traditional and MMC	3	Fully met - Projects can be procured quickly using both traditional and MMC	3
The framework allows flexibility to adjust standard processes (both accelerate and decelerate) to suit project timeframes whilst maintaining required cost and quality parameters	Fully met - early contractor engagement allows for flexibility	3	Partially met - the process of delivery is quite ridged, so alternative DfE MMC Frameworks might be better suited	2	Fully met - Projects can be procured quickly using both traditional and MMC	3	Fully met - Projects can be procured quickly using both traditional and MMC	3
Framework opportunities can be tendered without either employer or contractor expending significant additional resources	Fully met - turn around time can be as short at 2 months depending on level of feasibility detail required	3	Partially met - additional internal project management resource required	2	Not met - significant additional internal project management resource required	1	Not met - significant additional internal project management resource required	1
The framework facilitates early contractor involvement in project delivery	Fully met - Contractor is brought in at RIBA Stage 1/2	3	Partially met - The contractor is involved but the client initiates early design stage via a control option	2	Fully met- Contractor is brought in at RIBA Stage 1/2	3	Fully met - Contractor is brought in at RIBA Stage 1/2	3
The framework allows mini-competitions to be carried out to optimise value for money	Fully met - Its possible to mini-tender projects	3	Fully met - Its possible to mini-tender projects	3	Fully met - Its possible to mini-tender projects	3	Does not meet - single provider only. However, this may change with the new iteration of the framework procured in 2021	1
There are at least 5 Potential Providers that can be approached for each scheme	Does not meet - However, this could be addressed with the new iteration of the framework	1	Fully met - Its possible to mini-tender projects	3	Fully met - Its possible to mini-tender projects	3	Does not meet - single provider only. However, this may change with the new iteration of the framework procured in 2021	1
The framework has suppliers under different value bands/levels to ensure competitive rates are optimised but also normalised between small business and larger organisations	Fully met	3	Fully met	3	Fully met	3	Not met - single provider only. However, this may change with the new iteration of the framework procured in 2021	3
The framework benefits from the suppliers being well-versed and experienced with the local Cambridgeshire planning timescales	Partially met - The majority of the contractors have had experience of delivering a project in Cambridgeshire	2	Partially met - Some of the contractors have had experience of delivering a project in Cambridgeshire	2	Not met - none of the contractors have experience of delivering a project in Cambridgeshire	1	Not met - none of the contractors have experience of delivering a project in Cambridgeshire	1
Cost								
There is no charge/fee to be able to use the framework	Fully met - There is no charge	3	Fully met - there is no charge	3	Not met - There is a charge for using the framework	1	Not met - There is a charge for using the framework	1
There is a distinct set/schedule of maximum fees per element/per discipline for every stage of the project, in alignment with CCC Milestones or at least RIBA stages	Fully met - Fees are set for each stage of the project in alignment with CCC Milestones	3	Not met - The stages are fixed and do not align	1	Partially met - The framework is flexible, but with work fees could be aligned	2	Fully met - Fees are set for each stage of the project	3

Framework rates are fixed for a least a four year period	Fully met - New framework would be for a 4 year period	3	Partially met - Existing framework comes to an end in 2021, but its reasonable to assume that it will be the same in an new iteration.	2	Fully met - New framework would be for a 4 year period	2	Partially met - Existing framework comes to an end in 2021, but its reasonable to assume that it will be the same in an new iteration.	2
Maximum framework rates offered are considered competitive in the current market climate	Fully met - The framework is re-procured every 4 years in order to test the market	3	Fully met - The framework is re-procured every 4 years in order to test the market	3	Fully met - The framework is re-procured every 4 years in order to test the market	3	Fully met - The framework is re-procured every 4 years in order to test the market	3
There is flexibility in being able to choose which stage of the project the supplier's appointment is expected to commence e.g. appointment to start at Milestone 2 or 3 etc	Fully met - Its possible to bring the supplier in at any stage	3	Not met - The Client would be expected to the early design stage	1	Fully met - Its possible to bring the supplier in at any stage	3	Fully met - Its possible to bring the supplier in at any stage	3
The framework ensures CCC has no liability to suppliers for any losses should CCC decide to not proceed beyond Milestone 4 if a Contract Sum is not agreed.	Fully met - There is no liability to CCC if the contract is not taken forward	3	Not met - Contractors losses would need to be paid	3	Not met - Contractors losses would need to be paid	3	Not met - Contractors losses would need to be paid	3
The framework provides CCC the flexibility to own or transfer any project risk as they wish.	Fully met - Risk is agreed and managed via a project Risk Register	3	Not met - The contract position and process is rigid and the majority of the risk is passed to the contractor	1	Partially met - Risk is agreed and managed via a project Risk Register, but the Council may not have much flexibility in this area	2	Partially met - Risk is agreed and managed via a project Risk Register, but the Council may not have much flexibility in this area	2
There is an option to novate preferred designers without incurring additional charges	Fully met - Yes, its possible to novate without additional charges	3	Not met - It is not possible to novate a designer	1	Partially met - This could be arranged with a bespoke agreement, which would cost money and add time	2	Partially met - This could be arranged with a bespoke agreement, which would cost money and add time	2
The framework provides the ready option to discuss, plan and progress with either modular or traditional schemes with all suppliers	Fully met - Yes, it is possible to discuss, plan and progress with a modular and/or traditional supplier	3	Not met - There is a separate Framework for modular suppliers	1	Fully met - Yes, it is possible to discuss, plan and progress with a modular and/or traditional supplier	3	Fully met - Yes, it is possible to discuss, plan and progress with a modular and/or traditional supplier	3
There is effective management of costs on projects	Fully met - Done through a tried and tested milestone process and sign off process	3	Not met - Milestone process would need to be adapted in accordance with CCC governance processes. It is anticipated that there would need to be additional management process put in place to deal with this	1	Not met - Milestone process would need to be adapted in accordance with CCC governance processes. It is anticipated that there would need to be additional management process put in place to deal with this	1	Not met - Milestone process would need to be adapted in accordance with CCC governance processes. It is anticipated that there would need to be additional management process put in place to deal with this	1
The cost of delivering projects can be demonstrated to offer value for money	Fully met - Framework providers are expected to meet EBD OG benchmark rates, which are a standard for school building projects. Other than up front framework procurement costs, there are no other anticipated project costs.	3	Not met - Framework providers have to meet strict benchmark rates at project tender stage. It is anticipated that project management costs will be high to allow for new processes.	1	Not met - Framework providers have to meet strict benchmark rates at project tender stage. It is anticipated that project management costs will be high to allow for new processes.	1	Not met - Framework providers have to meet strict benchmark rates at project tender stage. It is anticipated that project management costs will be high to allow for new processes.	1
Quality								

The terms and conditions of the framework closely reflect CCC's priorities	Fully met - The framework can be bespoke to CCC requirements	3	Partially met - There are concerns regarding the transfer of risk and lack of long term collaboration with suppliers	2	Fully met - The framework is flexible enough to make it as close to CCC requirements as possible	3	Fully met - The framework is flexible enough to make it as close to CCC requirements as possible	3
CCC has a clear understanding of contractor performance prior to contract commencement	Fully met - Performance of contractors are monitored	3	Fully met - Performance of contractors are monitored	3	Fully met - Performance of contractors are monitored	3	Fully met - Performance of contractors are monitored	3
Contractors have demonstrable experience of working on education capital projects in a Local Authority context	Fully met - Contractors experience is reviewed as part of the framework entry requirements	3	Fully met - Contractors experience is reviewed as part of the framework entry requirements	3	Fully met - Contractors experience is reviewed as part of the framework entry requirements	3	Fully met - Contractors experience is reviewed as part of the framework entry requirements	3
The framework offers genuine partnership working, project innovation and assurance that the service providers will provide continuity of staff on projects throughout the duration of the framework	Fully met - Contractors ability to offer this is reviewed as part of the framework requirements and managed as part of overall performance	3	Partially met - Performance is monitored but genuine partnership working is difficult to achieve without a long term working relationship	2	Partially met - Performance is monitored but genuine partnership working is difficult to achieve without a long term working relationship	2	Partially met - Performance is monitored but genuine partnership working is difficult to achieve without a long term working relationship	2
The framework facilitates direct communication between the parties and allows long term relationships to be developed	Fully met - Contractors ability to offer this is reviewed as part of the framework requirements and managed as part of overall performance	3	Partially met - Performance is monitored but genuine partnership working is difficult to achieve without a long term working relationship	2	Partially met - Performance is monitored but genuine partnership working is difficult to achieve without a long term working relationship	2	Partially met - Performance is monitored but genuine partnership working is difficult to achieve without a long term working relationship	2
Continuous improvement measures and added value can be measured by Key Performance Indicators	Fully met - Performance monitoring is in place	3	Fully met - Performance monitoring is in place	3	Fully met - Performance monitoring is in place	3	Fully met - Performance monitoring is in place	3
Contractors can demonstrate a genuine ability to employ local labour and understand the local economy through the monitoring of social value	Fully met - All contractors report on a social value KPI	3	Fully met - All contractors report on a social value KPI	3	Fully met - All contractors report on a social value KPI	3	Fully met - All contractors report on a social value KPI	3
Contractors and their consultants have a detailed knowledge of the Cambridgeshire town planning processes and challenges	Partially met - The majority of the contractors have had experience of delivering a project in Cambridgeshire	2	Partially met - Some of the contractors have had experience of delivering a project in Cambridgeshire	2	Not met - none of the contractors have experience of delivering a project in Cambridgeshire	1	No t met - none of the contractors have experience of delivering a project in Cambridgeshire	1
The framework allows key stakeholders (planning, highways etc) to feed in to processes with a view to continuous improvement	Fully met - A full lessons learned review is undertaken after each project	3	Partially met - Lessons learned is undertaken but unlikely to cover local performance	2	Partially met - Lessons learned is undertaken but unlikely to cover local performance	2	Partially met - Lessons learned is undertaken but unlikely to cover local performance	2
The management of project risk is effectively managed through the framework and contract arrangements	Fully met - Risk is agreed and managed via a project Risk Register	3	Not met - The contract position and process is rigid and the majority of the risk is passed to the contractor	1	Partially met - Risk is agreed and managed via a project Risk Register. The Council may not have much flexibility in this area.	2	Partially met - Risk is agreed and managed via a project Risk Register. The Council may not have much flexibility in this area.	2
The quality of service and product delivery can be effectively managed	Fully met - Suppliers are well versed in using CCC design guides and processes	3	Partially met - New suppliers would need to establish working relationships and quality standards	2	Partially met - New suppliers would need to establish working relationships and quality standards	2	Partially met - New suppliers would need to establish working relationships and quality standards	2

There is an excellent track record of delivery of projects on time and in accordance with the contractual requirements	Fully met - Framework demonstrates good outcomes and delivers in these areas	3	Fully met - Framework demonstrates good outcomes and delivers in these areas	3	Fully met - Framework demonstrates good outcomes and delivers in these areas	3	Fully met - Framework demonstrates good outcomes and delivers in these areas	3
The framework arrangements encourage innovation in relation to design, management and process arrangements	Fully met - Contractors ability to offer this is reviewed as part of the framework requirements and managed as part of overall performance	3	Partially met - Performance is monitored but genuine partnership working is difficult to achieve without a long term working relationship	2	Partially met - Performance is monitored but genuine partnership working is difficult to achieve without a long term working relationship	2	Partially met - Performance is monitored but genuine partnership working is difficult to achieve without a long term working relationship	2
The framework arrangements would successfully support the of implementation of policy to support the CCC Climate Change Emergency agenda	Fully met - Suppliers are well versed in meeting CCC policy requirements	3	Partially met - New suppliers would need to establish ways of delivering policy requirements	2	Partially met - New suppliers would need to establish ways of delivering policy requirements	2	Partially met - New suppliers would need to establish ways of delivering policy requirements	2
Other								
The framework has the ability to deliver all capital projects, not just Education	Fully met - the framework can deliver non-education projects	3	Not met - The framework can only deliver education projects	1	Fully met - the framework can deliver non-education projects	3	Fully met - the framework can deliver non-education projects	3
Existing internal Council resourcing levels would be sufficient in managing this framework	Fully met - There would be an up front cost to the framework procurement process, but the overall staff resource would not need to change	3	Not met - On-going management time and resource would be required on a project level to deal with changes	1	Not met - On-going management time and resource would be required on a project level to deal with changes	1	Not met - On-going management time and resource would be required on a project level to deal with changes	1
TOTAL SCORE		101		71		80		77

Cambridgeshire County Council - Education Capital Procurement Options - Options Appraisal Financial Impact

10 - Low financial impact (Between £0 and £100k)				
7 - Medium financial impact (Between £100k and £500k)				
3 - High financial impact (Between £500k and £1m)				
0 - Very high impact (Between £1m and £50m)				
- 3 - Significant impact (over £1m)				
Framework provider based on a £245m programme over 5 years	N/A	N/A	£ 735,000	£ 1,225,000
External Resource Cost				
- LGSS Legal (framework costs and assumes no legal challenge)	£ 3,000	£ 1,500	£ 1,500	£ 1,500
- Professional Service Support (framework design, set up, evaluation & moderation)**	£ 28,000	N/A	N/A	N/A
Internal Staff Costs (direct costs)				
- CCC Staff Training	£ 2,000	£ 4,000	£ 800	£ 800
TOTAL ADDITIONAL COST	£ 30,000	£ 5,500	£ 737,300	£ 1,227,300
costs)				
- LGSS Procurement	£ 2,797	N/A	N/A	N/A
up	£ 14,386	£ 1,798	£ 1,798	£ 1,798
management	N/A	£ 14,545	£ 14,545	£ 14,545
management	£ 18,701	£ 37,403	£ 18,701	£ 18,701
Performance Management and KPI's	£ 14,545	N/A	N/A	N/A
TOTAL COST IMPACT	£ 50,430	£ 53,746	£ 35,045	£ 35,045
TOTAL COST	£ 80,430	£ 59,246	£ 772,345	£ 1,262,345
Total Score	7	7	0	-3

**County Council -
Education Capital
Procurement Options -
Opportunity Cost**

1 - Zero opportunity to save costs 2 - Minimal opportunity to save costs opportunity to save costs	Local Cambridgeshire Framework	Score	DfE School Building Framework	Score	Pagabo	Score	Scape	Score
Internal Staff Costs	Its anticipated that the existing staff levels will need to be maintained and additional staffing required for performance monitoring	1	Its anticipated that there would be additional demands on staff so there are zero opportunity to save costs	1	Its anticipated that there would be minimal opportunity to save costs	2	Its anticipated that there would be minimal opportunity to save costs	2
Joint Professional Development	Its anticipated that there will be opportunities to share professional development and training with partner suppliers	3	It is anticipated that there will no opportunity to share professional development	1	There may be some opportunities to share professional development and training	2	There may be some opportunities to share professional development and training	2

Established working or professional relationships and knowledge of planning/highways and 3 tier system of local government	It is anticipated that there will be opportunities for knowledge sharing and cross departmental working	3	It is anticipated that there will be no opportunity for knowledge sharing and cross departmental working	2	It is anticipated that there will be minimal opportunity for knowledge sharing and cross departmental working	2	It is anticipated that there will be minimal opportunity for knowledge sharing and cross departmental working	2
Ability to approach at least 4 Potential Providers and conduct Further Competitions in order to achieve best value/cost savings	There are more than 4 potential providers and the opportunity for Further Competitions	3	There are more than 4 potential providers and the opportunity for Further Competitions	3	There are more than 4 potential providers and the opportunity for Further Competitions	3	Single supplier only - But this might change with the next iteration of the Framework	1
Flexibility to own or transfer risks on each scheme	There is flexibility to manage and transfer risk	3	The DfE approach passes risk to the supplier and is fixed and cannot be changed	1	There is flexibility to manage and transfer risk	3	There is flexibility to manage and transfer risk	3

Ability to achieve competitive and realistic costs for either modular or traditional options with all suppliers	It is possible to bring in MMC and traditional suppliers	3	Its not possible to bring in MMC supplier, this would need to be done via a separate MMC Framework	1	There is limited opportunity to bring in MMC supplier, this would need to be done via a separate MMC Framework	2	There is limited opportunity to bring in MMC supplier, this would need to be done via a separate MMC Framework	2
Total Score		16		9		14		12

