

Appendix 7

PT3 - Procurement Options Report: Services and Goods

This document is used to identify the Procurement Strategy and Purchasing Routes associated with a project and only considers the option recommended on the associated Gateway report.

| | | | |
|---|--------------------------------------|--|--------------------|
| City Procurement Project Reference: | ProcOps | | |
| Project / Contract Title: | Moorgate Crossrail station links | | |
| Category Board: | Construction & Professional Services | | |
| Category Board date: | Value is below £100K | | |
| Project Lead & Contract Manager: | Maria Curro | Lead Department: | Maria Curro |
| Category Manager: | Kayleigh Rippe | Other Contact: | N/A |
| Total Contract Value (excluding VAT and inc. extension options): | £50K-£100K (each contract) | Contract Duration (inc. extension options): | 6 months to 1 year |
| Budget approved Capital/Revenue: | No, this report seeks approval | Capital Project/project vision ref reference (if applicable): | |
| Gateway Approval Process <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Is this project subject to the Gateway process? Yes - If so, what was the last Gateway report, and date of approval, and what is the next Gateway report and scheduled date for recommendation for approval? Last Gateway report for the 'wider area' was in February 2015 and was a Gateway 4. Current report, issues report, proposing next Gateway for the 'wider area' is a Gateway 3 /4 January 2020. <ul style="list-style-type: none"> o Within the issues report, seeking Delegated Authority for a Gateway 4/5 for the Finsbury Circus western arm. | | | |
| Opportunity for Inter-City Collaboration (is there another site/department that could benefit from this project)? Not at this time | | | |

Procurement Strategy Recommendation

| |
|---|
| City Procurement team recommended option |
| Appoint separate consultants – The City can appoint based on the requirement |

Route to Market Recommendation

| |
|--|
| City Procurement team recommended option |
| Request for quote exercise (Sub £100K) – This will provide the quickest route to market and will mean the City can work to its own terms. |

Specification and Evaluation Overview

| |
|--|
| Summary of the main requirements: Moorgate Crossrail station links (wider area) requirements include: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Traffic and pedestrian data collection/surveys • Traffic modelling, including consultancy support • Ground radar surveys Finsbury Circus western arm requirements include: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Ground radar surveys • Highway works to deliver in-house design • Green infrastructure/planters/seating |
| Technical and Pricing evaluation ratio 70% (Technical) / 30% (Price) |
| Overview of the key Evaluation areas (if known at this stage): Not known at this time |
| Does contract delivery involve a higher than usual level of Health & Safety, Insurance, or Business risk to be allowed in the procurement strategy? No |
| Is the contract likely to require financial uplifts? (Please describe what method will be used to calculate the uplift and whether this will be capped) |

| | |
|--|---|
| No | |
| Are there any accompanying documents with this report? e.g. PTO/outlined project plan identifying roles and responsibilities as appropriate If yes, please include information in the appendices section below. | Yes <input type="checkbox"/> No <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> |
| Will this project require the winning supplier(s) to process personal data on our behalf? | Yes <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> No <input type="checkbox"/> |
| If yes, please make sure you've defined roles and responsibilities within your project specification. For more information visit Designing Specifications under GDPR . You may include your Privacy Impact Assessment or other relevant report as an appendix to this PT form when submitting to category board (for information). | |
| Evaluation Panel – Please enter Names of evaluators and Departments below (if known) | |
| Maria Curro/Gillian Howard | Built Environment |

Procurement Timeframes

| | | | |
|---|-----------------------------|---|-----------------------------|
| Target tender live date (to market) August 2019 | Click here to enter a date. | Notification of outcome / intention to award date | Click here to enter a date. |
| Target contract start date | Click here to enter a date. | | |
| Are there any time, quality, or cost constraints which need to be taken into consideration? | | | |

Policy and Compliance Considerations

| |
|---|
| How will the Procurement meet the City's: |
| Responsible Procurement Strategy (including Social Value Panel): At least one supplier invited to bid will be a SME, Local business, or Social Enterprise |
| TUPE/Pension liabilities that need to be considered (including future exit provisions where applicable)? None |
| Will this procurement be split into Lots? No |
| Other: N/A |

Procurement Strategy Options: This could include inter-departmental usage, external collaborative opportunities, existing contracts integrated once expired or adding it to an existing contract. Options for Make (In-house delivery) versus Buy (Outsource) decision to be considered; also indicate any discarded or radical options.

| |
|--|
| Option 1: Appoint separate consultants |
| Advantages to this Option: |
| <ul style="list-style-type: none"> A specialist consultant is appointed for each specialism We can monitor the performance of each supplier as they would be bound by our own terms and conditions. |
| Disadvantages to this Option: |
| <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Multiple tender exercises are required. Additional administration is required for each. |
| Please highlight and possible risks associated with this option: Increased administration to deliver this project. |
| Option 2: Multi-Disciplinary Appointments |
| Advantages to this Option: |
| <ul style="list-style-type: none"> One Supplier to manage all sub consultants. Performance can be monitored at one source. |
| Disadvantages to this Option: |
| <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Unable to separately tender the rest of the project team, appointments are made by the main consultant. Unable to manage individual suppliers and must be done at high level. |
| Please highlight and possible risks associated with this option: |
| The highest level fails all the consultants fail |

Route to Market Options: Route to market is the way in which the City will invite suppliers to bid for the procurement.

| |
|---|
| Option 1: Request for quote exercise (Sub £100K) |
| Advantages to this Option: |
| <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Quick route to market (3-4 weeks end to end process) Tailored specification Work to the City's terms and conditions |
| Disadvantages to this Option: |

| |
|--|
| <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Increased administration on behalf of City Procurement |
| Please highlight and possible risks associated with this option: May result in increased resources |
| Option 2: Framework |
| Advantages to this Option: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Select list of suppliers to approach Established service Established terms and conditions |
| Disadvantages to this Option: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Terms and conditions are not the City's own A complex process could result in longer timeframes Suppliers on the framework may be new to the City |
| Please highlight and possible risks associated with this option: Could result in few or zero responses due to suppliers not having capacity. |

Outline of appendices

| |
|---|
| <ul style="list-style-type: none"> N/A |
|---|

Report Sign-offs (prior to Category Board approval)

| | | | |
|--------------------------|----------------|------|---|
| Senior Category Manager | Kayleigh Rippe | Date | Click here to enter a date. |
| Departmental Stakeholder | Maria Curro | Date | Click here to enter a date. |

