

## PT4 - Committee Procurement Report

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

### Introduction

<b>Author:</b>	Michael Harrington		
<b>Project Title:</b>	Middlesex Street Estate, Petticoat Tower, Replacement of Windows and Balcony Doors		
<b>Summary of Goods or Services to be sourced</b>			
Replacement of the existing windows and doors with an equivalent layout, with double glazing. At Middlesex Street Estate, Petticoat Tower			
<b>Contract Duration:</b>	12 weeks	<b>Contract Value:</b>	£787,000
<b>Stakeholder information</b>			
<b>Project Lead &amp; Contract Manager:</b>	<b>Category Manager:</b>	<b>Lead Department:</b>	
Jason Crawford	Michael Harrington	DCCS – Housing	
<b>Other Contact</b>		<b>Department</b>	
N/A		N/A	

### Specification Overview

<b>Summary of the Specification:</b>
Replacement of the existing windows and doors with an equivalent layout, with double glazing. At Middlesex Street Estate, Petticoat Tower
<b>Project Objectives:</b> To ensure high quality delivery of the project within budget and with the tenants experiencing the least amount of disruption.

### Customer Requirements

<b>Target completion date</b>	April 2017	<b>Target Contract award date</b>	June 2017
<b>Are there any time constraints which need to be taken into consideration?</b>			
None			

<b>Efficiencies Target with supporting information</b>	
Engage with SME's to deliver this project	

### City of London Initiatives

<b>How will the Project meet the City of London's Obligation to</b>
<b>Adhere to the Corporation Social Responsibility:</b>
N/A
<b>Take into account the London Living Wage (LLW):</b>
Yes
<b>Consideration for Small to Medium Enterprises (SME):</b>
Yes – Due to the location, this would be perfect for an SME as logistics would be to a minimum.
<b>Other:</b>

### Procurement Route Options

Make v buy to be considered; also indicate any discarded or radical options

<b>Option 1: Below OJEU Tender</b>
<b>Advantages to this Option:</b>
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Allows us to engage with the market as a whole.</li> <li>Allows the City to build the specification it requires and work to the timescales it requires.</li> <li>Allows us to engage with SME's as opposed to using a framework, which stereotypically have larger suppliers appointed to them.</li> </ul>
<b>Disadvantages to this Option:</b>
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Will take longer to engage with the market.</li> </ul>

## Appendix 1

- Tender may be seen as too much of a strain on resources for parties to participate.

**Please highlight any possible risks associated with this option:**

- No guarantee of the quality of responses returned.
- Responses could possibly be over OJEU threshold.

**Option 2: Appoint via a framework supplier**

**Advantages to this Option:**

- Quicker engagement with the market.
- Pre-vetted suppliers on the framework.

**Disadvantages to this Option:**

- Less engagement with SME's
- Larger Suppliers will subcontract the work as opposed to having employees working directly on the project.
- Supplier could be appointed who has no specialist experience in lift works.

**Please highlight any possible risks associated with this option:**

- The quality of the service and works carried out could be lower than expected.

### Procurement Route Recommendation

**City Procurement team recommended option**

Option 1: Below OJEU Tender – The budgets have been well worked and the possibility of an increased budget would require further Committee approval.

### Sign Off

<b>Date of Report:</b>	09/05/2016
<b>Reviewed By:</b>	David Downing
<b>Department:</b>	DCCS – Housing
<b>Reviewed By:</b>	Michael Harrington
<b>Department:</b>	<b>Chamberlain's Department</b>