

PT 3 - Procurement Options Report

This document is to be used to identify all Procurement options available and recommended



Author:	David Scott/ Melissa Richardson		
Project Reference:			
Project Title:	Design, build, support and hosting for a new Corporate website.		
Summary of Goods or Services to be sourced			
<p>Website was launched in 2012 and is now showing its age, particularly in regards of lack of responsive design (doesn't work well on mobile devices), search functionality and user focused site structure</p> <p>The intention is to move to an externally supported and hosted website model</p> <p>A redesign is needed to improve website look, feel, and functionality to improve user satisfaction, as measured through user feedback and industry benchmarking initiatives such as the annual SOCITM survey.</p>			
Contract Duration:	2+2	Contract Value:	£445,000 (est.)
Stakeholder information			
Project Lead & Contract Manager: Melissa Richardson	Category Manager: David Scott	Lead Department: Town Clerks	
Other Contact		Department	
Simon Hopkins		External (Turner Hopkins)	
Opportunity for Inter-City Collaboration (is there another site/department that could benefit from this project)?			
Barbican and CoLP have been approached. Barbican have just gone live with their own solution that we cannot utilise. CoLP are working on a joint project with the Metropolitan Police.			

Specification and Evaluation Overview

Summary of the Specification:

Key challenges:

- Alignment with corporate plan
- Diverse business drivers
- Diverse audiences – and audience needs
- Supply side vs demand side approach
- Positioning, messaging, tone of voice: established mature brand that nonetheless represents a “creative & dynamic” city
- Statutory obligations
- Integration with other CoL online services

The specification will be organised into the following key sections:

- Context: key audiences and key activities

Over view of the City of London as a Corporation covering relationships with key stakeholders i.e. local residents, City workers, visitors (tourists, shoppers, cultural consumers etc), international businesses or business leaders and users of other services. Explanation of activities within these areas; local authority tasks and services, advocacy for the Square Mile, as custodian of national treasures, providing sub-sites for “rock star brands” and specific services

- Facets and functionality: key aspects of how the site must work

Covering the look and feel of the solution. User focussed design. Ability to use on mobile and static devices. Responsive design and integration with other solutions such as GIS and social media.

- Content and services: what the new site will feature.

Covering general requirements around website design and functionality. Including portal to corporate sub-sites for both local authority and commercial use. Interfacing with form applications (Firmstep) and communications information (newsletters etc).

- Hosting and support: the website's ongoing maintenance

- Cloud based hosting

- CMS support
 - Robustness, scaling
 - Security
 - Integration with 3rd party services and content feeds
 - Maintenance, support, further development
- Process: how this project will be run.
 Overarching approach including Project management method (agile, waterfall etc), Communication and liaison, Timescales, User research and iterative testing, design process, build process, Launch process, post-launch activity and transition to business as usual.

Overview of the key Evaluation areas:

Price

- Discovery/Design Costs – Fixed Price
- Build Costs per day cost (with an estimated build time of 12 months)
- Support Costs per annum
- Hosting Costs per annum
- Exit Costs – Fixed Price

Technical

- Project Methodology
 - How does their proposed way of working meet the requirements of the City? Agile methodology is preferred.
We would like to agree the essential content required for go live which can be created to best practice standards, allowing all subsequent content to be rolled out to the same criteria
- Discovery Phase
 - How will they run this phase, what outputs will they create, how will the City input into this process.
We need to engage internal stakeholders (staff and members) in testing, plus user testing with external users
Agree what is needed for go-live
- Design & Build
 - Proposed timing to meet the minimum requirements set by the City. How will testing be carried out.
What is the minimum viable product for go-live
- Support
 - SLA/KPIs
 - Support Hours
 - Support model
- Hosting
 - Model appropriateness.

Technical and Pricing evaluation ratio
60% (Technical) / 40% (Price)

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)

Are there any accompanying documents with this report? Yes No

Evaluation Panel – Please enter Name and Department below

Melissa Richardson	Town Clerks
Jamie Ingham-Clark	Member (IT Sub-Chair)
Sam Collins	IT
Bob Roberts	Communications Director
Simon Hopkins (subject to conflict of interest form)	

Customer Requirements

Target completion date	01/10/2020	Target Contract award date	31/12/2018
------------------------	------------	----------------------------	------------

Are there any time constraints which need to be taken into consideration?
 Website to be live in October 2020.

Efficiencies Target with supporting information	n/a
---	-----

Procurement Timeframes - <i>To be determined using PTO Project Plan with Roles and Responsibilities</i>	
Procurement Start date	27/04/2018
Procurement End date	02/11/2018

City of London Initiatives

How will the Procurement meet the City of London's Obligation to
Adhere to the Social Value Act: n/a
Take into account the London Living Wage (LLW): n/a
Consideration for Small to Medium Enterprises (SME): n/a
Other:

Procurement Strategy Options *Procurement Strategy is building the way in which the contract will look once awarded. This could include inter-departmental usage, existing contracts integrated once expired or adding it to an existing contract.*

Option 1: Build In-House
Advantages to this Option: Able to design and build at City's pace.
Disadvantages to this Option: No in-house skills – would need to hire/upskill making this option more expensive than outsourcing.
Please highlight and possible risks associated with this option: Unable to find necessary skillset at an affordable price, not part of IT strategy. No funding agreed for hiring permanent staff.
Option 2: Outsource Design, Build and Support
Advantages to this Option: More flexible and resilient as a platform, i.e. cloud hosted. Appropriate expertise available and broader experience Able to access knowledge/expertise (agile supply) when required through support options. Meets IT Strategy to use SaaS solutions, where possible.
Disadvantages to this Option: No retention of skills in house.
Please highlight and possible risks associated with this option: Reliance on third party may introduce risk of non-performance.

Procurement Strategy Recommendation

City Procurement team recommended option
Option 2

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

Option 1: OJEU Procurement (Restricted Procedure)
Advantages to this Option: Able to access the entire market. No restrictions on scope or terms and conditions. Able to leverage City brand to obtain preferential pricing.
Disadvantages to this Option: Resource intensive route to market. Terms and Conditions would need to be developed for this procurement (none currently exist for this scope of work).
Please highlight and possible risks associated with this option: Suppliers may not accept terms which could lead to delays in the process.
Option 2: Digital Marketplace (G-Cloud)
Advantages to this Option: Majority of known suppliers (including those responding to the soft market testing exercise) suppliers named on this framework. Set terms and conditions. Established pricing. No need to pre-qualify.
Disadvantages to this Option: Not able to reduce the number of suppliers that can bid from the list provided by CCS which could lead to a large number of bids. Maximum of 4 year contract term. Contract will have to be re-let as a support only or designed so that City can take on maintenance.
Please highlight and possible risks associated with this option: Contract length is limited to 4 years meaning that additional support may not be available for the website post-contract.

Route to Market Recommendation

City Procurement team recommended option
Option 2

Recommendation

Is the procurement split into lots?	Yes <input type="checkbox"/> No <input checked="" type="checkbox"/>
Please specify why you have taken this decision regarding lots Not appropriate for this purchase.	
City Procurement team proposed route for sign off: IT Category Board > Project Sub-Committees (Gateway 3/4)	

Sign Off/Internal Checks

Date of Report:	
Reviewed By:	
Reviewer Signature :	
Insurance	Yes <input type="checkbox"/> No <input type="checkbox"/> N/A <input type="checkbox"/>
Financial	Yes <input type="checkbox"/> No <input type="checkbox"/> N/A <input type="checkbox"/>
Health and Safety	Yes <input type="checkbox"/> No <input type="checkbox"/> N/A <input type="checkbox"/>
Contract Approval	Yes <input type="checkbox"/> No <input type="checkbox"/> N/A <input type="checkbox"/>
<i>Add additional as required</i>	