### **APPENDIX 2**

## **Housing Repair & Maintenance**

**Options Appraisal** 

August 2011

Authors: Martin Storrs, Ian Saxby & Rob Wood Date: 09<sup>th</sup> Aug 2011 Version: 0.4





### **Document Control**

Version	Date	Changes	Owners
0.1	01.07.2011	1 <sup>st</sup> edition	Maureen McEleney, Martin Storrs, Ian Saxby, Rob Wood
0.2	06.07.2001	Updated benchmark, risk and scoring data	Maureen McEleney, Martin Storrs, Ian Saxby, Rob Wood
0.3	12.07.2001	Updated benchmark, risk and scoring data	Maureen McEleney, Martin Storrs, Ian Saxby, Rob Wood
0.4	09.08.2001	Updated benchmark, risk and scoring data	Maureen McEleney, Martin Storrs, Ian Saxby, Rob Wood

© Elevate East London 2011 Page 1 of 18



### **Table of Contents**

1 Executive Summary & Methodology	3
2 Options – Full List	3
2.1 Single Package (Re-procurement current arrangements)	3
2.1.1 Risk Assessment	4
2.2 2 or more management contracts	4
2.2.1 Risk Assessment	5
2.3 Combined Housing/Non-Housing Arrangement	5
2.3.1 Risk Assessment	6
2.4 Collaborate with other councils	6
2.4.1 Risk Assessment	6
2.5 Multi Lot procurement	6
2.5.1 Risk Assessment	7
2.6 Combine Capital and Revenue	7
2.6.1 Risk Assessment	8
2.7 In House Provision	8
2.7.1 Risk Assessment	8
2.8 Community Cooperative	8
2.8.1 Risk Assessment	8
2.9 Multi outsourcing	8
2.9.1 Risk Assessment	9
3 Options – Short List	9
3.1 HouseMark Scoring	11
3.2 LBBD Option Scoring	12
3.3 Scoring Summary & Conclusions	13
4 Geographical Scope and Contract Type	15
4.1 Geographical Options	
4.2 Contract Options	16

The enclosed material is copyright of Elevate East London LLP (Elevate) and must not be copied in whole or in part for any purpose without the express written consent of Elevate.



### 1 Executive Summary & Methodology

This options paper has been prepared to support LBBD's "Repairs Service and Major Works Procurement" cabinet paper. The paper has explored in total nine separate options. These options have been studied in detail and then refined to a shortlist. This shortlist of four options has then been scored based on benchmark data from HouseMark and also by LBBD stakeholders against the Councils strategic criteria. See section 3 for full details of the scoring.

The overall scoring demonstrates that options 2: 2 or more management contracts and option 5: Multi Lot procurement are the most beneficial for the Council from a risk, quality, and satisfaction perspective. Although from a scoring perspective option 2 and 5 have tied it is recognised that option 5 meets most closely the strategic objectives of the Council. It is therefore recommended that a **Multi Lot Procurement strategy** be selected as the procurement route.

It should be noted at this stage that a financial summary to support this Multi Lot option will be developed through the re-Procurement process although it is envisaged to deliver benefits of between approximately 20%-40%.

### 2 Options – Full List

The following options have been considered with the pros and cons detailed for each:

- Option 1 Single Package (Re-procurement current arrangements)
- Option 2 2 or more management contracts
- Option 3 Combined Housing/Non-Housing Arrangement
- Option 4 Collaborate with other councils
- Option 5 Multi Lot procurement
- Option 6 Combine Capital and Revenue
- Option 7 In House Provision
- Option 8 Community Cooperative
- Option 9 Multi outsourcing

The project team has made a recommendation for each option whether to consider in more detail as part of a short list analysis process.

### 2.1 Single Package (Re-procurement current arrangements)

Option 1 - Single Package (Re-procurement curent arrangements)					
All reactive and planned maintenance on the housing stock to be carried out by one firm; this includes					
management of repairs ordering					
Pros	Cons	Recommendation			
Enables a slim client side. Re-procurement could be straightforward if similar scope, pricing and delivery approach taken. TUPE issues simpler – all staff taken on by new contractor. Overhead costs limited. One single point of contact and	Limited client control, performance and financial management depend upon contractor co-operation. Limits those firms who can participate to a restricted number of large operators who may sub-contract (particularly planned maintenance elements) and incur additional on-costs.	Option to be taken forward to detailed options appraisal stage.			

© Elevate East London 2011 Page 3 of 18



responsibility.

More likely to encourage investment and technological innovation from contractor, especially if a longer term contract. Could encourage greater community engagement if managed appropriately.

"One size fits all" solution that assumes a firm can do all planned and response services equally well and for the right price.

Lack of competition once the contract is in place which could lead to complacency from the incumbent contractor.

Potentially a longer term contract needed in order to realize potential efficiencies.

#### 2.1.1 Risk Assessment

Number	Details of Risk/Opportunity, Including Impacts/Consequences	Owner	Assessme	ent of Risk/Op	portunity	Details of Amelioration/Mitigation Plans and Activities	Owner	Assessmo	ent of Risk/Op	portunity
			(Assum	e NOTHING i	n place)			(Af	ter Ameliorat	ion)
			Impact	Likelihood	Rating			Impact	Likelihood	Rating
1	Option 1 - Single Package (Re-procurement current arrangements)									
1.1	Limited client control, performance and financial management depend upon contractor co-operation.	Maureen McEleney	3	3	g	Ensure that robust contract management arrangements are put in place. Ensure that the project is expertly cliented and that an experienced and proficient team are put in place.	Maureen McEleney	3	2	e
1.2	Limits those firms who can participate to a restricted number of large operators who may sub-contract (particularly planned maintenance elements) and incur additional on-costs.	Maureen McEleney	3	4	12	Ensure that costs are expertly managed. Ensure that contractor supply chains are adequately managed.	Maureen McEleney	3	3	g
1.3	One size fits all" solution that assumes a firm can do all planned and response services equally well and for the right price.	Maureen McEleney	3	4	12	Ensure that contractor tender and selection process is robust in order to ensure that the most appropriate contractor with a mix of skills is engaged.	Maureen McEleney	3	2	6
1.4	Lack of competition once the contract is in place which could lead to complacency from the incumbent contractor.	Maureen McEleney	3	4	12	Ensure that robust KPI's and incentives are present in the contract and that the contractors performance in closely monitored in order to ensure good contractor performance	Maureen McEleney	3	3	Ś
1.5	Potentially a longer term contract needed in order to realize potential efficiencies, which will tie the council into a potentially less flexible approach.	Maureen McEleney	3	4	12	To ensure that adequate break clauses are contained within the contract.	Maureen McEleney	3	3	g

### 2.2 2 or more management contracts

### Option 2 - 2 or more management contracts

All reactive and planned maintenance on the housing stock to be carried out by 2 or more firms; this includes management of repairs ordering

Pros	Cons	Recommendation
Enables a slim client side. Re-procurement could be straightforward if similar scope, pricing and delivery approach taken. TUPE issues simpler – all staff taken on by new contractor. Overhead costs limited. Fewer points of contact and responsibility. More likely to encourage investment and technological innovation from contractor, especially if a longer term contract. Could encourage greater community engagement if managed appropriately.	Limited client control, performance and financial management depend upon contractor co-operation. Limits those firms who can participate to a restricted number of large operators who may sub-contract (particularly planned maintenance elements) and incur additional on-costs.  "One size fits all" solution that assumes a firm can do all planned and response services equally well and for the right price. Limits competition once the contract is in place which could lead to complacency from the incumbent contractor. Potentially a longer term contract needed in order to realize potential efficiencies.	Option to be taken forward to detailed options appraisal stage.

© Elevate East London 2011 Page 4 of 18



#### 2.2.1 Risk Assessment

Number	Details of Risk/Opportunity, Including Impacts/Consequences	Owner	Assessme	ent of Risk/Op	portunity	Details of Amelioration/Mitigation Plans and Activities	Owner	Assessm	ent of Risk/O	pportunity
			(Assum	e NOTHING i	n place)			(Af	ter Ameliorat	
			Impact	Likelihood	Rating			Impact	Likelihood	Rating
2	Option 2 - 2 or more management contracts				0					
2.1	Limited client control, performance and financial	Maureen	3	3	9	Ensure that robust contract management	Maureen	3	2	6
	management depend upon contractor co-operation.	McEleney				arrangements are put in place. Ensure that the project	McEleney			
						is expertly cliented and that an experienced and				
						proficient team are put in place.				
2.2	Limits those firms who can participate to a restricted	Maureen	3	4	12	Ensure that costs are expertly managed. Ensure that	Maureen	3	3	9
	number of large operators who may sub-contract	McEleney				contractor supply chains are adequately managed.	McEleney			
	(particularly planned maintenance elements) and	-					-			
	incur additional on-costs.									
2.3	One size fits all" solution that assumes a firm can do	Maureen	3	4	12	Ensure that contractor tender and selection process is	Maureen	3	2	6
	all planned and response services equally well and	McEleney				robust in order to ensure that the most appropriate	McEleney			
	for the right price.	-				contractor with a mix of skills is engaged.	-			
2.4	Lack of competition once the contract is in place	Maureen	3	4	12	Ensure that robust KPI's and incentives are present in	Maureen	3	3	9
	which could lead to complacency from the incumbent	McEleney				the contract and that the contractors performance in	McEleney			
	contractor.	-				closely monitored in order to ensure good contractor	-			
						performance				
2.5	Potentially a longer term contract needed in order to	Maureen	3	4	12	To ensure that adequate break clauses are contained	Maureen	3	3	9
	realize potential efficiencies, which will tie the council	McEleney				within the contract.	McEleney			
	into a potentially less flexible approach .	-					-			

### 2.3 Combined Housing/Non-Housing Arrangement

#### **Option 3 - Combined Housing/Non-Housing Arrangement**

Expand current arrangements. Let to one provider, and include repairs and planned maintenance for schools and corporate buildings. Note, any chosen option should be assessed in order to establish if it is suitable to combine the housing and non-housing areas.

Pros	Cons	Recommendation
Reduced duplication and overhead on	Limited client control – performance and	Option to be taken
contractor side.	financial management depend upon	forward to detailed
Share client side resources across	contractor co-operation so purchasing	options appraisal
departments.	economies may not be passed on.	stage.
May be purchasing economies of scale	"All eggs in one basket" – reliant on one	
and hence reduced costs.	contractor.	
TUPE issues simpler – all staff taken on	TUPE issues for displaced contractors on	
by new contractor (possibly more	corporate buildings?	
complicated on non-housing side).	Current housing and non-housing	
More likely to encourage investment and	contractual arrangements are out of	
technological innovation from contractor,	sync, although some elements of non-	
especially if a longer term contract.  One single point of contact and	housing contracts do need to be reprocured.	
responsibility.	Limits those firms who can participate to	
Could encourage greater community	a restricted number of large operators	
engagement if managed appropriately.	who may sub-contract (particularly	
engagement in managed appropriately.	planned maintenance elements) and	
	incur additional on-costs.	
	Will rule out a number of smaller, local	
	contractors that currently undertake non-	
	housing contracts.	
	"One size fits all" solution that assumes a	
	firm can do all planned and response	
	services equally well and for the right	
	price.	
	Lack of competition once the contract is	
	in place which could lead to complacency	
	from the incumbent contractor.	
	Potentially a longer term contract needed	
	in order to realize potential efficiencies.	
	Potential penalties from ending some	
	non-housing contracts earlier than	
	planned.	

© Elevate East London 2011 Page 5 of 18



### 2.3.1 Risk Assessment

Number	Details of Risk/Opportunity, Including Impacts/Consequences	Owner		ent of Risk/Op		Details of Amelioration/Mitigation Plans and Activities	Owner		ent of Risk/Op	
			(Assum	e NOTHING i	n place)			(Af	ter Ameliorat	ion)
			Impact	Likelihood	Rating			Impact	Likelihood	Rating
3	Option 3 - Combined Housing & Non Housing				C					
3.1	Limited client control, performance and financial	Maureen	3	3	ę	Ensure that robust contract management	Maureen	3	2	6
	management depend upon contractor co-operation.	McEleney				arrangements are put in place. Ensure that the project	McEleney			
		•				is expertly cliented and that an experienced and	_			
						proficient team are put in place.				
3.3	One size fits all" solution that assumes a firm can do	Maureen	3	4	12	Ensure that contractor tender and selection process is	Maureen	3	2	6
	all planned and response services equally well and	McEleney				robust in order to ensure that the most appropriate	McEleney			
	for the right price.	•				contractor with a mix of skills is engaged.	_			
3.4	Lack of competition once the contract is in place	Maureen	3	4	12	Ensure that robust KPI's and incentives are present in	Maureen	3	3	9
	which could lead to complacency from the incumbent	McEleney				the contract and that the contractors performance in	McEleney			
	contractor.	,				closely monitored in order to ensure good contractor				
						performance				

#### 2.4 Collaborate with other councils

### Option 4 - Collaborate with other councils

Expand current arrangements by collaboration and carrying out a joint procurement exercise with other Councils.

Pros	Cons	Recommendation
Share client side costs and resources which could improve performance management. Reduced duplication and overhead on contractor side. May be purchasing economies of scale and hence reduced costs. More likely to encourage investment and technological innovation from contractor, especially if a longer term contract.	The current timescales are not sufficient to progress a collaborative procurement exercise.  Longer procurement process.  Consortium partner's timescales are not in line with our current needs.  Possible loss of local control and influence.  Co-ordination between clients not straightforward.  Limited competition.  Only the very largest of companies could take provide.  Increased sub-contracting with increased on-costs.  Depends upon a possibly complex coordinated procurement.  "One size fits all" solution that assumes a firm can do all planned and response services equally well and for the right price.  Lack of competition once the contract is in place which could lead to complacency from the incumbent contractor.  Potentially a longer term contract needed in order to realize potential efficiencies.	Option not recommended to be taken forward to detailed options appraisal stage.

#### 2.4.1 Risk Assessment

Number	Details of Risk/Opportunity, Including Impacts/Consequences	Owner	Asse ssm e	ent of Risk/Op	portunity	Details of Amelioration/Mitigation Plans and Activities	Owner	Assessm	ent of Risk/Op	oportunity
			(Assum	e NOTHING i	n place)			(Af	ter Ameliorat	tion)
			Impact	Likelihood	Rating			Impact	Likelihood	Rating
4					C					
	Option 4 - Collaborate with other Councils									
4.	1 Client team could lose an element of strategic	Maureen	2	2	4	Ensure that robust contract management	Maureen	2	2	4
	direction from collaboration	McEleney				arrangements are put in place. Ensure that the project	McEleney			
4.	2 Could exclude smaller companies as collaboration	Maureen	2	2	4	Ensure a sensible lotting strategy is deployed so as not	Maureen	2	2	4
	approach would increase the size and scale of the	McEleney				to penalise the smaller providers	McEleney			

### 2.5 Multi Lot procurement

Option 5 - Multi Lot Procurement							
Reduce current scope by separating hous	Reduce current scope by separating housing planned and cyclical maintenance from response repairs						
Pros	Cons	Recommendation					
Allows greater flexibility and control Allows more competition once the contracts are in place.	Will require greater client co-ordination and staff resources.  Possible loss of any response and	Option to be taken forward to detailed options appraisal					

© Elevate East London 2011 Page 6 of 18



	·	г .
More flexible in terms of timescales and	planned synergies.	stage.
work volumes.	Increased initial procurement costs.	
Lends itself to more of a handyman	Lower level of investment and innovation	
approach.	from contractors.	
Facilitates the option to use	Greater level of investment required from	
cooperatives.	council in terms of ICT and management	
Could allow some smaller firms to enter	infrastructure.	
	illiastructure.	
the marketplace.		
Reduce main contractor on-costs.		
Reduces risk by not putting all eggs in		
one basket		
1 0110 1001101		
Potentially a larger, but simpler		
procurement process.		
'		

### 2.5.1 Risk Assessment

Number	Details of Risk/Opportunity, Including Impacts/Consequences	Owner	Assessment of Risk/Opportunity		portunity	Details of Amelioration/Mitigation Plans and Activities	Owner Assessment of Risk/Oppo		portunity	
			(Assum	e NOTHING is	n place)			(Af	ter Ameliorat	ion)
			Impact	Likelihood	Rating			Impact	Likelihood	Rating
5					C					
	Option 5 - Multi lot procurement									
5.1	Risk that LBBD fails to manage probably the larger	Maureen	3	3	g	Ensure appropriate client team is in place to effective	Maureen	3	2	6
	number of providers	McEleney				mange multiple contracts	McEleney			
5.2	Risk that client teams and internal costs increase	Maureen	3	4	12	Ensure appropriate systems, processes are	Maureen	3	3	9
	significantly in order to manage the increased	McEleney				implemented in order for a lean client team to manage	McEleney			
	number of providers					appropriately				
5.3	Strategic IT goals are not achieved as multiple	Maureen	3	4	12	LBBD to make IT investment to meet requirements	Maureen	3	2	6
	contractors are utilised	McEleney					McEleney			

### 2.6 Combine Capital and Revenue

Option 6 - Combine Capital and Revenu	16	
Increase scope to include both capital and	revenue works	
Pros	Cons	Recommendation
Combined management of maintenance and capital investment could provide an integrated asset management approach with efficiencies. Reduced duplication and overhead on contractor side. May be purchasing economies of scale and hence reduced costs. Enables a slim client side. Could deliver greater cost certainty in the longer term. May with the right level of investment be able to achieve decent homes standard more efficiently.	The borough currently does not have a robust asset management plan and therefore we do not fully understand the financial implications of this option and the level of risk.  Reduced competition affecting cost (Most capital works can be specified and tendered).  "All eggs in one basket" – reliant on one contractor.  Response repairs contractors not set up to plan and execute works.  Limits number of firms capable of tendering (many response and planned maintenance contractors do not do major refurbishment or new build)  Excludes firms that specialise in Housing capital works but which do not have a maintenance capability.  Requires a significant investment, especially in the short to medium term.	Option not recommended to be taken forward to detailed options appraisal stage.

© Elevate East London 2011 Page 7 of 18



#### 2.6.1 Risk Assessment

Number	Details of Risk/Opportunity, Including Impacts/Consequences	Owner	Assessment of Risk/Opportunity		portunity	Details of Amelioration/Mitigation Plans and Activities	Owner	Assessm	Assessment of Risk/Opportunity	
			(Assum	e NOTHING is	n place)			(Af	ter Ameliora	tion)
			Impact	Likelihood	Rating			Impact	Likelihood	Rating
6	Option 6 - Combine capital & revenue				C	)				
6.1	Risk of pricing inaccuracies as stock condition is	Maureen	4	4		Ensure stock conditions are surveyed prior to	Maureen	3	3	9
	unknown	McElenev				consideration	McElenev			

### 2.7 In House Provision

Option 7 - In House Provision							
To procure the current arrangements via an in house delivery option							
Pros	Cons	Recommendation					
Greater control and flexibility of workforce. Higher level of customer service if contract managed appropriately. No OJEU procurement process to go through. Current local knowledge and expertise would be maintained.	Higher risk profile for the council.  Value for money will depend on appropriate management and a motivated workforce.  Fixed level of on-costs regardless of work volumes going forward.  Increased investment in terms of innovation, training and management Does not allow competition.  Increased pension and redundancy burden to the council if staff are no longer required.  Requires long term training and investment.	Option to be taken forward to detailed options appraisal stage.					

### 2.7.1 Risk Assessment

Number	Details of Risk/Opportunity, Including Impacts/Consequences	Owner	Assessment of Risk/Opportunity		portunity	Details of Amelioration/Mitigation Plans and Activities	Owner	Owner Assessment of Risk/Opportu		portunity
			(Assum	e NOTHING i	n place)			(At	ter Ameliorat	ion)
			Impact	Likelihood	Rating			Impact	Likelihood	Rating
7	Option 7 - In House Provision				0					
7.1	Poor performance and limited flexibility	Maureen	4	4		Manage very closely with strong MI, KPI's & SLA's	Maureen	3	3	9
		McEleney					McEleney			
7.2	Due to poor performance cost increase	Maureen	4	4		Manage very closely with strong MI, KPI's & SLA's	Maureen	3	3	9
		McEleney					McEleney			
7.3	High level of repair failure and or missed statuary	Maureen	4	4		Manage very closely with strong MI, KPI's & SLA's	Maureen	3	3	9
	obligations	McEleney					McEleney			
7.4	Lack of competition once the service is in place	Maureen	4	4		Manage very closely with strong MI, KPI's & SLA's	Maureen	3	3	9
	which could lead to complacency from the service.	McEleney					McEleney			

### 2.8 Community Cooperative

Option 8 - Community Cooperative		
Pros	Cons	Recommendation
Would create local employment opportunities. Meets governments aspiration Big Society Agenda'	At present there appears to be limited interest from the current workforce and a general lack of entrepreneurial spirit. Higher risk of failure.  Would require a high level of council involvement and support to establish.	Option not recommended to be taken forward to detailed options appraisal stage.

### 2.8.1 Risk Assessment

Number	Details of Risk/Opportunity, Including Impacts/Consequences	Owner	Assessment of Risk/Opportunity		portunity	Details of Amelioration/Mitigation Plans and Activities	Owner	Assessm	Assessment of Risk/Opportunity	
			(Assum	e NOTHING i	n place)			(Af	ter Ameliorat	ion)
			Impact	Likelihood	Rating			Impact	Likelihood	Rating
8	Option 8 - Community Cooperative				C					
8.1	Limited evidence of entrepreneurial skills required to	Maureen	3	4	12	Work with candidates and support the process with	Maureen	3	2	6
	support option	McEleney				relevant training, tools etc	McEleney			

### 2.9 Multi outsourcing

Option 9 - Multi outsourcing						
To combine a number of services such as refuse, ground maintenance and street lighting into one larger contract						
Pros	Cons	Recommendation				
May be potential cost savings due to	"All eggs in one basket" – reliant on one	Option not				

© Elevate East London 2011 Page 8 of 18



increased efficiencies. Savings due to reduced management costs. Potentially better value for money.	contractor. Longer term contract required in order to achieve potential efficiencies (15 years+). Potential lower customer satisfaction. Market possibly not yet mature enough for this option. Limited in-house expertise to manage integrated service contractors. Increased sub-contracting with increased on-costs. Limited client control, performance and financial management depend upon contractor co-operation. Limits those firms who can participate to a restricted number of large operators who may sub-contract and incur additional on-costs. "One size fits all" solution that assumes a firm can do all planned and response services equally well and for the right price. Lack of competition once the contract is	recommended to be taken forward to detailed options appraisal stage.
	•	

#### 2.9.1 Risk Assessment

Number	Details of Risk/Opportunity, Including	Owner	Assessme	nt of Risk/Op	portunity	Details of Amelioration/Mitigation Plans and Activities	Owner	Assessm:	ent of Risk/Op	portunity
	Impacts/Consequences									
			(Assume	e NOTHING is	n place)			(Af	ter Ameliorat	ion)
			Impact	Likelihood	Rating			Impact	Likelihood	Rating
9	Option 9 - Multi outsourcing				C					
9.1	Risk that broadening the services to be outsourced	Maureen	3	3	Ç	Consult with relevant stakeholders	Maureen	3	2	6
	would not be politically acceptable	McEleney					McEleney			
9.2	Limits those firms who can participate to a restricted	Maureen	3	4	12	Explore lotting strategies and include relevant KPI's and	Maureen	3	3	9
	number of large operators due to the broadening	McEleney				Terms so as not to penalise smaller more specialist	McEleney			
	scope	- 1				companies	-			

### 3 Options – Short List

The following options have been selected to be considered as part of the detailed analysis:

- Option 1 Single Package (Re-procurement current arrangements)
- Option 2 2 or more management contracts
- Option 4 Multi Lot procurement
- Option 6 In House Provision

Detailed analysis has been completed combining House Mark benchmark data (2009/10) for each option utilising 3 peer group members. Points have been awarded dependent on the rank within the particular report across 12 peer group members including LBBD:

Nominated Peer Group Member	Suggested Delivery Model
1. LBBD	
2. Hackney Homes	Single Package
LB of Redbridge	
4. LB of Islington	2 or more management contracts
5. LB of Havering	a communication and a comm

© Elevate East London 2011 Page 9 of 18



6. City West Homes	
·	
7. LB of Newham	
8. LB of Camden	In House
o. Lb of Callidell	III I louse
O I D of Hardware	
9. LB of Haringey	
10. LB of Greenwich	
11. Hounslow Homes	Multi Lot
The tround of the trounds	111010 200
12. LB of Southwark	
12. LD UI SUULIIWAIK	

The total scores from House Mark have been averaged for each option and weighted by 30%. This score has then been combined with a further round of scoring based on the options and LBBD's strategic requirements. These scores have been weighted at 70% and is made up of qualitative scoring by LBBD stakeholders:

- Maureen McEleney (DIV DIR HSG & NEIGHBOUHDS)
- Ian Saxby (GRP MGR CRP CLIENT CONSTRUCTION)
- Rob Wood (GRP MGR REPS & MAINT)

© Elevate East London 2011 Page 10 of 18



# Housing R&M Options Appraisal 3.1 HouseMark Scoring

			Costs - VFM (Scores based on ranking from House Mark 2009/10 data)		Quality (Scores based on ranking from House Mark 2009/10 data)						
tions	LBBD or Nominated Peer Group Comparator	No' of Properties	Rank 1 - 8 = 10 points Rank 9 - 16 = 5 points Rank 17+= 1 point	House Mark Cost / Value Scores	Rank 1 - 8 = 10 points Rank 9 - 16 = 5 points Rank 17+= 1 point	House Mar Satisfaction Scores	% of homes meeting DHS	% of tenants satisfied with home	Total House Mark Score		
			Total CPP of Responsive Repairs & Void Works	<b>1</b> 0	Satisfaction - % satisfied with repairs and maintenance	<b>1</b> 0					
			Total CPP of Void Works (Management)	<b>⇒</b> 5	Average time in days to re-let empty properties	1					
	LBBD	22485	Total CPP of Void Works (Service Provision)	10	Average time in days to re-let empty properties	1	→ 68	<b>1</b> 76	68		
			Direct CPP of Responsive Repairs (Management)	<b>↓</b> 1	Satisfaction - % satisfied with repairs and maintenance	10	_				
			Total CPP of Responsive Repairs (Service Provision)	10	% of respondents satisfied with the way their HA/landlord deals with R&M	10					
			Total CPP of Responsive Repairs & Void Works	<b>⇒</b> 5	Satisfaction - % satisfied with repairs and maintenance	⇒ 5  ■ .	_				
Single package		30173	Total CPP of Void Works (Management) Total CPP of Void Works (Service Provision)	1 1	Average time in days to re-let empty properties  Average time in days to re-let empty properties	1 1	→ 65	<b>₽</b> 67	34		
Siligie package	Hackney Homes	301/3	Direct CPP of Responsive Repairs (Management)	<del>▼ 1</del>	Satisfaction - % satisfied with repairs and maintenance	5	- "	• 67	34		
			Total CPP of Responsive Repairs (Service Provision)	→ 5	% of respondents satisfied with the way their HA/landlord deals with R&M	⇒ 5	-				
			Total CPP of Responsive Repairs & Void Works	1	Satisfaction -% satisfied with repairs and maintenance	<b>↑</b> 10					
			Total CPP of Void Works (Management)	10	Average time in days to re-let empty properties	10					
	LB of Redbridge	7033	Total CPP of Void Works (Service Provision)	<b>⇒</b> 5	Average time in days to re-let empty properties	10	- 60	<b>↓</b> 67	72		
			Direct CPP of Responsive Repairs (Management)	<b>⇒</b> 5	Satisfaction - % satisfied with repairs and maintenance	10					
			Total CPP of Responsive Repairs (Service Provision)	<b>↓</b> 1	% of respondents satisfied with the way their HA/landlord deals with R&M	<b>1</b> 0					
			Total CPP of Responsive Repairs & Void Works	1	Satisfaction -% satisfied with repairs and maintenance	<b>⇒</b> 5					
			Total CPP of Void Works (Management)	10	Average time in days to re-let empty properties	10	<b>_</b> .				
	LB of Islington	25017	Total CPP of Void Works (Service Provision)	1	Average time in days to re-let empty properties	10	<b>1</b> 95	No data	58		
			Direct CPP of Responsive Repairs (Management)	<b>⇒</b> 5	Satisfaction - % satisfied with repairs and maintenance	10					
			Total CPP of Responsive Repairs (Service Provision)	1	% of respondents satisfied with the way their HA/landlord deals with R&M	<b>⇒</b> 5					
			Total CPP of Responsive Repairs & Void Works	10 5	Satisfaction - % satisfied with repairs and maintenance	1 10	_				
2 or more	10-411		LB of Havering	12385	Total CPP of Void Works (Management) Total CPP of Void Works (Service Provision)	10	Average time in days to re-let empty properties	10	42	<b>⇒</b> 71	77
Management contracts	LBornavering	12385	Direct CPP of Responsive Repairs (Management)	10	Average time in days to re-let empty properties Satisfaction - % satisfied with repairs and maintenance	10	42	7 /1	//		
contracts			Total CPP of Responsive Repairs (Service Provision)	10	% of respondents satisfied with the way their HA/landlord deals with R&M	1	_	1			
1		1	Total CPP of Responsive Repairs & Void Works	1	Satisfaction -% satisfied with repairs and maintenance	10					
			Total CPP of Void Works (Management)	1	Average time in days to re-let empty properties	10	-				
	City West Homes	21265	Total CPP of Void Works (Service Provision)	1	Average time in days to re-let empty properties	<b>⇒</b> 5	100	<b>1</b> 75	50		
	·		Direct CPP of Responsive Repairs (Management)	1	Satisfaction - % satisfied with repairs and maintenance	10		_			
			Total CPP of Responsive Repairs (Service Provision)	<b>1</b>	% of respondents satisfied with the way their HA/landlord deals with R&M	10					
		20752	Total CPP of Responsive Repairs & Void Works	10	Satisfaction -% satisfied with repairs and maintenance	10					
			Total CPP of Void Works (Management)	10	Average time in days to re-let empty properties	<b>⇒</b> 5					
	LB of Newham		Total CPP of Void Works (Service Provision)	10	Average time in days to re-let empty properties	<b>→</b> 5	<del>-</del> > 72	→ 74	80		
			Direct CPP of Responsive Repairs (Management)	10	Satisfaction - % satisfied with repairs and maintenance	5					
			Total CPP of Responsive Repairs (Service Provision)	10	% of respondents satisfied with the way their HA/landlord deals with R&M	⇒ 5					
			Total CPP of Responsive Repairs & Void Works Total CPP of Void Works (Management)	10 1	Satisfaction - % satisfied with repairs and maintenance	1 10	_				
In House	LB of Camden	33000	Total CPP of Void Works (Management)  Total CPP of Void Works (Service Provision)		Average time in days to re-let empty properties  Average time in days to re-let empty properties	10	No data	No data	54		
in House	LB of Camden	33000	Direct CPP of Responsive Repairs (Management)	<del>7</del> 5 5	Satisfaction - % satisfied with repairs and maintenance	10	No data	No data			
			Total CPP of Responsive Repairs (Service Provision)	<b>↑</b> 10	% of respondents satisfied with the way their HA/landlord deals with R&M	1					
1			Total CPP of Responsive Repairs & Void Works	10 1	Satisfaction - % satisfied with repairs and maintenance	1	•				
			Total CPP of Void Works (Management)	<u>1</u>	Average time in days to re-let empty properties	1					
	LB of Haringey	20597	Total CPP of Void Works (Service Provision)	1	Average time in days to re-let empty properties	1	→ 72	No data	14		
			Direct CPP of Responsive Repairs (Management)	<b>⇒</b> 5	Satisfaction - % satisfied with repairs and maintenance	1					
			Total CPP of Responsive Repairs (Service Provision)	<b>↓</b> 1	% of respondents satisfied with the way their HA/landlord deals with R&M	1					
			Total CPP of Responsive Repairs & Void Works	<b>⇒</b> 5	Satisfaction -% satisfied with repairs and maintenance	10					
			Total CPP of Void Works (Management)	10	Average time in days to re-let empty properties	<b>⇒</b> 5					
	LB of Greenwich	No data	Total CPP of Void Works (Service Provision)	<b>↓</b> 1	Average time in days to re-let empty properties	<b>⇒</b> 5	No data	No data	71		
			Direct CPP of Responsive Repairs (Management)	10	Satisfaction - % satisfied with repairs and maintenance	10					
			Total CPP of Responsive Repairs (Service Provision)	<b>⇒</b> 5	% of respondents satisfied with the way their HA/landlord deals with R&M	10					
			Total CPP of Responsive Repairs & Void Works	10	Satisfaction - % satisfied with repairs and maintenance	<b>⇒</b> 5	_				
Multi Lot	Hounday Hom	14924	Total CPP of Void Works (Management) Total CPP of Void Works (Service Provision)	1	Average time in days to re-let empty properties	1 1	100	<b>1</b> 80	48		
WILLIE LOT	Hounslow Homes	14924	Total CPP of Void Works (Service Provision)  Direct CPP of Responsive Repairs (Management)	<del>→</del> 5	Average time in days to re-let empty properties Satisfaction - % satisfied with repairs and maintenance	5	100	<b>™</b> 80	48		
			Total CPP of Responsive Repairs (Management)  Total CPP of Responsive Repairs (Service Provision)	10	% of respondents satisfied with the way their HA/landlord deals with R&M	5 5	-1				
ŀ			Total CPP of Responsive Repairs (Service Provision)	10	Satisfaction - % satisfied with repairs and maintenance	1	+	<u>†                                      </u>			
			Total CPP of Void Works (Management)	10	Average time in days to re-let empty properties	1	┪				
Southwark	Southwork	53523	Total CPP of Void Works (Service Provision)	⇒ 5	Average time in days to re-let empty properties  Average time in days to re-let empty properties	1	⇒ 65	<b>↓</b> 62	23		
	Southwark	33323	Direct CPP of Responsive Repairs (Management)	1	Satisfaction - % satisfied with repairs and maintenance	1		*	1		

© Elevate East London 2011 Page 11 of 18



# Housing R&M Options Appraisal 3.2 LBBD Option Scoring

Date Wand															
Rob Wood			i	1					ı			ı			
	Maximise opportunities for	Maximise opportunities for	Likelihood of Service	Transfer of risk	Contractual	Likelihood of	Impact of contract	Risk of disrepair	High quality repairs	High levels of resident engagement and	Using modern technology to improve efficiency	Apprenticeships and or training	Meets statutory	Ensuring and maintaining compliance with decent home	Total
	local economy	local labour (H=10,	Improvements	away from LBBD	flexibility (H=10,	contract failure	failure (H=1, M=5,	claims (H=1, M=5,	and service delivery	satisfaction (H=10,		(H=10, M=5, L=1)	obligations (H=10,	standards (H=10,	Weighte
Options	(H=10, M=5, L=1)	M=5, L=1)	(H=10, M=5, L=1)	(H=10, M=5, L=1)	M=5, L=1)	(H=1, M=5, L=10)	L=10)	L=10)	(H=10, M=5, L=1)	M=5, L=1)	(H=10, M=5, L=1)	(H=10, M=5, L=1)	M=5, L=1)	M=5, L=1)	Score
iingle Package	7	8	8	6	<del>-&gt;</del> 6	7	1	8	6	7	7	7	8	7	47.5
or more Management contracts	5	5	6	7	→ 4	6	3	7	7	6	7	5	8	5	41.25
n House	9	10	5	1	8	9	1	9	8	9	6	9	9	8	51
Viulti Lot Criteria Weight	9 tine 1	9 0.75	5	0.75	0.25	0.25	025	0.25	0.75	7	5	0.25	0.25	0.25	50
	-														ļ
an Saxby			1	1	1			1						Farming and	
										High levels of	Using modern			Ensuring and maintaining	
	Maximise	Maximise	Likelihood of							resident	technology to	Apprenticeships		compliance with	
	opportunities for	opportunities for	Service	Transfer of risk	Contractual	Likelihood of	Impact of contract	Risk of disrepair	High quality repairs	engagement and	improve efficiency	and or training	Meets statutory	decent home	Total
	local economy	local labour (H=10,	Improvements	away from LBBD	flexibility (H=10,	contract failure	failure (H=1, M=5,	claims (H=1, M=5,		satisfaction (H=10,		(H=10, M=5, L=1)	obligations (H=10,	standards (H=10,	Weighte
Options	(H=10, M=5, L=1)	M=5, L=1)	(H=10, M=5, L=1)	(H=10, M=5, L=1)	M=5, L=1)	(H=1, M=5, L=10)	L=10)	L=10)	(H=10, M=5, L=1)	M=5, L=1)	(H=10, M=5, L=1)	(H=10, M=5, L=1)	M=5, L=1)	M=5, L=1)	Score
Single Package	7	7	<b>↑</b> 6	7	<b>↓</b> 3	<b>↑</b> 6	1	7	6	7	8	6	<b>↑</b> 8	7	45.5
2 or more Management contracts	7	7	5	6	→ 5	6	→ 4	7	6	7	6	<b>⇒</b> 5	8	7	44.25
n House	8	8	5	1	2	6	1	7	7	8	5	6	8	7	42.25
Multi Lot	7	7	7	→ 5	<b>↑</b> 6	6	7	7	7	<b>↑</b> 8	5	<b>⇒</b> 5	8	7	46.75
Criteria Weight	ting 1	0.75	0.5	0.75	0.25	0.25	0.25	0.25	0.75	1	0.5	0.25	0.25	0.25	
Maureen McElenev															
														Ensuring and	
										High levels of	Using modern			maintaining	
	Maximise	Maximise	Likelihood of							resident	technology to	Apprenticeships		compliance with	
	opportunities for	opportunities for	Service	Transfer of risk	Contractual	Likelihood of	Impact of contract	Risk of disrepair	High quality repairs	engagement and	improve efficiency	and or training	Meets statutory	decent home	Total
	local economy	local labour (H=10,	Improvements	away from LBBD	flexibility (H=10,	contract failure	failure (H=1, M=5,	claims (H=1, M=5,	and service delivery	satisfaction (H=10,	and satisfaction	(H=10, M=5, L=1)	obligations (H=10,	standards (H=10,	Weighte
Options	(H=10, M=5, L=1)	M=5, L=1)	(H=10, M=5, L=1)	(H=10, M=5, L=1)	M=5, L=1)	(H=1, M=5, L=10)	L=10)	L=10)	(H=10, M=5, L=1)	M=5, L=1)	(H=10, M=5, L=1)	(H=10, M=5, L=1)	M=5, L=1)	M=5, L=1)	Score
Single Package	3	5	4	2	<b>→</b> 4	5	1	7	6	5	7	6	8	5	32.25
2 or more Management contracts	5	5	3	4	<del>→</del> 6	7	3	7	6	6	7	6	8	<b>→</b> 5	37.75
In House	1	8	6	2	<del>→</del> 6	9	1	7							
Multi Lot Criteria Weight	<b>↑</b> 8	<b>↑</b> 8						-	5	5	5	7	8	5	32
Citetia Weight	6	0.75		0.75	8 0.25	7	8	7	7	8	7	5	8	<b>⇒</b> 5	
		0.75	0.5	0.75	0.25	7 0.25		7 0.25							
Tony Wiggins		0.75					8		7		7	5	8	5 0.25	
Tony Wiggins		0.75					8		7	8 1	7 0.5	5	8	5 0.25 Ensuring and	
Tony Wiggins			0.5				8		7	8 1 High levels of	7 0.5 Using modern	5 0.25	8	5 0.25 Ensuring and maintaining	
Tony Wiggins	Maximise	Maximise	0.5 Likelihood of	0.75	0.25	0.25	8 0.25	0.25	7 0.75	1 High levels of resident	7 0.5 Using modern technology to	5 0.25 Apprenticeships	0.25	Ensuring and maintaining compliance with	51.75
Tony Wiggins	opportunities for	Maximise opportunities for	0.5  Likelihood of Service	0.75 Transfer of risk	0.25  Contractual	0.25 Likelihood of	8 0.25	0.25 Risk of disrepair	7 0.75	8 1 High levels of resident engagement and	Using modern technology to improve efficiency	5 0.25 Apprenticeships and or training	8 0.25 Meets statutory	Ensuring and maintaining compliance with decent home	51.75
	opportunities for local economy	Maximise opportunities for local labour (H=10,	0.5  Likelihood of Service Improvements	0.75  Transfer of risk away from LBBD	0.25  Contractual flexibility (H=10,	0.25  Likelihood of contract failure	8 0.25 Impact of contract failure (H=1, M=5,	0.25 Risk of disrepair claims (H=1, M=5,	7 0.75  High quality repairs and service delivery	High levels of resident engagement and satisfaction (H=10,	Using modern technology to improve efficiency and satisfaction	Apprenticeships and or training (H=10, M=5, L=1)	8 0.25  Meets statutory obligations (H=10,	Ensuring and maintaining compliance with decent home standards (H=10,	51.75  Total Weighte
Options	opportunities for local economy (H=10, M=5, L=1)	Maximise opportunities for local labour (H=10, M=5, L=1)	Likelihood of Service Improvements (H=10, M=5, L=1)	0.75  Transfer of risk away from LBBD (H=10, M=5, L=1)	0.25  Contractual flexibility (H=10, M=5, L=1)	0.25  Likelihood of contract failure (H=1, M=5, L=10)	Impact of contract failure (H=1, M=5, L=10)	0.25 Risk of disrepair claims (H=1, M=5, L=10)	7 0.75  High quality repairs and service delivery (H=10, M=5, L=1)	High levels of resident engagement and satisfaction (H=10, M=5, L=1)	Using modern technology to improve efficiency and satisfaction (H=10, M=5, L=1)	Apprenticeships and or training (H=10, M=5, L=1) (H=10, M=5, L=1)	Meets statutory obligations (H=10, M=5, L=1)	Ensuring and maintaining compliance with decent home standards (H=10, M=5, L=1)	Total Weighte Score
Options ingle Package	opportunities for local economy (H=10, M=5, L=1)	Maximise opportunities for local labour (H=10, M=5, L=1) 7	Likelihood of Service Improvements (H=10, M=5, L=1)	Transfer of risk away from LBBD (H=10, M=5, L=1)	Contractual flexibility (H=10, M=5, L=1)	Likelihood of contract failure (H=1, M=5, L=10)	8 0.25  Impact of contract failure (H=1, M=5, L=10)	Risk of disrepair claims (H=1, M=5, L=10)	7 0.75  High quality repairs and service delivery (H=10, M=5, L=1)	High levels of resident engagement and satisfaction (H=10, M=5, L=1)	Using modern technology to improve efficiency and satisfaction (H=10, M=5, L=1)	Apprenticeships and or training (H=10, M=5, L=1) (H=10, M=5, L=1)	Meets statutory obligations (H=10, M=5, L=1)	Ensuring and maintaining compliance with decent home standards (H=10, M=5, L=1)	Total Weighte Score 41.25
Options ingle Package or more Management contracts	opportunities for local economy (H=10, M=5, L=1)	Maximise opportunities for local labour (H=10, M=5, L=1)	Likelihood of Service Improvements (H=10, M=5, L=1)	0.75  Transfer of risk away from LBBD (H=10, M=5, L=1)	0.25  Contractual flexibility (H=10, M=5, L=1)	0.25  Likelihood of contract failure (H=1, M=5, L=10)	Impact of contract failure (H=1, M=5, L=10)	0.25 Risk of disrepair claims (H=1, M=5, L=10)	7 0.75  High quality repairs and service delivery (H=10, M=5, L=1)	High levels of resident engagement and satisfaction (H=10, M=5, L=1)	Using modern technology to improve efficiency and satisfaction (H=10, M=5, L=1)	Apprenticeships and or training (H=10, M=5, L=1) (H=20, M=5, L=1) 8	Meets statutory obligations (H=10, M=5, L=1)	Ensuring and maintaining compliance with decent home standards (H=10, M=5, L=1)	Total Weighte Score 41.25
Options Single Package 2 or more Management contracts n House	opportunities for local economy (H=10, M=5, L=1)  5 7 8	Maximise opportunities for local labour (H=10, M=5, L=1) 7	Likelihood of Service Improvements (H=10, M=5, L=1) 6 8	Transfer of risk away from LBBD (H=10, M=5, L=1) 5 6	0.25  Contractual flexibility (H=10, M=5, L=1) 4	Likelihood of contract failure (H=1, M=5, L=10)	8 0.25  Impact of contract failure (H=1, M=5, L=10)  1 3 1	Risk of disrepair claims (H=1, M=5, L=10)	7 0.75  High quality repairs and service delivery (H=10, M=5, L=1) 6 7	High levels of resident engagement and satisfaction (H=10, M=5, L=1)	Using modern technology to improve efficiency and satisfaction (H=10, M=5, L=1)	5 0.25  Apprenticeships and or training (H=10, M=5, L=1) (H=0, M=5, L=1) 7  8 7	Meets statutory obligations (H=10, M=5, L=1)	Ensuring and maintaining compliance with decent home standards (H=10, M=5, L=1)	Total Weighte Score 41.25 46.75
Options Single Package 2 or more Management contracts n House	opportunities for local economy (H=10, M=5, L=1)  5 7 8 8	Maximise opportunities for local labour (H=10, M=5, L=1) 7 7 8	Likelihood of Service Improvements (H=10, M=5, L=1)	Transfer of risk away from LBBD (H=10, M=5, L=1)	Contractual flexibility (H=10, M=5, L=1) 4 6 6	Likelihood of contract failure (H=1, M=5, L=10)	8 0.25  Impact of contract failure (H=1, M=5, L=10) 1 3	Risk of disrepair claims (H=1, M=5, L=10)	7 0.75  High quality repairs and service delivery (H=10, M=5, L=1) 6 7 7	High levels of resident engagement and satisfaction (H=10, M=5, L=1)	Using modern technology to improve efficiency and satisfaction (H=10, M=5, L=1)	Apprenticeships and or training (H=10, M=5, L=1) (H=20, M=5, L=1) 8	Meets statutory obligations (H=10, M=5, L=1)	Ensuring and maintaining compliance with decent home standards (H=10, M=5, L=1)	Total Weighte Score 41.25 46.75
Options ingle Package or more Management contracts I House Multi Lot Giteria Weigh	opportunities for local economy (H=10, M=5, L=1)  5 7 8 8	Maximise opportunities for local labour (H=10, M=5, L=1) 7 7 7 8 8	Likelihood of Service Improvements (H=10, M=5, L=1) 6 6 6	Transfer of risk away from LBBD (H=10, M=5, L=1)  5 6 2 7	Contractual flexibility (H=10, M=5, L=1 4 6 6 6	Likelihood of contract failure (H=1, M=5, L=10) 6 6 8 6 6 6	8 025  Impact of contract failure (H=1, M=5, L=10)  1 3 1 7	Risk of disrepair claims (H=1, M=5, L=10) 7 8 7 7 7 7 7 7 7	7 0.75  High quality repairs and service delivery (H=10, M=5, L=1) 7 7 7 7	High levels of resident engagement and satisfaction (H=10, M=5, L=1)	Using modern technology to improve efficiency and satisfaction (IH=10, M=5, L=1) 7 7 7 7	Apprenticeships and or training (H=10, M=5, L=1) (H=20, M=5, L=1) 7	Meets statutory obligations (H=10, M=5, L=1)  *** 8**  *** 8**  *** 8**	Ensuring and maintaining compliance with decent home standards (H=10, M=5, L=1) 8 7 7 7 7 7 7 7 7 7 7 7 7 7 7 7 7 7 7	Total Weighte Score 41.25 46.75
Options Single Package 2 or more Management contracts In House Multi Lot Giteria Weigh	opportunities for local economy (H=10, M=5, L=1)  5 7 8 8	Maximise opportunities for local labour (H=10, M=5, L=1) 7 7 7 8 8	Likelihood of Service Improvements (H=10, M=5, L=1) 6 6 6	Transfer of risk away from LBBD (H=10, M=5, L=1)  5 6 2 7	Contractual flexibility (H=10, M=5, L=1 4 6 6 6	Likelihood of contract failure (H=1, M=5, L=10) 6 6 8 6 6 6	8 025  Impact of contract failure (H=1, M=5, L=10)  1 3 1 7	Risk of disrepair claims (H=1, M=5, L=10) 7 8 7 7 7 7 7 7 7	7 0.75  High quality repairs and service delivery (H=10, M=5, L=1) 7 7 7 7	High levels of resident engagement and satisfaction (H=10, M=5, L=1)	Using modern technology to improve efficiency and satisfaction (IH=10, M=5, L=1) 7 7 7 7	Apprenticeships and or training (H=10, M=5, L=1) (H=20, M=5, L=1) 7	Meets statutory obligations (H=10, M=5, L=1)  *** 8**  *** 8**  *** 8**	Ensuring and maintaining compliance with decent home standards (H=10, M=5, L=1)  7  7  0.25	Total Weighte Score 41.25 46.75
Options Single Package 2 or more Management contracts In House Multi Lot Giteria Weigh	opportunities for local economy (H=10, M=5, L=1)  5 7 8 8	Maximise opportunities for local labour (H=10, M=5, L=1) 7 7 7 8 8	Likelihood of Service Improvements (H=10, M=5, L=1) 6 6 6	Transfer of risk away from LBBD (H=10, M=5, L=1)  5 6 2 7	Contractual flexibility (H=10, M=5, L=1 4 6 6 6	Likelihood of contract failure (H=1, M=5, L=10) 6 6 8 6 6 6	8 025  Impact of contract failure (H=1, M=5, L=10)  1 3 1 7	Risk of disrepair claims (H=1, M=5, L=10) 7 8 7 7 7 7 7 7 7	7 0.75  High quality repairs and service delivery (H=10, M=5, L=1) 7 7 7 7	High levels of resident engagement and satisfaction (H=10, M=5, L=1) 6 7 1	Using modern technology to limprove efficiency and satisfaction (H=10, M=5, L=1) 7 7 7 7 0.5	Apprenticeships and or training (H=10, M=5, L=1) (H=20, M=5, L=1) 7	Meets statutory obligations (H=10, M=5, L=1)  *** 8**  *** 8**  *** 8**  *** 8**	Ensuring and maintaining compliance with decent home standards (H=10, M=5, E1) 7 7 0.35	51.75  Total Weighte Score 41.25 46.75
Options Single Package 2 or more Management contracts In House Multi Lot Giteria Weigh	opportunities for local economy (H=10, M=5, L=1)	Maximise opportunities for local labour (H=10, M=5, L=1) 7 7 7 8 7 8 8 075	Likelihood of Service Improvements (H=10, M=5, L=1)  1 6 1 6 0 5	Transfer of risk away from LBBD (H=10, M=5, L=1)  5 6 2 7	Contractual flexibility (H=10, M=5, L=1 4 6 6 6	Likelihood of contract failure (H=1, M=5, L=10) 6 6 8 6 6 6	8 025  Impact of contract failure (H=1, M=5, L=10)  1 3 1 7	Risk of disrepair claims (H=1, M=5, L=10) 7 8 7 7 7 7 7 7 7	7 0.75  High quality repairs and service delivery (H=10, M=5, L=1) 7 7 7 7	High levels of resident engagement and satisfaction (H=10, M=5, L=1) 6 7 1 High levels of	Using modern technology to improve efficiency and satisfaction (H=10, M=5, L=1) 7 7 7 7 0 5	Apprenticeships and or training (H=10, M=5, L=1) [H=10, M=5, L=1) 7 7 4 0.25	Meets statutory obligations (H=10, M=5, L=1)  *** 8**  *** 8**  *** 8**  *** 8**	Ensuring and maintaining compliance with decent home standards (H=10, M=5, L=1)  7 7 7 0.25	Total Weighte Score 41.25 46.75
Options Single Package 2 or more Management contracts In House Multi Lot Gnaria Weigh	opportunities for local economy (H=10, M=5, L=1)	Maximise opportunities for local labour (H=10, M=5, L=1) 7 7 7 8 8 8 0.75	Likelihood of Service Improvements (H=10, M=5, L=1)  6  8  6  05  Likelihood of	0.75  Transfer of risk away from LBBD (H=10, M=5, L=1)  5 6 7 0.75	Contractual flexibility (H=10, M=5, L=1)  4 6 6 0-25	Likelihood of contract failure (H=1, M=5, L=10)  6 6 8 6 0.25	Impact of contract failure (H=1, M=5, L=10)  1 1  7 0.25	Risk of disrepair claims (H=1, M=5, L=10) 7 7 1 8 7 0.25	High quality repairs and service delivery (H=10, M=5, L=1)  6 7 7 7 0.75	High levels of resident engagement and satisfaction (H=10, M=5, L=1) 6 7 1	Using modern technology to improve efficiency and satisfaction (H=10, M=5, L=1) 7 7 7 7 7 7 0 5	Apprenticeships and or training (H=10, M=5, L=1) (H=10, M	Meets statutory obligations (H=10, H=1) M=5, L=1) M=8 B B 0.25	Ensuring and maintaining compliance with decent home standards (H=10, M=5, L=1) 7 7 7 2.25	Total Weighte Score 41.25 46.75 49.25
Options Single Package 2 or more Management contracts In House Multi Lot Gnaria Weigh	opportunities for local economy (H=10, M=5, L=1)  5  7  8  8  Maximise opportunities for	Maximise opportunities for local labour (H=10, M=5, L=1)  T 7  S 7  S 8  O75  Maximise opportunities for	Ukelihood of Service Improvements (H=10, M=5, L=1)  6 6 6 6 0.5  Ukelihood of Service	Transfer of risk away from LBBD (H=10, M=5, L=1)  5 6 2 7 0.75	Contractual flexibility (H=10, M=5, L=1)  4 1 6 1 6 0 25  Contractual	Likelihood of contract failure (H=1, M=5, L=10)  6 6 6 0.25	Impact of contract failure (H=1, M=5, L=10)  1 1 7 235  Impact of contract	Risk of disrepair claims (H=1, M=5, L=10)  7 7 7 7 7 8 7 Risk of disrepair	High quality repairs and service delivery (H=10, M=5, L=1)  7 7 7 7 0.75	High levels of resident engagement and satisfaction (H=10, M=5, L=1)  6  7  1  High levels of resident engagement and	Using modern technology to improve efficiency and satisfaction (H=10, M=5, L=1) 7 7 7 2 5	Apprenticeships and or training (H=10, M=5, L=1) (H=10, M=5, L=1) 7 4 0.25	Meets statutory obligations (H=10, M=5, L=1)  1 8 1 8 1 8 0.25	Ensuring and maintaining compliance with decent home standards (H=10, M=5, L=1)  7  7  Ensuring and maintaining compliance with decent home	51.75  Total Weighte Score 41.25 46.75 49.25
Options Single Package 2 or more Management contracts n House Multi Lot Creera Weigh	opportunities for local economy (H=10, M=5, L=1)  5  7  8  8  Maximise opportunities for local economy	Maximise opportunities for local labour (H=10, M=5, L=1)  7  7  8  3  035	Likelihood of Service Improvements (H=10, M=5, L=1) 6 6 0.5 Likelihood of Service Improvements	Transfer of risk away from LBBD (H=10, M=5, L=1)  5  6  7  0.75	Contractual flexibility (H=10, M=5, L=1)  4 6 6 0 0 25  Contractual flexibility (H=10,	Likelihood of contract failure (H=1, M=5, L=10)  1 6 1 6 25 Likelihood of contract failure	Impact of contract failure (H=1, M=5, L=10)  1 1 1 7 0.25  Impact of contract failure (H=1, M=5, d=5)	Risk of disrepair claims (H=1, M=5, L=10) 7 7 8 7 0.25 Risk of disrepair claims (H=1, M=5,	High quality repairs and service delivery (H=10, M=5, L=1)  1 7  7 7  7 7  High quality repairs and service delivery and service delivery	High levels of resident engagement and satisfaction (H=10, M=5, L=1) 6 7 1 1 High levels of resident engagement and satisfaction (H=10, M=10, M=10) High levels of resident engagement and satisfaction (H=10, H=10)	Using modern technology to improve efficiency and satisfaction (H=10, Ms, L=1) 7 7 7 7 7 7 7 7 7 7 7 7 7 7 7 7 7 7 7	Apprenticeships and or training (H=10, M=5, L=1) (H=0, M=5, L=1) (H=0, M=5, L=1) (H=0, M=5, L=1) Apprenticeships and or training (H=10, M=5, L=1) (H=10, M=5, L=1)	Meets statutory obligations (H=10, M=5, L=1) M=3, B N=8 0.25	Ensuring and maintaining compliance with decent home standards (H=10, M=5, L=1)  7 7 7 7 7 7 7 7 7 7 7 7 7 7 7 7 7 7 7	51.75  Total Weights Score 41.25 46.75 49.25
Options Single Package Or more Management contracts In House Multi Lot Criteris Weight Ken Jones	opportunities for local economy (H=10, M=5, L=1)  5  7  8  8  Maximise opportunities for	Maximise opportunities for local labour (H=10, M=5, L=1)  T 7  S 7  S 8  O75  Maximise opportunities for	Likelihood of Service Improvements (H=10, M=5, L=1) 6 8 6 03 Likelihood of Service Improvements (H=10, M=5, L=1)	Transfer of risk away from LBBD (H=10, M=5, L=1)  5 6 2 7 0.75	Contractual flexibility (H=10, M=5, L=1)  4 1 6 1 6 0 25  Contractual	Likelihood of contract failure (H=1, M=5, L=10)  6 6 6 0.25	Impact of contract failure (H=1, M=5, L=10)  1 1 7 235  Impact of contract	Risk of disrepair claims (H=1, M=5, L=10)  7 7 7 7 7 8 7 Risk of disrepair	High quality repairs and service delivery (H=10, M=5, L=1)  1 7  7 7  7 7  0.75	High levels of resident engagement and satisfaction (H=10, M=5, L=1)  High levels of resident engagement and satisfaction (H=10, M=5, L=1)	Using modern technology to improve efficiency and satisfaction (H=10, M=5, L=1) 7 7 7 2 5	Apprenticeships and or training (H=10, M=5, L=1) (H=10, M=5, L=1) (H=10, M=5, L=1) Apprenticeships and or training (H=10, M=5, L=1) (H=10, M=5, L=1)	Meets statutory obligations (H=10, M=5, L=1)  Meets statutory obligations (H=10, M=5, L=1)	Ensuring and maintaining compliance with decent home standards (H=10, M=5, L=1)  Ensuring and maintaining compliance with decent home standards (H=10, M=5, L=1)	Total Weighte Score 41.25 46.75 49.25
Options Single Package 2 or more Management contracts In House Multi Lot Criteria Weight Ken Jones  Options Single Package	opportunities for local economy (H=10, M=5, L=1)  5  7  8  8  Maximise opportunities for local economy (H=10, M=5, L=1)	Maximise opportunities for local labour (H=10, M=5, L=1)    M=5, L=1    7	Likelihood of Service Improvements (H=10, M=5, L=1) 6 6 0.5 Likelihood of Service Improvements	Transfer of risk away from LBBD (H=10, M=5, L=1)  5 6 2 7 0.75  Transfer of risk away from LBBD (H=10, M=5, L=1)	Contractual flexibility (H=10, M=5, L=1)  4 6 6 6 0.25  Contractual flexibility (H=10, M=5, L=1)	Likelihood of contract failure (H=1, M=5, L=10)  6 6 8 6 0.25  Likelihood of contract failure (H=1, M=5, L=10)	Impact of contract failure (H=1, M=5, L=10)  Impact of contract failure (H=1, M=5, L=10)	Risk of disrepair claims (H=1, M=5, L=10) 7 7 8 7 0.25	High quality repairs and service delivery (H=10, M=5, L=1)  1 7  7 7  7 7  High quality repairs and service delivery and service delivery	High levels of resident engagement and satisfaction (H=10, M=5, L=1) 6 7 1 1 High levels of resident engagement and satisfaction (H=10, M=10, M=10) High levels of resident engagement and satisfaction (H=10, H=10)	Using modern technology to improve efficiency and satisfaction (H=10, Ms, L=1) 7 7 7 7 7 7 7 7 7 7 7 7 7 7 7 7 7 7 7	Apprenticeships and or training (H=10, M=5, L=1) (H=0, M=5, L=1) (H=0, M=5, L=1) (H=0, M=5, L=1) Apprenticeships and or training (H=10, M=5, L=1) (H=10, M=5, L=1)	Meets statutory obligations (H=10, M=5, L=1) M=3, B N=8 0.25	Ensuring and maintaining compliance with decent home standards (H=10, M=5, L=1)  7 7 7 7 7 7 7 7 7 7 7 7 7 7 7 7 7 7 7	Total Weighte Score 41.25 46.75 49.25
2 or more Management contracts In House Multi Lot Criteria Weight Ken Jones  Options Single Package 2 or more Management contracts	opportunities for local economy (H=10, M=5, L=1)  5  7  8  8  Maximise opportunities for local economy (H=10, M=5, L=1)	Maximise opportunities for local labour (H=10, M=5, L=1) 7 7 7 8 8 0.75  Maximise opportunities for local labour (H=10, M=5, L=1) 5 5	Likelihood of Service Improvements (H=10, M=5, L=1)  Likelihood of Service Improvements (H=10, M=5, L=1)  S	Transfer of risk away from LBBD (H=10, M=5, L=1)  6  7  0.75  Transfer of risk away from LBBD (H=10, M=5, L=1)  4  4  4  4  4  4  4  4  4  4  4  4  4	Contractual flexibility (H=10,	Likelihood of contract failure (H=1, M=5, L=10)  1 6  1 6  2 0.25  Likelihood of contract failure (H=1, M=5, L=10)  5 5	Impact of contract failure (H=1, M=5, L=10)  1 1 7 0.25  Impact of contract failure (H=1, M=5, L=10)	Risk of disrepair claims (H=1, M=5, 1=10) 7 7 8 7 0.25  Risk of disrepair claims (H=1, M=5, 1=10)	High quality repairs and service delivery (H=10, M=5, L=1)  7  7  7  7  7  6  7  6  7  6  7  6  7  6  6	High levels of resident engagement and satisfaction (H=10, M=5, L=1)  6  7  1  High levels of resident engagement and satisfaction (H=10, M=5, L=1)	Using modern technology to improve efficiency and satisfaction (H=10, M=5, L=1) 7 7 7 0.5  Using modern technology to improve efficiency and satisfaction (H=10, M=5, L=1) 7 7 7 7 7 7 7 7 7 7 7 7 7 7 7 7 7 7 7	Apprenticeships and or training (H=10, M=5, L=1) (H=10, M=5, L=1)	Meets statutory obligations (H=10, M=5, L=1)  Mest statutory obligations (H=10, Meets statutory obligations (H=10, Mest, L=1)	Ensuring and maintaining compliance with decent home standards (H=10, M=5, L=1)  To a standards (H=10, M=5, L=1)  Ensuring and maintaining compliance with decent home standards (H=10, M=5, L=1)  6	Total Weighte Score 41.25 46.75 49.25 Total Weighte Score 37.5 41
Options Single Package 2 or more Management contracts In House Multi Lot Criteria Weight Ken Jones  Options Single Package	opportunities for local economy (H=10, M=5, L=1)  5  7  8  Maximise opportunities for local economy (H=10, M=5, L=1)  5  6	Maximise opportunities for local labour (H=10, M=5, L=1)  7 7 8 8 8 0.75  Maximise opportunities for local labour (H=10, M=5, L=1)  5 6	Likelihood of Service Improvements (H=10, M=5, L=1)  6  8  6  0.5  Likelihood of Service Improvements (H=10, M=5, L=1)  5  4	Transfer of risk away from LBBD (H=10, M=5, L=1)  6  7  0.75  Transfer of risk away from LBBD (H=10, M=5, L=1)  4  4  4  4  4  4  4  4  4  4  4  4  4	Contractual flexibility (H=10, M=5, L=1)  4 6 6 0 25  Contractual flexibility (H=10, M=5, L=1)  4 4 6 6 0 25	Likelihood of contract failure (H=1, M=5, L=10)  1 6 1 8 1 6 235  Likelihood of contract failure (H=1, M=5, L=10) 2 5 7	Impact of contract failure (H=1, M=5, L=10)  Impact of contract failure (H=1, M=5, L=10)  Impact of contract failure (H=1, M=5, L=10)	Risk of disrepair claims (H=1, M=5, L=10) 7 7 8 7 7 0.25  Risk of disrepair claims (H=1, M=5, L=10) 7 7	High quality repairs and service delivery (H=10, M=5, L=1)  7 7 7 7 075  High quality repairs and service delivery (L=10, M=5, L=1)	High levels of resident engagement and satisfaction (H=10, M=5, L=1)  High levels of resident engagement and satisfaction (H=10, M=5, L=1)  6	Using modern technology to improve efficiency and satisfaction (H=10, M=5, L=1) 7 7 7 7 7 7 7 7 7 7 7 7 7 7 7 7 7 7 7	Apprenticeships and or training (H=10, M=5, L=1) (H=10, M=5, L=1) (H=0, M=5, L=1) Apprenticeships and or training (H=10, M=5, L=1) (H=10, M=5, L=1) (H=10, M=5, L=1) 6	Meets statutory obligations (H=10, M=5, L=1)  8 8 0.23  Meets statutory obligations (H=10, M=5, L=1)  M=5, L=1	Ensuring and maintaining compliance with decent home standards (H=10, M=5, L=1)  7 7 7 7 7 0.23  Ensuring and maintaining compliance with decent home standards (H=10, M=5, L=1)  6	Total Weighte Score 41.25 46.75 49.25 Total Weighte Score 37.5

© Elevate East London 2011 Page 12 of 18



## Housing R&M Options Appraisal 3.2.1 LBBD Option Scoring continued

3.2.1 LDDD Opt		9 00													
Jo Moore  Options Single Package	Maximise opportunities for local economy (H=10, M=5, L=1)	Maximise opportunities for local labour (H=10, M=5, L=1)	Likelihood of Service Improvements (H=10, M=5, L=1)	Transfer of risk away from LBBD (H=10, M=5, L=1)	Contractual flexibility (H=10, M=5, L=1)	Likelihood of contract failure (H=1, M=5, L=10)	Impact of contract failure (H=1, M=5, L=10)		High quality repairs and service delivery (H=10, M=5, L=1)	High levels of resident engagement and satisfaction (H=10, M=5, L=1)	Using modern technology to improve efficiency and satisfaction (H=10, M=5, L=1)	Apprenticeships and or training (H=10, M=5, L=1) (H=10, M=5, L=1)	Meets statutory obligations (H=10, M=5, L=1)	Ensuring and maintaining compliance with decent home standards (H=10, M=5, L=1)	Total Weighted Score 41.5
2 or more Management contracts	4	5	7	7	5	5	3	7	7	6	7	5	8	5	40.75
In House	7	8	<b>⇒</b> 5	<b>1</b>	<b>⇒</b> 4	8	1	7	6	7	→ 4	<b>1</b> 6	8	<b>⇒</b> 5	39.5
Multi Lot	<b>6</b>	<b>↑</b> 6	7	<b>1</b> 8	<b>↑</b> 6	7	7	7	<b>↑</b> 8	<b>1</b> 6	7	<b>⇒</b> 5	<b>↑</b> 8	<b>⇒</b> 5	46.75
Criteria Weightin	ng 1	0.75	0.5	0.75	0.25	0.25	0.25	0.25	0.75	1	0.5	0.25	0.25	0.25	J
Sue Lees		1										1	1		1
Options	Maximise opportunities for local economy (H=10, M=5, L=1)	Maximise opportunities for local labour (H=10, M=5, L=1)	Likelihood of Service Improvements (H=10, M=5, L=1)	Transfer of risk away from LBBD (H=10, M=5, L=1)	Contractual flexibility (H=10, M=5, L=1)	Likelihood of contract failure (H=1, M=5, L=10)	Impact of contract failure (H=1, M=5, L=10)	Risk of disrepair claims (H=1, M=5, L=10)	High quality repairs and service delivery (H=10, M=5, L=1)	High levels of resident engagement and satisfaction (H=10, M=5, L=1)	Using modern technology to improve efficiency and satisfaction (H=10, M=5, L=1)	Apprenticeships and or training (H=10, M=5, L=1) (H=10, M=5, L=1)	Meets statutory obligations (H=10, M=5, L=1)	Ensuring and maintaining compliance with decent home standards (H=10, M=5, L=1)	Total Weighted Score
Single Package	3	<b>→</b> 7	♠ 8	10	<b>⇒</b> 7	<b>⇒</b> 5	1	<b>↑</b> 8	<b>↑</b> 8	7	♠ 8	10	10	<b>↑</b> 8	49
2 or more Management contracts	5	7	8	9	7	5	3	8	8	7	8	10	10	8	50.75
In House	1	10	6	1	10	10	8	→ 6	<b>⇒</b> 6	7	→ 6	10	10	7	42
Multi Lot	8	<b>↑</b> 9	→ 6	<b>⇒</b> 5	<b>→</b> 7	<b>→</b> 7	<b>1</b> 9	<b>→</b> 6	<b>⇒</b> 7	<b>→</b> 7	→ 6	8	10	8	50.5
Criteria Weightin	ng 1	0.75	0.5	0.75	0.25	0.25	0.25	0.25	0.75	1	0.5	0.25	0.25	0.25	
Hakeem Osinalke	Maximise opportunities for local economy	Maximise opportunities for local labour (H=10,	Likelihood of Service Improvements	Transfer of risk away from LBBD	Contractual flexibility (H=10,	Likelihood of contract failure	Impact of contract		High quality repairs	High levels of resident engagement and satisfaction (H=10,	Using modern technology to improve efficiency and satisfaction	Apprenticeships and or training (H=10, M=5, L=1)	Meets statutory	Ensuring and maintaining compliance with decent home standards (H=10,	Total Weighted
Options	(H=10, M=5, L=1)	M=5, L=1)	(H=10, M=5, L=1)	(H=10, M=5, L=1)	M=5, L=1)	(H=1, M=5, L=10)	L=10)	L=10)	(H=10, M=5, L=1)	M=5, L=1)	(H=10, M=5, L=1)	(H=10, M=5, L=1)	M=5, L=1)	M=5, L=1)	Score
Single Package	→ 6	<b>⇒</b> 5	7	7	2	9	1	<b>→</b> 4	7	7	9	8	8	8	45.25
2 or more Management contracts	7	→ 6	<b>↑</b> 9	8	→ 6	7	<b>⇒</b> 5	2	9	<b>↑</b> 8	<b>↑</b> 8	8	8	9	52
In House	9	9	7	1	8	1	1	1	3	7	→ 6	9	8	→ 6	40.75
Multi Lot	9	9 0.75	<del>→</del> 6	9 0.75	7 0.25	0.25	0.25	0.25	0.75	→ 6	→ 6 0.5	7 0.25	1 8 0.25	7 0.25	48
Criteria Weightin	1g I	0.75	0.5	0.75	0.25	0.25	0.25	0.25	0.75		0.5	0.25	0.25	0.25	
Andrew Sivess	1	ı													
										High levels of	Using modern			Ensuring and maintaining	
	Maximise	Maximise	Likelihood of							resident	technology to	Apprenticeships		maintaining compliance with	
	opportunities for	opportunities for	Service	Transfer of risk	Contractual	Likelihood of	Impact of contract		High quality repairs	resident engagement and	technology to improve efficiency	and or training	Meets statutory	maintaining compliance with decent home	Total
Ontions	opportunities for local economy	opportunities for local labour (H=10,	Service Improvements	away from LBBD	flexibility (H=10,	contract failure	failure (H=1, M=5,	claims (H=1, M=5,	and service delivery	resident engagement and satisfaction (H=10,	technology to improve efficiency and satisfaction	and or training (H=10, M=5, L=1)	obligations (H=10,	maintaining compliance with decent home standards (H=10,	Weighted
Options Single Package	opportunities for local economy (H=10, M=5, L=1)	opportunities for local labour (H=10, M=5, L=1)	Service Improvements (H=10, M=5, L=1)	away from LBBD (H=10, M=5, L=1)	flexibility (H=10, M=5, L=1)		failure (H=1, M=5, L=10)	claims (H=1, M=5, L=10)	and service delivery (H=10, M=5, L=1)	resident engagement and satisfaction (H=10, M=5, L=1)	technology to improve efficiency and satisfaction (H=10, M=5, L=1)	and or training (H=10, M=5, L=1) (H=10, M=5, L=1)	obligations (H=10, M=5, L=1)	maintaining compliance with decent home	Weighted Score
Single Package	opportunities for local economy	opportunities for local labour (H=10,	Service Improvements	away from LBBD	flexibility (H=10,	contract failure (H=1, M=5, L=10)	failure (H=1, M=5,	claims (H=1, M=5,	and service delivery	resident engagement and satisfaction (H=10,	technology to improve efficiency and satisfaction	and or training (H=10, M=5, L=1)	obligations (H=10,	maintaining compliance with decent home standards (H=10, M=5, L=1)	Weighted
	opportunities for local economy (H=10, M=5, L=1)	opportunities for local labour (H=10, M=5, L=1)	Service Improvements (H=10, M=5, L=1)	away from LBBD (H=10, M=5, L=1)	flexibility (H=10, M=5, L=1)	contract failure (H=1, M=5, L=10)	failure (H=1, M=5, L=10)	claims (H=1, M=5, L=10)	and service delivery (H=10, M=5, L=1)	resident engagement and satisfaction (H=10, M=5, L=1)	technology to improve efficiency and satisfaction (H=10, M=5, L=1)	and or training (H=10, M=5, L=1) (H=10, M=5, L=1)	obligations (H=10, M=5, L=1)	maintaining compliance with decent home standards (H=10, M=5, L=1)	Weighted Score 33.25
Single Package 2 or more Management contracts In House Multi Lot	opportunities for local economy (H=10, M=5, L=1)  5  6  7  8	opportunities for local labour (H=10, M=5, L=1) 6 7 8	Service Improvements (H=10, M=5, L=1)  3  5  6  8	away from LBBD (H=10, M=5, L=1)  3  5  1  7	flexibility (H=10, M=5, L=1) 3 4 5 7	contract failure (H=1, M=5, L=10) 3 3 2 5	failure (H=1, M=5, L=10) 10 10 10 4	claims (H=1, M=5, L=10) 5 6 6 7	and service delivery (H=10, M=5, L=1) 3 4 5 7	resident engagement and satisfaction (H=10, M=5, L=1) 5 6	technology to improve efficiency and satisfaction (H=10, M=5, L=1)	and or training (H=10, M=5, L=1) (H=10, M=5, L=1) 8 8 10 6	obligations (H=10, M=5, L=1)  7  8  7  8	maintaining compliance with decent home standards (H=10, M=5, L=1)	Weighted Score 33.25 40.75
Single Package 2 or more Management contracts In House	opportunities for local economy (H=10, M=5, L=1)  5  6  7  8	opportunities for local labour (H=10, M=5, L=1) 6 7	Service Improvements (H=10, M=5, L=1) 3 5 6	away from LBBD (H=10, M=5, L=1) 3 5	flexibility (H=10, M=5, L=1) 3 4 5	contract failure (H=1, M=5, L=10) 3 3 2	failure (H=1, M=5, L=10) 10 10 10	claims (H=1, M=5, L=10) 5 6	and service delivery (H=10, M=5, L=1) 3 4 5	resident engagement and satisfaction (H=10, M=5, L=1) 5 6 5	technology to improve efficiency and satisfaction (H=10, M=5, L=1) 4 5	and or training (H=10, M=5, L=1) (H=10, M=5, L=1) 8 8	obligations (H=10, M=5, L=1) 7 8 7	maintaining compliance with decent home standards (H=10, M=5, L=1) 7 1 8	Weighted Score 33.25 40.75 40.75
Single Package 2 or more Management contracts In House Multi Lot	opportunities for local economy (H=10, M=5, L=1)  5  6  7  8	opportunities for local labour (H=10, M=5, L=1) 6 7 8	Service Improvements (H=10, M=5, L=1)  3  5  6  8	away from LBBD (H=10, M=5, L=1)  3  5  1  7	flexibility (H=10, M=5, L=1) 3 4 5 7	contract failure (H=1, M=5, L=10) 3 3 2 5	failure (H=1, M=5, L=10) 10 10 10 4	claims (H=1, M=5, L=10) 5 6 6 7	and service delivery (H=10, M=5, L=1) 3 4 5 7	resident engagement and satisfaction (H=10, M=5, L=1) 5 6 5	technology to improve efficiency and satisfaction (H=10, M=5, L=1)	and or training (H=10, M=5, L=1) (H=10, M=5, L=1) 8 8 10 6	obligations (H=10, M=5, L=1)  7  8  7  8	maintaining compliance with decent home standards (H=10, M=5, L=1)	Weighted Score 33.25 40.75 40.75
Single Package 2 or more Management contracts In House Multi Lot Critera Weightin	opportunities for local economy (H=10, M=5, L=1)  5  6  7  8	opportunities for local labour (H=10, M=5, L=1) 6 7 8	Service Improvements (H=10, M=5, L=1)  3  5  6  8	away from LBBD (H=10, M=5, L=1)  3  5  1  7	flexibility (H=10, M=5, L=1) 3 4 5 7	contract failure (H=1, M=5, L=10) 3 3 2 5	failure (H=1, M=5, L=10) 10 10 10 4	claims (H=1, M=5, L=10) 5 6 6 7	and service delivery (H=10, M=5, L=1) 3 4 5 7	resident engagement and satisfaction (H=10, M=5, L=1) 5 6 5	technology to improve efficiency and satisfaction (H=10, M=5, L=1)	and or training (H=10, M=5, L=1) (H=10, M=5, L=1) 8 8 10 6	obligations (H=10, M=5, L=1)  7  8  7  8	maintaining compliance with decent home standards (H=10, M=5, L=1) 7 8 7 8 0.25	Weighted Score 33.25 40.75 40.75
Single Package 2 or more Management contracts In House Multi Lot Criteria Weightin	opportunities for local economy (H=10, M=5, L=1)  5 6  7 7  8 8	opportunities for local labour (H=10, M=5, L=1)  6 7 8 8 0.75	Service Improvements (H=10, M=5, L=1)  3  5  6  8  0.5	away from LBBD (H=10, M=5, L=1)  3  5  1  7	flexibility (H=10, M=5, L=1) 3 4 5 7	contract failure (H=1, M=5, L=10) 3 3 2 5	failure (H=1, M=5, L=10) 10 10 10 4	claims (H=1, M=5, L=10) 5 6 6 7	and service delivery (H=10, M=5, L=1) 3 4 5 7	resident engagement and satisfaction (H=10, M=5, L=1) 5 6 5 8 1 High levels of	technology to improve efficiency and satisfaction (H=10, M=5, L=1) 4 5 7 6 0.5	and or training (H=10, M=5, L=1) (H=10, M=5, L=1) (H=10, M=5, L=1) 8 8 10 6 0.25	obligations (H=10, M=5, L=1)  7  8  7  8	maintaining compilance with decent home standards (H=10, M=5, L=1) 7 8 7 8 0.25	Weighted Score 33.25 40.75 40.75
Single Package 2 or more Management contracts In House Multi Lot Critera Weightin	opportunities for local economy (H=10, M=5, L=1)  5 6  7 7  8 8  Maximise	opportunities for local labour (H=10, M=5, L=1)  6 7 1 8 0.75  Maximise	Service   Improvements   (H=10, M=5, L=1)	away from LBBD (H=10, M=5, L=1)  3  5  1  7  0.75	flexibility (H=10, M=5, L=1)  3  4  5  7  0.25	contract failure (H=1, M=5, L=10) 3 3 2 5 0.25	fallure (H=1, M=5, L=10) 10 10 10 4 0.25	claims (H=1, M=5, L=10) 5 6 6 7 0.25	and service delivery (H=10, M=5, L=1)  3  4  5  7  0.75	resident engagement and satisfaction (H=10, M=5, L=1)  5  6  8  1  High levels of resident	technology to improve efficiency and satisfaction (H=10, M=5, L=1)  4  5  7  6  0.5  Using modern technology to	and or training (H=10, M=5, L=1) (H=10,	obligations (H=10, M=5, L=1)	maintaining compliance with decent home standards (H=10, M=5, L=1) 7 7 8 3 0.25	Weighted Score 33.25 40.75 40.75 50.75
Single Package 2 or more Management contracts In House Multi Lot Critera Weightin	opportunities for local economy (H=10, M=5, L=1)  5  6  7  8  1  Maximise opportunities for	opportunities for local labour (H=10, M=5, L=1) 6 7 8 8 0.75  Maximise opportunities for	Service Improvements (H=10, M=5, L=1)  3 5 6 8 0.5	away from LBBD (H=10, M=5, L=1)  3  5  7  0.75	flexibility (H=10, M=5, L=1)  M=5, L=1)  3  4  5  7  0.25	contract failure (H=1, M=5, L=10)  3  2  5 0.25	failure (H=1, M=5, L=10) 10 10 10 10 4 0.25	claims (H=1, M=5, L=10) 5 6 7 0.25	and service delivery (H=10, M=5, L=1)  3 4 5 7 0.75	resident engagement and satisfaction (H=10, satisfaction (H=10, satisfaction (H=10, satisfaction H=10)    5	technology to improve efficiency miprove efficiency and satisfaction (H=10, M=5, L=1)   7   6  05   Using modern technology to improve efficiency improve efficiency	and or training (H=10, M=5, L=1) (H=10,	obligations (H=10, M=5, L=1) 7 7 8 7 8 0.25	maintaining compilance with decent home standards (H=10, M=5, L=1)  7  8  0.25  Ensuring and maintaining compilance with decent home	Weighted Score 33.25 40.75 40.75 50.75
Single Package 2 or more Management contracts In House Multi Lot Crieria Weighten  Christopher Boyo	opportunities for local economy (H=10, M=5, L=1)  5 6 7 8 1  Maximise opportunities for local economy	opportunities for local labour (H=10, M=5, L=1)  7  8  8  075  Maximise opportunities for local labour (H=10, local labour (H=	Service Improvements (H=10, M=5, L=1)  3  5  6  8  05  Likelihood of Service Improvements	away from LBBD  (H=10, M=5, L=1)  3  5  1  7  0.75  Transfer of risk away from LBBD	flexibility (H=10, M=5, L=1) M=5, L=1) M=5, L=1) M=5 TO 0.25  Contractual flexibility (H=10,	contract failure (H=1, M=5, L=10)  3  2  5  0.25	failure (H=1, M=5, L=10) 10 10 10 10 4 0.25	claims (H=1, M=5, L=10) 5 6 6 7 0.25	and service delivery (H=10, M=5, L=1)  3  4  5  7  0.75	resident engagement and satisfaction (H=10, M=5, L=1)  5  6  5  8  1  High levels of resident engagement and satisfaction (H=10, M=10)	technology to improve efficiency and satisfaction (H=10, M=5, L=1) \$\frac{1}{2}\$ \$\fra	and or training (H=10, M=5, L=1) (H=10, M=5, L=1) (H=10, M=5, L=1)  8 10 6 025  Apprenticeships and or training (H=10, M=5, L=1)	obligations (H=10, M=5, L=1)  7  8  7  8  0.25	maintaining compilance with decent home standards (H=10, M=5, L=1) 7 7 8 9 7 8 0.25 Ensuring and maintaining compliance with decent home standards (H=10, M=10, M=10)	Weighted Score 33.25 40.75 40.75 50.75
Single Package 2 or more Management contracts In House Multi Lot Criteria Weightin Christopher Boyo  Options	opportunities for local economy (H=10, M=5, L=1) 5 6 7 8 8 1  Maximise opportunities for local economy (H=10, M=5, L=1)	opportunities for local labour (H=10, M=5, L=1)  6  7  8  0.75  Maximise opportunities for opportunities for opportunities for local labour (H=10, M=5, L=1)	Service	away from LBBD (H=10, M=5, L=1)	flexibility (H=10, M=5, L=1)	contract failure (H=1, M=5, L=10)	failure (H=1, M=5, L=10)  10  10  10  4  0.25  Impact of contract failure (H=1, M=5, L=10)  L=10)	claims (H=1, M=5, L=10) 5 6 6 7 0.25	and service delivery (H=10, M=5, L=1)  3  4  5  7  0.75  High quality repairs and service delivery (H=10, M=5, L=1)	resident engagement and satisfaction (H=10, M=5, L=1)  5  6  8  1  High levels of resident engagement and satisfaction (H=10, M=5, L=1)	technology to improve efficiency and satisfaction (H=10, M=5, L=1)	and or training (H=10, M=5, L=1) (H=40, M=5, L=1) (H=40, M=5, L=1) 6 0.25	obligations (H=10, M=5, L=1)  7  8  7  8  0.25  Meets statutory obligations (H=10, M=5, L=1)	maintaining compilance with decent home standards (H=10, M=5, L=1)  7  8  7  8  0.35  Ensuring and maintaining compilance with decent home standards (H=10, M=5, L=1)	Weighted Score 33.25 40.75 40.75 50.75
Single Package 2 or more Management contracts In House Multi Lot Crieria Wegitin  Christopher Boyo  Options Single Package	opportunities for local economy (H=10, M=5, L=1)  5  7  8  1  Maximise opportunities for local economy (H=10, M=5, L=1)	opportunities for local labour (H=10, M=5, L=1)  6  7  8  0.75  Maximise opportunities for local labour (H=10, M=5, L=1)  3	Service	away from L880 (H=10, M=5, L=1)  3  5  1  7  0.75  Transfer of risk away from L880 (H=10, M=5, L=1)  7	flexibility (H=10, M=5, L=1)	contract failure (H=1, M=5, L=10)  3  2  5  0.25	failure (H=1, M=5, L=10)  10 10 10 10 10 4 025  Impact of contract failure (H=1, M=5, L=10) 10 10	claims (H=1, M=5, L=10)	and service delivery (H=10, M=5, L=1)  3 4  5 5  7  075  High quality repairs and service delivery (H=10, M=5, L=1)  5	resident engagement and satisfaction (H=10, M=5, L=1)	technology to improve efficiency and satisfaction (H=10, M=5, L=1) \$\frac{1}{2}\$ \$\fra	and or training (H=10, M=5, L=1) (H=10, M=5, L=1) (H=10, M=5, L=1) (H=10, M=5, L=1) Apprenticeships and or training (H=10, M=5, L=1) (H=10, M=5, L=1) (H=10, M=5, L=1)	obligations (H=10, M=5, L=1)  7  8  7  8  025  Meets statutory obligations (H=10, M=5, L=1)  5	maintaining compilance with decent home standards (H=10, M=5, L=1)  7  8  7  8  0.25  Ensuring and maintaining compilance with decent home standards (H=10, M=5, L=1)  6	Weighted Score 33.25 40.75 40.75 50.75
Single Package 2 or more Management contracts In House Multi Lot Criteria Weightin Christopher Boyo Options	opportunities for local economy (H=10, M=5, L=1) 5 6 7 8 8 1  Maximise opportunities for local economy (H=10, M=5, L=1)	opportunities for local labour (H=10, M=5, L=1)  6  7  8  0.75  Maximise opportunities for opportunities for opportunities for local labour (H=10, M=5, L=1)	Service	away from LBBD (H=10, M=5, L=1)	flexibility (H=10, M=5, L=1)	contract failure (H=1, M=5, L=10)	failure (H=1, M=5, L=10)  10  10  10  4  0.25  Impact of contract failure (H=1, M=5, L=10)  L=10)	claims (H=1, M=5, L=10) 5 6 6 7 0.25	and service delivery (H=10, M=5, L=1)  3  4  5  7  0.75  High quality repairs and service delivery (H=10, M=5, L=1)	resident engagement and satisfaction (H=10, M=5, L=1)  5  6  8  1  High levels of resident engagement and satisfaction (H=10, M=5, L=1)	technology to improve efficiency and satisfaction (H=10, M=5, L=1)   4  5  7  6  6  65  Using modern technology to improve efficiency and satisfaction (H=10, M=5, L=1)  7	and or training (H=10, M=5, L=1) (H=40, M=5, L=1) (H=40, M=5, L=1) 6 0.25	obligations (H=10, M=5, L=1)  7  8  7  8  0.25  Meets statutory obligations (H=10, M=5, L=1)	maintaining compilance with decent home standards (H=10, M=5, L=1)  7  8  7  8  0.35  Ensuring and maintaining compilance with decent home standards (H=10, M=5, L=1)	Weighted Score 33.25 40.75 40.75 50.75
Single Package 2 or more Management contracts In House Multi Lot Criteria Weightin  Christopher Boyo  Options Single Package 2 or more Management contracts	opportunities for local economy (H=10, M=5, L=1)  5 6 7 8 1  Maximise opportunities for local economy (H=10, M=5, L=1) 2 6	opportunities for local labour (H=10, M=5, L=1)  6  7  8  8  0.75  Maximise opportunities for local labour (H=10, M=5, L=1)  3  6	Service Improvements (H=10, M=5, L=1) 3 3 5 6 8 0.5 Ukelihood of Service Improvements (H=10, M=5, L=1) 2 7	away from LBBD (H=10, M=5, L=1) 3 5 5 7 0.75 Transfer of risk away from LBBD (H=10, M=5, L=1) 7 8	flexibility (H=10, M+5, L=1) 3 4 4 5 5 7 0.25 Contractual flexibility (H=10, M+5, L=1) 3 5 5	contract failure (H=1, M=5, L=10)	failure (H=1, M=5, L=10)  10 10 10 10 10 10 10 10 10 10 10 10 10	claims (H=1, M=5, L=10)  5 5  6 6  7 0.25  Risk of disrepair claims (H=1, M=5, L=10)  2 6	and service delivery (H=10, M=5, L=1)  High quality repairs and service delivery (H=10, M=5, L=1)  8	resident engagement and satisfaction (H=10, M=5, L=1)  5  6  1  High levels of resident engagement and satisfaction (H=10, M=5, L=1)  6  7	technology to improve efficiency and satisfaction (H=10, M=5, L=1)	and or training (H=10, M=5, L=1) (H=10, M=5, L=1) (H=10, M=5, L=1) 6 0.25  Apprenticeships and or training (H=10, M=5, L=1) (H=10, M=5, L=1) (H=10, M=5, L=1) 6 6	obligations (H=10, M=5, L=1)  7  8  7  8  025  Meets statutory obligations (H=10, M=5, L=1)  5	maintaining compliance with decent home standards (H=10, M=5, L=1) 7 7 8 9 7 7 8 8 9 7 7 9 9 9 9 9 9 9 9 9	Weighted Score 33.25 40.75 40.75 50.75 Total Weighted Score 32.25

© Elevate East London 2011 Page 13 of 18



### 3.3 Scoring Summary & Conclusions

Based on the data extracted from HouseMark and the Officer scoring; the 2 or more management contracts and Multi Lot option are tied. The Multi Lot option scored most highly against LBBD's strategic criteria but was the joint lowest from the HouseMark data. The main reason for the low score was the inclusion of LB of Southwark data. LB of Southwark is a unique housing Borough with comparable decency most exceptionally low tenant satisfaction. This low satisfaction has contributed to the low HouseMark scoring against the Multi Lot option. Even with the inclusion of these unique Boroughs e.g. City West, LB of Haringey, and LB of Southwark etc the HouseMark scoring is still very even against the four options.

Options	Benchmark Scoring via HouseMark (30%)	Weighted LBBD qualitative Scoring (70%)	Total Weighted Scoring
Single Package	23	41	64
2 or more Management contracts	25	→ 44	69
In House	20	42	62
Multi Lot procurement	20	49	69

© Elevate East London 2011 Page 14 of 18



### 4 Geographical Scope and Contract Type

Of the four options that have been taken forward, there are a number of further decisions that need to be made. These further decisions can be broadly categorised in terms of geography and contract type.

### 4.1 Geographical Options

In term of geographical split, the following may be possible:

Option 1 - Single Borough Wide Contract						
Pros	Cons	Recommendation				
Reduces the amount of client co- ordination and management. Enables a slim client side. One single point of contact and responsibility. More likely to encourage investment and technological innovation from contractor, especially if a longer term contract. Could encourage greater community engagement if managed appropriately.	Geared mainly towards the larger firms. Limits those firms who can participate to a restricted number of large operators who may sub-contract. Lack of competition once the contract is in place which could lead to complacency from the incumbent contractor.					

Option 2 - Divide contract into two geographic areas					
Pros	Cons	Recommendation			
Increased competition between contractors. Could allow some smaller firms to enter the market. Could allow for alternative provision on some functions (e.g. voids, planned maintenance) Spreads risk of a complete contract failure	Requires increased client co-ordination and management. Requires OJEU advertisement so no guarantee that two separate firms appointed. Increased duplication, and contractor profit and overhead costs. Increased procurement costs. Could develop two levels of service within the borough.				

Option 3 - Divide Contract into multiple areas					
Pros	Cons	Recommendation			
Increased competition.  Could allow more smaller companies to participate.  Could allow for alternative provision on some functions (e.g. voids, planned maintenance)	Requires much increased client resources to ensure that levels of quality, safety etc. maintained. Would include increased client co-ordination (call centre).  Requires OJEU advertisement so no guarantee that smaller companies engaged.  Increased duplication and contractor profit and overhead costs.  Problem to ensure consistency of standards delivered to tenant.  Increased Procurement costs.				

© Elevate East London 2011 Page 15 of 18



### 4.2 Contract Options

In term of contract type, the following may be possible:

Option 1 - Measure Term Contract					
Pros	Cons	Recommendation			
Conventional, easily understood.	Prices set at outset and contain				
Can be based on agreed standards (e.g.	profit/overhead. Often opaque and little				
NFHA).	scope to investigate real cost of work.				
	Difficult to ascertain actual works				
	required since there is an incentive to				
	"job build" on site.				
	Difficult to predict outturn costs unless				
	demand is actively managed.				
	Set in stone and little option to get cost				
	improvements over term of contract.				

Option 2 - MTC using basket rates						
Pros	Cons	Recommendation				
Conventional, easily understood.  Basket rates can be adjusted for local	Prices set at outset and contain profit/overhead. Often opaque and little					
conditions.	scope to investigate real cost of work.					
Easier to manage.	Possible overpayment if not all elements in basket require to be done.  Difficult to predict outturn costs unless demand is actively managed.  Set in stone and little option to get cost improvements over term of contract.					

Option 3 - Target Cost (e.g. cost per property)					
Pros	Cons	Recommendation			
Overall contract cost likely to be more	Depends upon a good understanding of				
predictable.	current costs to ensure value for money.				
Easier to manage.	Target cost no guarantee of maximum				
	cost if scope changes (which it will do if				
	information not robust).				

Option 4 - Guaranteed Maximum Cost/ Agreed maximum Price(e.g. output cost per property)						
Pros	Cons	Recommendation				
Often based on a guaranteed cost to	Requires completely reliable information					
keep each property in its current	on current stock condition before					
condition.	contractor will commit.					
Can predict cost of service.	Will require planned maintenance to be					
Easy to manage	included to allow contractor to commit.					
	Likely to favour larger contractors who					
	can bear risks.					

Option 5 - Partnering Arrangement based on Target Cost/AMP						
Pros	Cons	Recommendation				
Can use any of above but Target Cost or	Requires active client management and					
AMP/GMP give more predictable costs.	transparent/comprehensive cost data					
Can use open book accounting and	from contractor to get cost efficiencies.					
guaranteed profit/overhead to look at real	Will require planned maintenance to be					
cost of service.	included to allow contractor to commit.					

© Elevate East London 2011 Page 16 of 18



Can get greater cost efficiencies over	Likely to favour larger contractors who	
term of contract	can analyse cost and bear risks.	

Option 6 - Partnering Arrangement based on MTC						
Pros	Cons	Recommendation				
Could engage Contractor on MTC which	Requires active client management and					
can be migrated to an AMP arrangement	transparent/comprehensive cost data					
after a period of analysis by Contractor	from contractor to get cost efficiencies.					
and Client.	The two stage nature could place chosen					
Can use open book accounting and	contractor in an advantageous position.					
guaranteed profit/overhead to look at real	Will require planned maintenance to be					
cost of service.	included to allow contractor to commit.					
Can get greater cost efficiencies over	Likely to favour larger contractors who					
term of contract	can analyse cost and bear risks.					

Of the above geographical and contractual options, not all are suitable to take forward in all cases. The table below summarises the contractual and geographical options in relation to each of the short listed functional options:

Options	Payment / Contractual Options	Payment / Contractual Option Available (Yes / NO)	Likely Contract duration (years)	Could this contract be split amongst 2 areas	Could this contract be split amongst multiple areas	Preferred Contract Option
Single Package	Measure Term Contract (MTC)	Yes	3-5 yrs	No	No	Contract option will depend on level of management expertise. More management expertise needed the further down the list you go.
	MTC using basket of rates	Yes	3-5 yrs			
	Target Cost	Yes	3-5 yrs			
	Guaranteed Maximum Cost	Yes	3-5 yrs			
	Partnering Agreement	Yes	7-10 yrs			
2 or more Managem ent contracts	Measure Term Contract (MTC)	Yes	3-5 yrs	Yes	Yes	Contract option will depend on
	MTC using basket of rates	Yes	3-5 yrs			level of management expertise. More management expertise needed the further down the list you go.
	Target Cost	Yes	3-5 yrs			
	Guaranteed Maximum Cost	Yes	3-5 yrs			
	Partnering Agreement	Yes	7-10 yrs			
In House	Measure Term Contract (MTC)	No	NA	No	No	In-house partnering arrangement. Payment method to be agreed with in- house contractor. Could allow
	MTC using basket of rates	No	NA			
	Target Cost	No	NA			
	Guaranteed Maximum Cost	No	NA			
	Partnering Agreement	No	NA			future migration
Multi Lot procurem ent	Measure Term Contract (MTC)	Yes	3-5 yrs	Yes	Yes	Either Option depending on
	MTC using basket of rates	Yes	3-5 yrs			preference
	Target Cost	Yes	3-5 yrs			N/A
	Guaranteed Maximum Cost	No	3-5 yrs			N/A
	Partnering Agreement	No	7-10 yrs			N/A

© Elevate East London 2011 Page 17 of 18