Options Appraisal

Option	Advantages	Disadvantages
Do Nothing (Option 1)		 Current contract with current service provider about to run out (June 2016) Demand for temporary workers unlikely to cease
Extend the current MSP Contract (Option 2)		12 months extension option on current contract already taken, no further extension available
In House Delivery Model (Option 3)	 Financial saving due to mitigation of the management margin and profit element Direct access to candidates Potential improvement in response times 	 Initial set up of the section will be time consuming Initial set up will attract financial input Lack of existing recruitment agency experience available in-house, recruitment and retention will take time Build-up of talent pool will be required which will take time to implement Council has full liability for any claims made against the Temporary worker's actions or advice Labour intensive in terms of audit and vetting implementation and transfer of existing work force will need to be factored in
Single Authority Competitive Tender in the Open Market (Option 4)	 Specification reflects the Councils current and future needs Tender to be conducted in house giving control to the Council in terms of evaluation and implementation Potential cost savings in some areas 	 Time required to compete properly, this can take between 3 and 6 months dependant on the process used and may not be deliverable prior to expiry of the existing contract. Economies of scale may not be achieved, which would drive the costs up against a higher

Options Appraisal

	 EU Compliant process will be conducted AWR conversant providers, which will mitigate the risk to the Council of noncompliance Internal expertise required for evaluating the tender returns, external support maybe required which adds to the costs. If not the incumbent, then implementation will need to be factored in
Multiple Authority Competitive Tender in the Open Market (Option 5)	 Potential cost savings in some areas EU Compliant process will be conducted AWR conversant providers, which will mitigate the risk to the Council of noncompliance Economies of scale may be achieved, but this would be dependent on how many Authorities collaborate Specification broadly reflects the Councils current and future needs Tender potentially to be conducted in house or may be conducted by partnering Authority Time required to compete properly, this can take between 3 and 6 months dependant on the process used and may not be deliverable prior to expiry of the existing contract If not the incumbent, then implementation will need to be factored in
Access Alternative Open Frameworks (CCS) (Option 6)	 EU Compliant process has been conducted Saving on procurement costs Reduces time taken to conclude the process Pre-defined terms and conditions including broad based specification which can be added to All pre audit checks completed Economy of scale should yield beneficial costs to the Council Collaborative hubs can easily be utilised in geographic locations such as Pan London Pre-defined KPI's with compensatory values attached

Options Appraisal

MStar 2 Framework by ESPO Option 7		
Lot 1 – Neutral Vendor (NV)	Very flexibleAllows managers to approach any desired agency	 May result in different margins payable for staff on the same job type Can encourage non-compliant spend and retrospective ordering
Lot 2- Master Service Provider (MSP) (this is the recommended option)	 Familiar processes which promote compliant spend Single point contact- the MSP Consistent margins for each job type End to end supply chain On-line IT solution and reporting e-portal Council is able to influence on local presence 	 Certain framework pre-set terms and conditions limits achievement of a truly bespoke service Actual mark-up/margins not yet known and will become clear after the e-auction
Lot 3- Hybrid Model	 Combines the MSP and the NV approach Offers maximum flexibility and freedom of action to council managers 	- Perceived to encourage non-compliance with Council's Procurement Rules