SC55 PROCUREMENT OF HOUSING REPAIRS, MAINTENANCE AND CAPITAL IMPROVEMENTS PROVISION FROM 2025.
OPTION APPRAISAL SCORING MATRIX

Option	Time to Procure (1-5)	Risk (1-5)	Market Appetite (1-5)	Intelligence (1-5)	Flexibility (1-5)	Cost (1-5)	Service Quality (1-5)	Control (1-5)	Cumulative Score	RAG
1. Continue with UNSL joint venture to 2030	5	2	2	4	2	3	2	2	22	
2. Continue with UNSL joint venture, new Service Agreement	4	2	3	4	2	3	3	2	23	
3. End UNSL, replace with Single Integrated Contract	3	4	4	3	2	4	3	2	25	
4. End UNSL, replace with Dynamic Purchasing System	2	3	4	2	4	3	3	3	24	
5. End UNSL, replace with Joint /Shared Service	2	3	3	2	3	3	3	2	21	
6. End UNSL, replace with Direct Labour Organisation	1	2	3	2	2	2	4	4	20	
7. End UNSL, replace with new Joint Venture	2	3	3	2	2	3	3	2	20	
8, End UNSL, replace with Wholly Owned Subsidiary	1	2	3	2	2	2	4	4	20	
9. End UNSL, replace with Multiple Individual Contracts	3	4	4	3	4	3	3	3	27	
10. End UNSL, acquire and operate UNSL without Norse	1	2	3	2	2	2	4	4	20	
11. End UNSL, replace with Mixed Economy	3	4	4	4	5	4	4	4	32	

Below is an explanation of the criteria review and the logic relating to the scoring.

Time to Procure: This evaluates the duration required to implement each option. Options with shorter procurement timelines receive higher scores, while those necessitating longer setup periods score lower.

- Options 1 and 2 (continuing with the existing joint venture) would require the least time to procure, hence scored 5 and 4, respectively.
- Options involving setting up new in-house capabilities (6, 8, 10) would require the most time, hence scored 1.
- Other options were scored based on the estimated procurement time required.

Risk: Risk assessment involves considering the potential uncertainties and challenges associated with each option. Options entailing significant changes or requiring the establishment of new capabilities are deemed riskier and receive lower scores. Conversely, options offering continuity with existing ventures are perceived as less risky and score higher.

- Options involving significant changes or setting up new in-house capabilities (3, 6, 8, 9, 10, 11) were scored lower on risk (4 or less) due to the higher risk associated with these options.
- Options involving continuity with the existing joint venture (1, 2) were scored higher on risk (2) due to the lower risk associated with these options.

Market Appetite: Market appetite refers to the anticipated interest from external stakeholders, such as potential service providers or partners. Options expected to garner substantial interest from the market receive higher scores, while those likely to encounter limited market interest score lower.

- Options involving outsourcing to the market (3, 4, 9, 11) were scored higher on market appetite (4) due to the expected interest from the market. This being derived from market intelligence and soft market testing.
- Options involving in-house capabilities (6, 8, 10) were scored lower on market appetite (3) due to the limited market interest for these options.

Intelligence: This evaluates the extent to which each option leverages existing knowledge or specialised expertise. Options benefiting from pre-existing intelligence, such as continuing with established ventures, score higher. Conversely, options necessitating the development of intelligence from scratch receive lower scores.

- Option 11 (mixed economy with different providers) was scored highest on intelligence (4) due to the ability to leverage specialised knowledge from different providers.
- Options involving continuity with the existing joint venture (1, 2) were also scored higher on intelligence (4) due to the existing knowledge and intelligence available. However, it should be noted that performance to-date is poor and a notice has already been served
- Options involving setting up new in-house capabilities (6, 8, 10) were scored lower on intelligence (2) due to the need to build intelligence from scratch.

Flexibility: Flexibility assesses the adaptability of each option to changing circumstances or requirements. Options offering greater flexibility, such as those involving multiple providers or contracts, score higher. Conversely, options characterized by rigid structures or reliance on single providers score lower.

- This assesses how flexible each option is in adapting to changing requirements or circumstances. Options involving multiple providers or contracts (4, 9, 11) are scored higher, while options with a single provider or in-house solutions (1, 2, 3, 6, 8, 10) are scored lower.

Cost: Cost evaluation involves assessing the potential financial implications of each option. Options deemed cost-effective, such as outsourcing to the market, receive higher scores. Conversely, options expected to incur higher setup and operational costs, such as in-house solutions, score lower.

- This evaluates the potential cost implications of each option. Options involving outsourcing to the market (3, 4, 9, 11) are generally scored higher, while in-house solutions (6, 8, 10) are scored lower due to the potential for higher setup and operational costs.

Service Quality: This criterion considers the potential of each option to deliver high-quality services. Options enabling better control over service delivery or leveraging specialised providers score higher. Conversely, options with potential limitations on service quality, such as reliance on single providers, score lower.

- This assesses the potential for each option to deliver high-quality services. In-house solutions (6, 8, 10) and the mixed economy option (11) are scored higher, as they allow for better control and specialised providers, respectively. Options involving a single provider (1, 2, 3) are scored lower due to potential limitations.

Control: This assesses the level of control the council would have over service delivery under each option. Options affording greater control, such as in-house solutions or mixed economy approaches, score higher. Conversely, options with reduced control, such as outsourcing to single providers, score lower.

- In-house solutions (6, 8, 10) and the mixed economy option (11) are scored higher, as they provide more direct control. Options involving outsourcing to a single provider (1, 2, 3) are scored lower due to reduced control.

The "Cumulative Score" column is the sum of the scores across all criteria, providing an overall assessment of each option's strengths and weaknesses. As you will see Option 11, Replace with Mixed Economy scores the highest in the evaluation and is the preferred option to move forward with.