

## APPENDIX 1 - LESSONS LEARNT ACTION PLAN

Issue	Action
<p><b>In-Scope works covering multiple work-streams stopped Contractors giving the expected focus on each type of work.</b></p>	<p>It is proposed to have separate bespoke arrangements for the following workstreams:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Responsive Repairs</li> <li>• Vacant Repairs</li> <li>• Planned Works</li> <li>• Disabled Adaptations (Various)</li> </ul>
<p><b>Withdrawal of Contractors from Frameworks due to inability to deliver works for the contracted rates despite a checking exercise for VfM / Abnormally low rates. This prevented the benefits of multiple contractors for continuity of supply, and left the Frameworks over reliant on a smaller number of contractors.</b></p>	<p>The following are proposed in order to prevent this happening again:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Clause to be included in Contract Notice and all tender documentation to allow a replacement contractor to be appointed should an appointed contractor withdraw. However, this would be time-limited within a reasonable period.</li> <li>• Contractors must confirm at PQQ stage if they have previously withdrawn from contracts due to their inability to deliver for the contracted rates. We will be able to disqualify them at this stage unless they can demonstrate that they have taken suitable action to prevent this from happening again.</li> <li>• Introduction of clauses in the new frameworks with penalties for contractors withdrawing due to their inability to deliver at contracted rates.</li> <li>• Introduction of two-part cost evaluations: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>○ Schedule of Rates (SORs)</li> <li>○ Typical Jobs Schedule</li> </ul> <p>Bidders will be required to submit their tendered rates against the SORs and then apply those rates to the Typical Job Schedules. This will help the bidder to identify any errors in their tendered rates as it puts the</p> </li> </ul>

	<p>focus on the total cost of a typical job.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Introduction of guide rates which will be based on current / market rates.</li> </ul>
<b>Problems with interpretation of Schedule of Rates (SORs)</b>	Engagement of an independent consultant to review the SORs for consistency between short and long descriptions for inconsistencies and longevity, review the units of measure to ensure that they are in line with NMR2 (national industry recognised units of measure), and a review of the guide rates to ensure that they are realistic.
<b>Specialist Works are better delivered by Specialist Contractors</b>	It is proposed that separate arrangements will be procured for specialist and major works. Recent experience has proved that this also delivers better value for money.
<p><b>The same model is not the best option for service delivery of each of the following categories of work</b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• <b>Responsive Repairs</b></li> <li>• <b>Vacant Repairs</b></li> <li>• <b>Planned Works</b></li> <li>• <b>Disabled Adaptations (Various)</b></li> </ul>	<p>Each category of work has been considered separately and the best model for each identified. For example, due to the nature of responsive repairs, it is much easier to manage this by contractors being appointed to deliver works in a particular district of the city rather than trying to manage allocation of works cross city.</p> <p>Also the proposed quality weighting for each Framework reflects the nature of the work. For example, for Disabled Adaptations the quality weighting is higher than for other work categories. Consideration for each category independently gives more flexibility.</p>