

PORTFOLIO HOLDER DECISIONS



Please refer to Guidance Notes overleaf

| | | |
|--|---|--|
| Forward Plan Ref. No. | 2017 275 April – Web Procurement Options | Date of decision 26 April 2017 |
| Name of Portfolio Holder | Cllr John Parham | |
| Name of Officer | Sara Skirton | |
| Details of Decision | <p>Authorisation of exemption from the procurement process as set out in section C12 of Section 22 (Contract Procedure Rules) of the Constitution). Exemption is requested under 12.1(f).</p> <p>This to enable Mendip District Council to enter into a contract with the current Web provider GOSS for a new 12 month contract, with the option of a 12 month extension, under the same terms and conditions that are currently in place.</p> | |
| Details of consultation carried out: Tick | | |
| | Chief Executive/ Deputy Chief Executive | Name: Donna Nolan Date:25 April 2017 |
| | Legal | Name: Alex Kershaw-Moore Date:7 March 2017 |
| | Finance | Name: Paul Deal Date: 25 April 2017 |
| | Group Manager | Name: Sara Skirton Date: 25 April 2017 |
| | Portfolio Holder | Name: John Parham Date: 25 April 2017 |
| | Ward Member (mark NA if necessary) | Name: NA Date: |
| Reasons for Decision | <p>The Council's website is a key self-serve channel and convenient information source for customers. It also represents one of the best value for money channels in terms of transaction costs.</p> <p>The Council currently operates a website created and maintained by GOSS International Limited through a contract which is due to expire in January 2018. This cannot be further extended and therefore a new contract is required.</p> <p>It is essential that the council's website keeps pace with technical advances, customer expectations and the increasing use of mobile devices.</p> <p>However it is equally important that the solution that the council procures is as flexible and future proofed as possible, and works seamlessly with our other service delivery arrangements, including 5 Councils Partnership. This partnership is currently developing its approach to digital service delivery, which is likely to affect the type and nature of any website provision in the future. The detail is unlikely to be</p> | |

| | |
|--|--|
| | <p>known in time to feed into procurement of a new website.</p> <p>Additionally and concurrently, the council is reviewing its strategic approach to digital and social media and marketing. The website will be key to delivering the outcomes of these strategies.</p> <p>The principal benefit of the proposed decision is to allow the Council sufficient time to establish a solid basis to scope and procure an integrated web solution on a longer term contract that aligns with our strategy, helps fully optimise functionality and improves the service on offer to our customers.</p> <p>In the meantime, this option also provides for consistency of service delivery, and minimal impact on staff resources.</p> |
| <p>Any alternative options considered and rejected</p> | <p>Alternative Option 1</p> <p>Consideration was given to going to the market at this stage to procure a comprehensive and longer term new web solution.</p> <p>The aim of this exercise would be to provide the Council with a web solution that has the ability and functionality to provide a longer term service and potentially futureproof the website. This remains the ultimate intention, however given the number of as yet unknowns in relation to the 5CP digital provision, and the need to ensure alignment with the proposed a marketing and digital strategy, the Council is not currently in a position to be able to fully and confidently scope the requirements of a new longer term solution.</p> <p>Additionally, a full procurement exercise would require the review and potential replacement of all current web content and functionality, and corporate training on how to use the new website. This would have a significant operational impact on the whole organisation, at a time of significant transformation and change, most notably the transition and transformation element of the 5CP.</p> <p>There risks associated with this option include:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Procuring, at considerable expense, a system that ultimately transpires not to be the best solution for the council • The capital needed to be invested in this solution would be substantial and it may be possible that some elements will in future be provided via the 5CP contract, risking duplication of expense. • The time available to scope this option before the |

| | |
|--|--|
| | <p>current contract expires is limited. To try to complete such an exercise in this time would likely impact on the quality of the scoping and could impact on other priority work such as 5CP transition and transformation.</p> <p>Alternative Option 2</p> <p>Recognising the time and work that is required to fully scope a comprehensive longer term web solution, consideration was given to going to the market to procure a new solution on a short term basis (12 months with option for further 12 month extension), with a specification that closely mirrors the current website.</p> <p>In common with the proposed option, the principal benefit of this option would be to allow the Council sufficient time to establish a solid basis to procure a solution on a longer term contract to fully optimise functionality and improve the service on offer to our customers. However, whilst the specification would be similar to that of the current website, it is recognised that a solution provided by a different supplier will significant adjustment, investment in training and in content management. It will also take significant time for any new supplier to gain the knowledge of the organisation and its website requirements that the current supplier holds.</p> <p>Financially such a solution would cost in the region of approximately £25,000 for the initial implementation, plus support and maintenance costs.</p> <p>The risks associated to this option would include:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Implementing an unfamiliar product that would require staff training over a short period of time. • A product that may appear visually different for customers for a relatively short period of time which may cause confusion. • Additional expenditure over and above what is currently allocated • The need to change the chosen system in a relatively short time to improve the functionality due to a change in business need. |
| Financial and personnel implications | The proposed option would cost in the region of £13,000 per annum, based on the current contract. |
| Any relevant personal Interest under the Code of | Please specify None |

PORTFOLIO HOLDER DECISIONS



| | |
|---|---------------------------------|
| Conduct | |
| Reports and Background papers relevant to the decision | |
| Date e-mailed to Members incl Scrutiny Board Chair | Wednesday, 26 April 2017 |
| Date of Publication of Notice | Wednesday, 26 April 2017 |
| Date Decision comes into force (*see below) | Friday, 5 May 2017 |
| * Please Note: The decision detailed above will come into force, and may be implemented, 5 clear working days after Publication unless subject to call-in by the Scrutiny Board. | |
| Signature of Portfolio Holder | |