

Appendix 3 - Comparison of Alternate Procurement Routes

Appraisal Criteria	A-Block Contract	B-Cost&Volume	C-Accredited List	D- Framework	E-Spot Purchase	F-DPS
Financially sustainable -does the approach support financial sustainability	Provides stability for providers, commissioner will have to pay for voids	Provides stability for provider. Commissioner will have to pay for voids or over placement within a range.	Provides fixed price for provider and increased likelihood of placements.No contractual relationships in place	A closed approach will encourage providers to agree price. Commissioners may have to overstate requirement to guarantee supply	Many individual negotiations means no overall certainty for providers or commissioners	Does not provide stability for providers due to constant mini comping
Deliverability -can the approach be delivered in the timescales outlined?What is the admin burden to establish or maintain?	Requires very good info on demands, supply and will take a lot of effort to set up and manage	Requires very good information on demand, supply and will take a lot of effort to set up and manage	Implementation is more straightforward as provider accepts revised specification & fees	Requires robust procurement process to set up and manage when re-opened	Individual negotiations may be unmanageable.	Administration heavy due to the number of mini comps being run, providers will tire of constantly bidding for short term contracts

Appendix 3 - Comparison of Alternate Procurement Routes

<p>Meeting Need- Will the approach deliver the right services in the right place? Will quality be assured? Does the approach enable market shaping?</p>	<p>The contract will be established to set up based on predicted demand and agreed quality</p>	<p>Requires a good understanding of requirements to set up</p>	<p>There is no guarantee that there will be sufficient providers to meet demand. Quality assured through provider agreeing to standard on application</p>	<p>Demand and quality can be clearly stated (within the limitations of current understanding) with the ability to either run some mini comps for new work or direct award</p>	<p>More flexibility to buy in location required but may be at expense of quality & price</p>	<p>Able to add new providers therefore more flexible than a framework</p>
--	--	--	---	---	--	---

<p>Overall Risk- Will the approach meet the stated aims whilst being sufficiently attractive to providers</p>	<p>The approach is not easily delivered to guarantee all aims being met</p>	<p>The process will reduce risks of delivering sufficient services but may not be sustainable or deliverable</p>	<p>The approach is deliverable provided sufficient providers are attracted to join the list</p>	<p>The process is likely to deliver what is required, with greater buy in from providers due to increased surety of work</p>	<p>Complex to maintain with no guarantee of meeting need</p>	<p>Assuming providers agree to join the DPS should minimise risks due to flexibility</p>
--	---	--	---	--	--	--