

APPENDIX TWO: Full SWOT Analysis

Option one – Like for like

Run a light open competition using an appropriate framework, should one be available with no or minimal changes to current contractual specification, scope or supporting arrangements

Strengths <ol style="list-style-type: none">1. May provide incentives for savings and service improvements from competition.2. Less onerous and shorter process than full above-threshold procurement.3. Provides a streamlined and less complex model to manage and oversee.	Weaknesses <ol style="list-style-type: none">1. Does not address the councils' requirements for changes and additions to IT services provision.2. Will not provide sufficient agility to address requirements from emerging and future challenges for the Council.3. Unlikely to be flexibility on scope, SLAs, KPIs compared to other options.4. Riskier transition phase.5. Unlikely and difficult to drive savings in the short and long term
Opportunities <ol style="list-style-type: none">1. Build new partnership model with hungry and eager new entrant2. Opportunity to complete process quicker therefore saving money on procurement process and taking any savings earlier.	Threats <ol style="list-style-type: none">1. Increased risks and disruption due to potential deployment of new supplier.2. Existing partner loses appetite and or direction after an initial burst of enthusiasm.3. Will be more difficult to persuade supply market to engage.4. Cannot find suitable framework5. Possibility that un-fulfilled needs inside council leads to proliferation of shadow IT inside departments.

Option Two – Appropriate framework with specification changes to reflect current and future requirements

Run a ‘light’ open competition using an appropriate framework, should one be available based on the existing contract, specification, scope and supporting arrangements with changes, rescaling and revised operating model, to reflect taking some functions and services in-house and/or being provided by different suppliers. The contract will be outcome-focused with a refreshed service specification and scope to create savings.

<p>Strengths</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. Provides incentives for savings and service improvements from competition. 2. New model reduces single points of failure in the management of IT service. 3. The Council’s resilience to cyber threats and business continuity is increased. 4. The new model will mean that new requirements can be met much more speedily, e.g. the fire warden app. 5. Less onerous and shorter process than full above-threshold procurement. 6. Scope for savings by not having to rely on the contractor for skilled resource. 7. Provides a streamlined and less complex model to manage and oversee. 8. Allows for amendments and additions in the scope and contract. 9. Increased flexibility that enhances the roll out of digitalisation and AI to deliver a better experience and service to Bromley residents and enables the accommodation strategy that will support the hybrid working of members and officers. 10. Provides the most effective means of securing efficiencies and savings whilst balancing the changing nature of operational and customer needs 	<p>Weaknesses</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. Unlikely to be flexibility on scope, SLAs, KPIs compared to other options. 2. Increased risks and disruption due to potential deployment of new supplier. 3. Potentially riskier transition phase, but this can be mitigated by staggering starts.
<p>Opportunities</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. Re-energise existing partner or find eager, new partner(s) resulting in improvement in service delivery and agility. 2. Opportunity to complete process quicker therefore saving money on procurement process and taking any savings earlier. 3. Reduce/eliminate any “margin on margin” by contracting directly with specialist suppliers thereby reducing cost. 4. Create a “digital/innovation” competition to help increase the success and speed of the digitalisation drive at the Council. 	<p>Threats</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. Existing partner loses appetite and or direction after an initial burst of enthusiasm. 2. Recruiting and or retaining highly sought-after skilled staff could leave significant gaps in service. 3. Can’t find a supplier(s) who wants to work as a true partner of the Council. 4. May inadvertently/unintentionally cause skilled staff to leave by the choice of partner. 5. Can’t find a framework that delivers all the Council wants: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> a. Contract term b. T&C’s c. SLA’s & KPI’s

<p>5. Improved ability of IT services to support service units by drawing from a bigger and or more specialist pool of staff, both internal and external.</p> <p>6. IT Services cross train staff, such as system admin, to support multiple systems resulting in:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none">a. a better cost profile,b. fewer single points of failure,c. better engagement with the business units	<p>d. Outcome driven</p>
--	--------------------------

Option Three – Run a full procurement.

Run a full procurement exercise to select a new primary supplier, based on a new contract approach with changes, rescaling and revised operating model, to reflect taking some functions and services in-house and/or being provided by different suppliers. The contract will be outcome -focused with a refreshed service specification and scope to create savings.

<p>Strengths</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none">1. Provides platform for full refresh of scope, contractual and supporting arrangements.2. Full competition gives incentives to bidders.3. Trusted approach providing assurance.4. Gives a framework for engagement and dialogue to better achieve required outcomes including revised KPIs and SLAs.5. Provides a structured and assured model for management and oversight of operations and delivery.	<p>Weaknesses</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none">1. Expensive and highly onerous procurement process: requiring additional:<ol style="list-style-type: none">i. work,ii. resources,iii. costs2. Insufficient time to complete to the necessary process and comply with LBB quality and financial standards.3. Lack of flexibility due to fixed processes and highly formalised protocols and procedures for information exchange and engagement.
<p>Opportunities</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none">1. Scoop up all known and potential requirements into this procurement making it attractive to the very largest suppliers.2. Create a “Digital/innovation” competition to help increase the success and speed of the digitisation drive at the council	<p>Threats</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none">1. Key personnel not available to make timely decisions2. No certainty that we will have enough suppliers at the end3. Suppliers sign up for the SLA's but decide not to deliver4. May inadvertently/unintentionally cause skilled staff to leave by the choice of partner.5. Time pressures will force wrong decisions.6. May end up having to accept unfavourable T&C's /SLA's/KPI's

Option Four – In house Service

Replace the current supplier model with one which brings all functions and services currently provided by the supplier in-house and procure new contracts as necessary for services that may then be externalised

Strengths <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. Gives full control back to Council on all aspects of IT service provision. 2. Potentially gives council much greater agility on IT/Digital service provision. 3. Enables competition between suppliers which may lead to better pricing. 4. Allows for grouping of related services to incentivise potential suppliers and achieve savings. 	Weaknesses <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. Completion of necessary review and analysis work to support this approach may prove too challenging given that all services provided under the IT provision is currently provided by an external contractor. 2. Complexity of enabling services to be moved and then operated in-house or externalised may not be achievable in the time available and may require additional resources, new processes and incur extra cost. 3. Potentially overly complex and fragmented operational model which is difficult to manage and oversee and will require expanded client function. 4. Independent inhouse provision of ‘commodity’ services such as; helpdesk, 1st/2nd line fix and support will require implementation of new systems and internal arrangements that are highly likely to be higher cost than externally provided ones, where economies of scale can be achieved via locational and operational economies of scale. 5. Would not give the access to digital/IT skills and innovation of a partner ecosystem
Opportunities <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. Allows for greater flexibility for changing operational and delivery arrangements and to meet user needs. 1. Potential for greater savings through increased competition. 2. Joint procurement possibilities for specific elements 	Threats <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 2. Recruiting and or retaining highly sought-after skilled staff would leave significant gaps in service. 3. In-ability to recruit permanent staff would drive up the budget envelope 4. Would require a much bigger team to procure. 5. May inadvertently/unintentionally cause skilled staff to leave by the choice of partner. 6. Timescale is very short, which means working with incumbent much earlier on in the process with the attendant un-settling of personnel currently delivering the service. 7. The pace of change within the IT and Digital service arena is so fast that it could prove: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> a. impossible to keep the people within the IT department at the appropriate technical knowledge level b. skill levels are inappropriate to the role of trusted advisor for the service departments c. resulting in costly mistakes and or costly lost opportunities