
Decision Maker:	PORTFOLIO HOLDER FOR CHILDREN, EDUCATION AND FAMILIES		
Date:	For Pre-Decision Scrutiny by the Children, Education and Families PDS Committee on 20 June 2023		
Decision Type:	Non-Urgent	Executive	Non-Key
Title:	PROCEEDING TO PROCUREMENT (GATEWAY 0/1): FAMILY GROUP CONFERENCE		
Contact Officer:	Bola Bakare, Integrated Strategic Commissioner, Tel: 0208 461 7614 E-mail: bola.bakare@bromley.gov.uk		
Chief Officer:	Richard Baldwin, Director Children Education and Families		
Ward:	All Wards		

1. REASON FOR REPORT

- 1.1 The Family Group Conference (FGC) service is a key tool in early intervention used in the prevention of children entering the care system. The current contract is held by Daybreak Family Group Conferences, following a competitive tender. The contract commenced on 1 April 2019 and has an estimated annual value of £90k, for 75 FGC's and 5 reviews per annum.
- 1.2 The original contract award was for 3 years, and commenced from 1 April 2019 to 31 March 2022, with the option to extend for a further two years up to 31 March 2024. The option to extend has been exercised, and the contract is currently operating in final year of the two-year extension period.
- 1.3 As these contract arrangements will come to an end on 31 March 2024 and there are no further extensions, this report seeks authorisation from the Portfolio Holder for Children, Education and Families to explore procurement options and recommendations on how FGC's will be commissioned in the future to meet the needs of Bromley's vulnerable families from 1 April 2024.
- 1.4 A procurement exercise will allow for a new contract that will be let on a 5 + 2-year basis. The available budget for this service is £129.6k per annum. There has been a significant increase in demand for the service, as such the projected total estimated value of this procurement exercise will be £907k over 7 years, based on an annual value of £129k per annum for 105 FGCs per year.

2. RECOMMENDATION(S)

- 2.1 Children Education and Families PDS is asked to note and comment on the contents of this report.

2.2 The Portfolio Holder for Children, Education and Families in agreement with the Chief Officer, Director of Corporate Services, Assistant Director of Governance & Contracts and the Director of Finance is recommended to approve proceeding to tender for a new FGC service for a five year contract commencing 1 April 2024, with the option to extend for a further two years, at an estimate annual value of £129.6k (estimated whole life value of £907k).

Impact on Vulnerable Adults and Children

1. Summary of Impact: This will have a positive impact on vulnerable children and families, by providing children the best opportunity to remain within the family network and reducing the number of those going into the care system.
-

Transformation Policy

1. Policy Status: Existing Policy: Safeguarding Children and Young People
 2. Making Bromley Even Better Priorities: -
 - (1) For children and young People to grow up, thrive and have the best life chances in families who flourish and are happy to call Bromley home.
 - (5) To manage our resources well, providing value for money, and efficient and effective services for Bromley's residents.
-

Financial

1. Cost of proposal: Estimated Cost, £129k per annum, based on current spend and utilisation, giving a cumulative value of £907K over 7 years
 2. Ongoing costs: Recurring Cost
 3. Budget head/performance centre: R11251
 4. Total current budget for this head: £ £130k
 5. Source of funding: Core
-

Personnel

1. Number of staff (current and additional): N/A
 2. If from existing staff resources, number of staff hours: N/A
-

Legal

1. Legal Requirement: Non-Statutory - Government Guidance: Family Justice Review (2011) Public Law Outline, (2014) :(2023)
 2. Call-in: Applicable: Portfolio Holder decision.
-

Procurement

1. Summary of Procurement Implications:
-

Property

1. Summary of Property Implications There are no property implications attached to this contract.
-

Carbon Reduction and Social Value

1. Summary of Carbon Reduction/Sustainability Implications: See section 5
-

Customer Impact

1. Estimated number of users or customers (current and projected): Current: 75 FGC's per annum, Projected 105 per annum
-

Ward Councillor Views

1. Have Ward Councillors been asked for comments? Not Applicable
2. Summary of Ward Councillors comments: NA

3. COMMENTARY

- 3.1 A Family Group Conference (FGC) is a decision-making meeting in which a child's wider family network come together with the relevant agencies to make a plan for the future arrangements for the child. The Conference ensures that the child's safety and wellbeing is promoted and that they are an active participant in the plan that is being made for them. A Family Group Conference must be facilitated by an independent co-ordinator.
- 3.2 FGCs originated in New Zealand where they have been used since the 1970s. They are now used in many local authorities as part of the legal planning process in safeguarding, and have considerable benefits in working with children and families to find family-based solutions that will: -
- Keep children safe by preventing the occurrence and re-occurrence of child abuse and neglect.
 - Keep children within their family.
 - Include family members in the creation of their own plan and facilitate implementation of the plan.
 - Strengthen and extend the support networks within and around the family.
 - Increase the number of children and young people living safely with immediate or extended family or friends.
 - Develop plans for children in care which are supported by extended family and significant people in the child or young person's life.
- 3.3 The government has placed increased emphasis on the importance on the role of "family" in the development of a young child, with the emphasis on keeping the child at the centre of all discussions and decisions, by looking at ways to keep the family together whilst safeguarding the child/dren, by providing intervention at the earliest opportunity.
- 3.4 The Family Justice Review report (2011), noted that alternative processes such as FGC's, aimed at avoiding proceedings or resolving difficulties between local authorities and families outside the court room, may reduce distress and promote better support to and for families. The report also highlighted the benefits of Family Group Conferences stating that they should be more widely recognised, and their use should be considered before proceedings rather than further down the line.
- 3.5 FGC's feed into the decision-making process for children going into legal planning and can be instrumental in keeping children and young people from going into care and in some cases facilitate returning children back to their families, from care. FGCs also empower families by providing them with an active role in decision making.
- 3.6 The current FGC contract was awarded to Daybreak Family Group Conference service, following a competitive tender process. The contract commenced on 1 April 2019 for a three-year period with the option to extend for a further two years. The contact is now in year one of a two-year extension that will end on 31 March 2024. The contract is for 75 FGC's and 5 reviews per annum.

3.7 The provider is paid at fixed unit rates per Conference or Review delivered, based on referrals made by the Children’s Social Care (CSC) teams. However, the last 2 years has seen an increase in the number of FGC completed as seen in Table 1, mainly due to CSC promoting the need to embed FGC’s much earlier in the child/rens journey to proceedings in line with government guidelines.

Table1

	2019/20	2020/21	2021/22	2022/23
Referrals	94	106	119	133
FGCs completed	66*	95	108	94
Reviews	0**	3	4	2

**This figure was greatly impacted by covid 19*

*** The 5 reviews were converted into cases for 20/21*

3.8 CSC have also reported an increase in the number of referrals coming through the front door since the covid outbreak. This increase has resulted in an increase in demand on all CSC services including FGC’s. The aim is to mitigate the need for or migration to more expensive services by embedding FGCs at the earliest opportunity in line with Government guidelines as per the Family Justice Review report (2011)

3.9 To ensure that FGCs become more embedded in social work practice the current provider also offers Lunchtime learning sessions for staff to explain the service and how to access it. These sessions that are arranged in conjunction with the Head of service, and also offers a platform for social workers to ask questions and voice concerns. This practice has been incorporated into the new service specification to ensure that this practice continues with future providers.

Summary of Business Case

3.10 The recommissioning of the FGC service offers the opportunity for LBB Children’s Social Care (CSC) to effectively support Bromley children and their families through difficult periods in their lives, by ensuring that decisions concerning the safeguarding and wellbeing of the children and young people are made in a more timely and holistic manner, by exploring alternative options early in the child’s journey.

3.11 There has been a reported increase in the number of referrals into CSC since the Covid 19 lockdown. This has been putting tremendous pressure on social care budgets, the early intervention aspect of FGC’s can positively impact on the number of child/ren affected through consolidating support from within their own family network at an early stage.

3.12 Placing children into the care of the Local Authority, is a major financial strain on Children’s Social Care across the Country. In 2019, Local Government Association and the Association of Directors of Children’s Services research established an average cost of £56,000 per annum to look after a child in care. In addition, children who have been in care are more likely to demonstrate several poorer outcomes and life chances, than their non-care peers.

3.13 FGCs operate as a ‘spend to save’ option, but more importantly as a preventative model, because the early use of FGC’s is likely to offer better outcomes for all involved. By intervening early and providing an arena for family networks to develop a plan to safeguard the child/ren within that

network offers better outcomes for the child/ren in that decisions can be made much earlier reducing the time of uncertainty, families realise they have more to offer than they thought and enables the LA to focus spend on where it is needed most.

Service Profile / Data Analysis / Specification

- 3.14 As stated in section 3.7, there has been a steady increase in the number of FGC's undertaken, CSC staff correlate this with the increase in new referrals coming through the front door, especially post COVID as can be seen in Table 1.
- 3.15 Data from the last 4 years indicates that there were more referrals for FGCs from the Safeguarding and court teams, however, not all these referrals proceeded to an FGC. As part of CSC's aim to ensure that FGCs are offered at a much earlier stage, it is envisioned that referrals from Family Support and Child in Need (CIN) teams will increase and referrals at the later stages such as when cases are about to go or are already in court. The earlier stage is where it is felt that FGC's will have the most impact and could potentially decrease the number of Safeguarding referrals

Spend

- 3.16 The estimated annual cost of the current contract is £90,000 for 75 FGC's and 5 reviews per annum, however as stated in section 3.7 the number of FGC's is steadily increasing, this as a result of CSC embedding the use of FGC into their service delivery. This is indicated in the spend to date noted in Table 2 below There is the likelihood that these figures could increase if the number of FGC's continue to rise, but this is seen as a positive, however this will continue to be monitored closely through the contract monitoring process.

Table 2

Year 1 (2019/20)		Year 2 (2020/21)		Year 3 (2021/22)		Year 4 (2022/23)	
Projected Spend	Actual Spend	Projected Spend	Actual Spend	Projected Spend	Actual Spend	Projected Spend	Actual Spend
£90,000	£ 84,840	£90,000	£ 101,320	£90,000	£110,702	£90,000	£104,212

Options Appraisal

- 3.17 The options below are presented based on there being the acceptance that the council is committed to the FGC model due to the positive outcomes for the child, family and local authority:

3.18 Option 1- Do nothing

3.18.1 This is not an option to be considered, because of the following: -

- As the contract would come to a natural end with nothing in place to provide this best practice service.
- Even though this is not a statutory service, it has a significant impact on the need for statutory services by reducing the need for cases to move to statutory provision.
- It would expose the council to spot purchasing individual FGC's if directed by the court
- and would negatively impact on the current momentum of embedding the practice of early FGC's
- Does not offer value for money.

3.19 Option 2 - Bring service in-house

3.19.1 This option would involve creating an in-house service which would have to consist of an FGC lead and 3 or 4 coordinators in order to meet the caseloads. And additional casual Coordinators. In the current market the estimated cost would be £140,000 per annum.

3.19.2 This option is not recommended due to the following reasons:

- This would not offer value for money based on current bench marking, considering set up costs, TUPE implications, LA staff costs such as pensions and line management staff implications, and would result in Bromley paying more for the same.
- It may add to the workload of an already stretched service
- A tender exercise will generate competition within the market
- A tender exercise should deliver efficiencies both in service provision and financially.
- It would also remove the perceived lack of objectivity of parents of dealing with the same body who is questioning their parenting ability

3.20 Option 3 – Re-commission the FGC service via competitive tender

3.20.1 This is the option recommended for the following reasons: -

- A tender exercise will generate competition within the market, and ensure that a provider with detailed knowledge and experience in this area will bid
- It will also enable the Council to fully understand the breadth of the market available and ensure value for money is achieved.
- A tender exercise will deliver efficiencies both in service provision and spend, ultimately the tender will seek experts in the field.
- It will also ensure compliance with the Council Contract Procedure Rules and National Procurement regulations, as there is no option to extend the contract beyond the existing term.

3.21 Preferred Option

Option 3 as per section 3.20

4. MARKET CONSIDERATIONS

- 4.1 The use of FGCs in Bromley has been consistent, and the model continues to be endorsed by the social care management and operational teams as an invaluable tool in preventing young people entering care.
- 4.2 Market research has highlighted the fact that there are at least five well known FGC providers who offer this service, so there is feasibility in going to market.
- 4.3 Benchmarking with similar services and across other local authorities who outsource FGCs indicated that the average cost of an FGC averages to about £1,300 per FGC, inclusive of reviews. Benchmarking also highlighted that some boroughs either offered a hybrid service, using their own conference coordinators and casual staff or bought in the whole service, or provided the whole service in House, some of which are indicated below, however these do not indicate the additional LA staff costs.

- LB Southwark operates a hybrid FGC service, they complete about 135 FGCs per annum, the service consists of 3 FGC LA workers, (1 manager, 1 parent advocacy worker and 1 FGC coordinator) and up to 10 independent FGC coordinators at up to £ 1000/FGC in-house.
- LB Lambeth – operate an in-house service, with 1 FGC manager, 1 FGC coordinator and 1 administrator in addition to 7 casual FGC coordinators. In 2022/22 they completed 66 FGC's and are projecting to complete 75 in 2022/23.

4.4 At present LBB is operating on par with other outsourced services at 1,088 per FGC based on of 75 packages, with an additional £2,500 for 5 reviews

5. SOCIAL VALUE, CARBON REDUCTION AND LOCAL / NATIONAL PRIORITIES

5.1 The Public Services (Social Value) Act 2012 requires local authorities to have regard to economic, social, and environmental wellbeing in connection with public service contracts. In doing so, the London Borough of Bromley contracted services must consider these factors when tendering for a new service and measures must be put in place to ensure that Providers adhere to the Council's Social Value and Local /National Priorities.

5.2 In proceeding to procurement, the new FGC Service contract and service specification has been reviewed to maximise the Social Value opportunities. New tender instructions will now require providers to demonstrate via the tender their Social Value strategy which will include details on what they will do to grow the local economy e.g, via apprenticeships and work placements for residents. Providers will also be asked to consider the impact of their service on the environment, in line with the Council's Net Zero Carbon ambitions.

6. STAKEHOLDER ENGAGEMENT

6.1 Initial feedback from operational colleagues has been positive; they have found the service very responsive in meeting the needs of the families involved. The provider as part of the contractual agreement obtains feedback from all participants including the children and young people that access the service. Feedback has included the following which has informed the service specification and individual care and support planning for children: -

6.2 **The voice of the child: -**

What do you think was the positive aspects of holding an FGC?

"My whole family helped me say what I wanted to say".

What would you like to say at the FGC?

I would like to say that I love to go back to my mum whenever she adjusts herself.

Where would you like to live apart from your mum's house?

"I would like to live with my mum but if I cannot live with my mum, I would like to live with xxx until my sister xxx comes back from Africa

Would you like to attend the FGC meeting?

"Yes, I would like to attend and tell them at the meeting that I am sorry for xxx for taking me to school far from the house, therefore I would like to change my school to xxx school which is very close to xxx house

Is there anything you like to tell your family?

"I think that the plan is great, and I feel that I will be safer as a result and my views were included in the plan.

6.3 Families/ Friends: -

What do you think was the positive aspects of holding an FGC?

- Found it very useful, we all expressed concerns, comments & got a good plan for the future. Thank you for providing the room to meet and providing the food, it made the experience more relaxed. The coordinator was very helpful & kind and made the meeting very smooth. Thank you. Yes, we made a very useful plan.
- Was a good meeting. Xxx (Mother) was able to express herself.
- Increased time spent at his dad's and stepmother's house where child benefits a safe environment free of drugs and violence and with a well-structured routine supporting his needs. Good outcome.
- The meeting was very helpful and exceeded my expectations. Would recommend to anyone in similar position. Coordinator was excellent.
- "Just to say thank you for helping us all feel at ease with your friendly manner and being supportive by making sure we all fully understood what the meeting was about and being there to clarify anything we were not sure about".
- "This meeting is greatly helpful and very important. I am reassured and truly relieved to learn more about social worker involvement in monitoring the wellbeing and safety of my nieces. Moreover, this is an opportunity to express my willingness and hope to support and stay in touch with my nieces. Yes, it certainly was a welcome opportunity. I had a chance to learn more from the social worker perspective and advice from the coordinator. I now understand the current situation of my nieces. I can therefore make a practical plan to support them".
- "Thank you so much to arrange the family conference to discuss about the solutions and support which family can give us. Special thanks to xxx & xxx to arrange such a useful meeting. Xxx did a good job in making contact with all the family members most of whom live abroad (India, Sri Lanka and the USA). It was challenging but she was able to reach out to them and to have the meeting held despite the difference in time zones and the working schedules of the family members. She was able to foster a good working relationship with parents within a short period by listening and speaking to them and this helped to progress the FGC to its successful conclusion."

6.4 Operational colleagues/professional:

what do you think was the positive aspects of holding an FGC?

- Positives
 - "The Family were able to get together and agree a plan".
 - "Family working positively together & understanding the purpose of the plan"
 - Brought the family together, put differences aside in order to put children first. They worked well together.
 - It allowed the family to focus specifically on the children and identify support available.
 - Family engaged well with professionals and have committed themselves to implement the developed plan.

What do you think were the negative aspects?

"Although the remote meeting worked well, it would of course have been preferable to hold the meeting in person, yet due to Covid-19 measures this wasn't possible. That said, the family members worked really well and supported each other, and they were obviously very

comfortable with their social worker so in this instance, I don't think the remote meeting disadvantaged them.

The family seemed a bit anxious about having their plan ready to send to the co-ordinator by the required time; the nominated family member has a busy life with children and a demanding job, and I think the deadline seemed to concern her."

"I believe that initially the child's parents struggled to agree during the conference and tensions escalated, however the coordinator was able to step in and remind the family of the importance of keeping the child's best interests at the centre of discussions, and by the time I re-joined the conference, both families were agreeable and amicable towards one another, and the plan was constructive.

Neg: Mixed Information and understanding around the child attending the FGC, which nearly caused problem between the parents at the last minute.

(An example of how stakeholder feedback leads to service improvement - In this instance the information was relayed back to the provider, and it turned out that information regarding the parents' estrangement had not been relayed to the FGC Coordinator. The outcome of this particular situation highlighted the need for good communication and led to a change to the referral form that LBB social workers complete to ensure that all pertinent information is provided.)

6.5 All Information collected from the various feedback both positive and negative is used for continuous service improvement with the current provider and will be incorporated into future service delivery.

7. PROCUREMENT AND PROJECT TIMESCALES AND GOVERNANCE ARRANGEMENTS

7.1 The indicative timetable for this exercise is as below: -

Activity	Date
Documents made available from	W/C 26 June 2023
Closing date for clarification questions	W/C 24 July 2023
Tender closing date	4 August 2023
Evaluation of submitted tenders	August /September 2023
Clarification interviews	September 2023
Anticipated award date	November 2023
Standstill Ends	November 2023
Mobilisation period	December - 2023 March 2024
Commencement of contract	1 April 2024

7.2 **Estimated Value of Proposed Action:** The estimated value of the proposed exercise is £129.6k per annum, with a projected total estimated value of £907K over 7 years.

7.3 **Other Associated Costs:** N/A

7.4 **Proposed Contract Period:** Proposed Contract Period: will be 5 years, with the option to extend for a further 2 years.

7.5 The current service specification is fit for purpose; however, we continuously seek to improve the service by reflecting on any lessons learnt during the lifetime of the existing contract as

detailed in the stakeholder feedback. As such the specification has been refined, for example following feedback from operational colleagues the referral process has been modified to ensure clearer communication channels between the provider and LBB, the additional lunchtime training for LBB staff.

7.6 The proposed tender process will be carried out with support from Corporate Procurement in line with the Council's Contract Procedure Rules and compliance with the Public Contracts Regulations 2015 requirements and prospective bids will be evaluated on a 60% price and 40% quality split.

7.7 The proposed quality criteria for scoring prospective bid will be based on the following which has been agreed by the FGC Project Group, which will consist of operational staff, commissioning, Finance with input from Procurement and Quality Assurance.

7.8

Criteria	Weighting
Financial Resources & Contract Affordability	10%
General Data Protection Regulations (GDPR) and Information Governance	5%
Implementation/Mobilisation	5%
Management, Operation and Delivery of Service:	
Achieving Outcomes	20%
Service Delivery	20%
Contract Management	00%
Staffing and Structures	10%
Social Value	10%

8. IMPACT ASSESSMENTS (INCLUDING VULNERABLE ADULTS AND CHILDREN)

8.1 An equalities impact assessment has been completed for this service and has shown that there will be no disproportionate negative or positive impact on any identified group as the service is needs led. The gaps in the evidence base however include the following mainly because these are not areas currently monitored for this service.

- Gender re-assignment
- Sexual orientation
- Religion and belief
- Pregnancy and maternity
- Marriage and civil partnership

8.2 Because the provider is required to support the councils Equalities Duty, monitoring on the 9 protected characteristics will be submitted for review as part of the contract monitoring arrangement.

8.3 As this is a needs led service offered at point of need, it is not envisioned that any of these groups will be impacted negatively.

9. TRANSFORMATION/POLICY IMPLICATIONS

9.1 The commissioning approach embraces the Making Bromley Even Better Ambitions:

- “For children and young people to grow up, thrive and have the best life chances in families who flourish and are happy to call Bromley home”.
- Whilst the procurement approach supports ambition 5, “To manage our resources well, providing value for money, and efficient and effective services for Bromley’s residents”.

10. IT AND GDPR CONSIDERATIONS

10.1 The contract for this service will be updated to ensure that it remains GDPR compliant. In addition, providers will need to demonstrate their compliance with all data protection legislation as part of the tender submission.

11. PROCUREMENT CONSIDERATIONS

11.1 This report seeks proceeding to procurement of a Family Group Conference (FGC) service contract at an estimated annual value of £129.6k for a total of seven years on an initial 5 years plus a potential 2 years’ extension. The total value if the available extension is utilised is £907k.

11.2 This is an above threshold contract that falls within the Light Touch Regime (LTR) and is therefore covered by Schedule 3 of the Public Contracts Regulations 2015. An open process will be used, and a high-level timetable is included at Section 7.1 above.

11.3 The Council’s specific requirements for authorising proceeding to procurement are covered in Rules 1 and 5 of the Contract Procedure Rules with the need to obtain the formal Agreement of the Assistant Director Governance & Contracts, the Director of Corporate Services and the Director of Finance for a procurement of this value. In accordance with CPR 2.1.2, Officers must take all necessary professional advice.

11.4 In compliance with the Council’s Contract Procedure Rules (Rule 3.6.1), this procurement must be carried out using the Council’s e-procurement system.

11.5 The actions identified in this report are provided for within the Council’s Contract Procedure Rules, and the proposed actions can be completed in compliance with their content.

12. FINANCIAL CONSIDERATIONS

12.1 The estimated budget required for this service is £129,600, with a whole life value of £907k. There is sufficient budget within the service to manage this contract

12.2 As can be seen in the main body of the report there has been increases in demand for this service. As part of the budget setting process for 2023/24 the budget was increased to reflect these demand pressures.

13. PERSONNEL CONSIDERATIONS

13.1 There will be TUPE implications attached to this exercise

14. LEGAL CONSIDERATIONS

- 14.1 The Council has a statutory duty for the provision of vulnerable children and families and for the prevention of children entering into the Care System. This is generally echoed in the Public Services (Social Value) Act 2012 (taking into account the economic, social and environmental wellbeing in connection with Public Service Contracts) and in the 'Making Bromley Even Better Ambitions' Guidance as stated at clause 9.1 of the Report. In furtherance of this statutory duty, the Council has the legal power to enter into a Family Group Conference (FGC) Service Contract and may also provide and commission through the contract, the services outlined in this report.
- 14.2 This Report seeks approval for the tender regarding a new Family Group Conference Service. The Current Contract is held by Daybreak Family Group Conference Service following a competitive tender. The Proposed Contract period for the new Contract commences from 1st April 2024 and lasts till 31st March 2029 with the option to extend till 31st March 2031, resulting in a duration of 5 years with the option to extend for a further two years (i.e a 5 + 2-year Contract). An open process will be undertaken. The annual value of the Contract is £129.6k (i.e seven years in total with 5 + 2 years extension). The whole life cost of the extension to the Contract amounts to £907k.
- 14.3 This is a public services Contract within the meaning of the Public Contracts Regulations 2015 whereby the value of the Contract is above the relevant threshold and falls within the services outlined in Schedule 3 of the Public Contracts Regulations (PCR's) 2015 (i.e the light touch regime).
- 14.4 This Report also asks the Portfolio Holder for Children, Education and Families in agreement with the Chief Officer, Director of Corporate Services, Assistant Director of Governance and Contracts and the Director of Finance authorisation regarding the tender for the new FGC service. Under the Council's Contract Procedure Rules, the Councils requirement for Proceeding to Procurement is in accordance with CPR 1-5 where the agreement of the Budget Holder, Chief Officer, Assistant Director of Governance and Contracts, Director of Corporate Services, Director of Finance and the approval of the Portfolio Holder must be sought for a Contract of this value. In accordance with CPR 2.1.2, Officers must take all necessary professional advice.
- 14.5 In accordance with 3.6.1 of the Council's Contract Procedure Rules, all Officers are required to make use of the Council's eProcurement System when carrying out any Contracting activity which has an estimated value of £5,000 and above, unless otherwise agreed with the Head of Procurement.
- 14.6 The Contract can be awarded in accordance with the Council's Contract Procedure Rules and the Public Procurement Regulations 2015.

16.1 N/A Non-Applicable Headings:	Strategic Property Considerations; Ward Councilor Views
Background Documents: (Access via Contact Officer)	[Title of document and date]