

# COMMERCIAL STRATEGY APPROVAL

## CAPITAL CONSTRUCTION PROJECTS

### KEY FACTS

<b>Project title</b>	Fire Risk Assessment Works Batch 3 Extension (Batch 2 Works)	<b>Project value</b>	£146,500	<b>Client Portfolio</b>	PLACE	<b>Evaluation Criteria</b>	Price	100%	Quality	0%	E&S	0%
----------------------	--	----------------------	----------	-------------------------	-------	----------------------------	-------	------	---------	----	-----	----

<b>Purpose and scope of works</b>	<p>These Batch 2 works comprise Fire Alarm, Emergency Lighting, Fire Doors and Fire Barrier upgrades to 133 Stradbroke (day care centre), Adlington Road Community Centre and Collegiate Crescent.</p> <p>The works will ensure that the buildings are compliant with the Fire Safety Regulations and can continue in full operation.</p> <p>This is a component of the overall F.R.A programme of works to multiple sites. The works were originally approved to be procured through the CSSR Contract we hold with Kier Services. However, due to works being instructed late to Kier as a result of changing priorities of the F.R.A schemes, and incorporation of sites in the new Measured Term Contract, it is not possible for these works to be completed before the end of the financial year.</p> <p>Due to the relatively small scale and urgency of the works, it is recommended that the most efficient and effective route is for these works to be procured by way of an extension of the existing Batch (3) F.R.A contract with CHG Electrical, rather than approaching the market again and incurring further costs.</p>
-----------------------------------	---

### RECOMMENDATIONS AND APPROVALS

PROCUREMENT STRATEGY		CONTRACT AWARD	
<b>Recommendation:</b>	That the Director of Finance and Commercial Services or her nominated deputy extends the existing Fire Risk Assessment Works Batch 3 (Staniforth Road Depot) contract with CHG Electrical to add the Batch 2 works by way of a contract variation under Contracts Standing Order C.2.9.	<b>Recommendation:</b>	That the submitted price of £105,852.83 is accepted for these works, and that authority to issue a contract instruction adding these works to the existing Fire Risk Assessment Works Batch 3 (Staniforth Road Depot) contract is granted accordingly.

### PROJECT TEAM APPROVALS

	Who	Signature	Date	Signature	Date
<b>Cost Manager</b>	Paul Lynch	<i>Paul Lynch</i>	8 <sup>th</sup> February 2017	<i>Paul Lynch</i>	8 <sup>th</sup> February 2017
<b>Project Manager</b>	James Payton-Greene				
<b>Contract Manager</b>	James Payton-Greene				
<b>Client Lead</b>	Dave Capp				
<b>Technical Manager – C &amp; C M</b>	Richard Eccles	<i>Richard Eccles</i>	8 <sup>th</sup> February 2017	<i>Richard Eccles</i>	8 <sup>th</sup> February 2017
<b>Procurement Professional</b>	Phil Moorcroft	<i>Phil Moorcroft</i>	20 February 2017	<i>Phil Moorcroft</i>	20 February 2017
<b>Project Sponsor</b>	Nathan Rodgers	<i>pp Chris Johnson</i>	20 February 2017	<i>pp Chris Johnson</i>	20 February 2017
<b>Head of Capital Delivery Service</b>	Sean McClean	<i>Sean McClean</i>	20 February 2017	<i>Sean McClean</i>	20 February 2017
<b>Capital Programme Group</b>	Kerry Bollington	<i>Kerry Bollington</i>	20 February 2017	<i>Kerry Bollington</i>	20 February 2017
<b>Commercial Director</b>	Kerry Bollington	<i>Kerry Bollington</i>	18 April 2017	<i>Kerry Bollington</i>	18 April 2017

### COMMERCIAL SERVICES' APPROVAL DETAILS

<b>Commercial Approval No.</b>		<b>Original Commercial Approval (if extension)</b>		<b>CDS Project Reference</b>	RE04841
--------------------------------	--	--	--	------------------------------	---------



# PROCUREMENT STRATEGY APPROVAL

## SECTION A CAPITAL APPROVAL MILESTONES AND PROCUREMENT PROGRAMME

<b>A1</b>	<b>GATEWAY 1A (RELEVANT BOARD)</b> Initial Business Case	Name of Board: Name of Board: TFM Board Date of approval: 21st July 2015 Date of approval: 11 November 2016	<b>A2</b>	<b>GATEWAY 1B (CAPITAL PROGRAMME GROUP)</b> Initial Business Case	Date of approval: 27th July 2015
<b>A3</b>	<b>GATEWAY 2A (RELEVANT BOARD)</b> Outline Business Case	Name of Board: TFM Board Batch 2 approved: February 2015 Revised procurement route agreed February 2017	<b>A4</b>	<b>GATEWAY 2B (CAPITAL PROGRAMME GROUP)</b> Outline Business Case	Proposed date of approval: February 2015
<b>A5</b>	<b>CABINET OR LEADER DELEGATION</b>	Cabinet: Date of approval:	<b>A6</b>	<b>Issue advertisement to market / notify framework participants</b>	Date: Not Applicable
<b>A7</b>	<b>Return of PQQ (if applicable)</b>	Date: Not Applicable	<b>A8</b>	<b>Issue of tender documents</b>	Date: Not Applicable
<b>A9</b>	<b>Deadline for tender / mini-competition returns</b>	Date: Not Applicable	<b>A10</b>	<b>Evaluation of tender deadline</b>	Date: Not Applicable
<b>A11</b>	<b>GATEWAY 3A (RELEVANT BOARD)</b> Final Business Case	Name of Board: TFM Board Proposed date of approval: TBC (expected Feb 2017)	<b>A12</b>	<b>GATEWAY 3B (CAPITAL PROGRAMME GROUP)</b> Final Business Case and Contract Award Approval	Proposed date of approval: 20 <sup>th</sup> February 2017

## SECTION B BUDGET

<b>B1</b>	<b>TOTAL CAPITAL PROJECT BUDGET</b>	<b>B1a</b>	This must agree to the latest approved value – quote the Q-tier CAF version	£146,500.00	OEO Business Unit No.: Split between 3 BUs: 90155, 90156, 90157	
	The total project budget is the summation of B1b-B1f	<b>B1b</b>	<b>Construction cost</b> (estimated tender value excluding contingency) If this is a Design & Build contract, please state and provide full details	£105,852.83	Explanation: Based on the submitted price of CHG Electrical.	
		<b>B1c</b>	<b>Lotting structure</b> If this requirement is divided into lots, state the value of each lot and explain your approach	Lot 1: £ Lot 2: £ [etc]	Explanation: Not Applicable	
		<b>B1d</b>	<b>Fees</b> - please provide a breakdown of all fees (e.g. QSs, in-house design fees, external fees)		Explanation:	
			Capital Delivery Service fees	£19,500	As previously advised by the Capital Delivery Service (19.8% of the original estimate of £98,000). This fee was agreed at the time based on £98k construction and speaking to Chris Turner for a scheme of this value he says that the fee percentage isn't high. We've almost incurred all of this fee in design work.	
			Delivery Partner fees (Turner and Townsend) fees	£0.00	Although no fees may be specifically allocated to the Delivery Partner at this stage, CDS reserves the right to engage the Delivery Partner in accordance with its 'Core & Flex' model.	
			Commercial Services	£1,000	Fixed fee of £1k to cover all commercial / procurement costs	
			External fees (please state how the external consultant is to be procured or, if a waiver request, include full justification)	£0.00	Not Applicable	
			Other fees (please specify)	£0.00	Not Applicable	
			<b>B1e</b>	<b>Client costs capital</b> - any client side costs that are recharged directly to this project	£9,647.17	Explanation: Any asbestos removal will involve the appointment of a licenced external contractor. A term contract for Asbestos Project Management is now in place and is being managed by CDS (James Payton-Greene). This will be utilised if required to manage any removal or abatement works.
		<b>B1f</b>	<b>Contingency</b>	£10,500.00	10%	Explanation: An allowance of 10% has been included, above the price submitted by the Contractor, to allow for unforeseen costs and general risks.
<b>B2</b>	<b>REVENUE COST IMPLICATIONS</b>	Not Applicable				

<b>B3</b>	<b>EXTERNAL FUNDING (E.G. GRANTS / ERDF)</b> Please specify grant, value and how key grant conditions will be complied with	Not Applicable (no external funding)
-----------	---	--------------------------------------

**SECTION C OUR COMMERCIAL STRATEGY**

<b>C1</b>	<b>PROPOSED TENDER ROUTE</b>	<b>Justification for proposed tender route / explanation why other options discounted</b>						
	<b>Framework contract</b> (e.g. YORhub / EN Procure / Scape – please specify)	No	Low value scheme which will attract limited interest from framework participants.			Framework access fee	N/A	
	<b>Full competitive tender process</b> (please specify procedure to be used)	No	<p>This was considered, but it was decided that the Kier CSSR contract would be a more appropriate route at the time due to the value and nature of the site works. At the time these schemes were considered to be a high priority, but in the context of the wider F.RA. programme of works currently being undertaken by CDS on behalf of T&amp;FM, other sites became more urgent and were tendered and awarded as Batches 1 and 3.</p> <p>The large Measured Term Contract which is currently in place didn't include 133 Stradbroke (day care centre), Adlington Road Community Centre and Collegiate Crescent, but they remain a high priority and the condition of all three sites has continued to deteriorate. With this in mind, and given that value for money can be demonstrated by comparing the CHG quotation to the Kier rates, the quickest and most cost effective route to carrying out the works is to award this contract to CHG as detailed below.</p> <p>CHG Electrical are a local Sheffield company who have recently completed Batch 3 Staniforth Road FRA works and have performed well.</p>					
	<b>In-house provider</b> (please confirm they have been asked to price first)	No						
	<b>Existing contract</b> (please confirm it can be varied to deliver this project)	Yes	<p>It is recommended that the works are issued as an extension to the existing Fire Risk Assessment Works Batch 3- Staniforth Road Depot contract. The existing Contract will allow the works to be added to the scheme as a contract variation. This will increase the overall value of this contract from £ 276,579.71 to £ 382,432.54 . The original contract was competitively tendered on the open market on a work schedules basis And these rates have transposed between batch 3 and batch 2. ) and the contractor has agreed to stand by these rates, which were originally tendered in XXX. We have conducted a VFM check and are of the view that best VFM for the Council can be obtained by extending the current batch 3 contract, as the rates have already been competitively tendered and this will save on CDS fees</p> <p>The original procurement strategy (approved November 2015) approved the negotiation of this phase with Kier Services through the CSSR contract, due to the relatively low value of works and commercial interest in the open market for this type of scheme. However, this contract is now in the process of closing and the works can no longer be procured through this route. The current CSSR contract comes to an end at the end of March 2017, and Kier stopped taking orders early in January 2017.</p> <p>We did consider putting these works through the Measured Term Contract (MTC). The schemes within the MTC have been designed and specified in a different way including a brand new NBS specification. In order to allow these sites to be inserted into the MTC contract (and be compatible and consistent from a pricing and site works point of view), some re-design work would have been required which would have incurred further design fees. The MTC also has a pre-determined priority list with design, pricing and lead in times which have already been agreed for the first group of sites. Incorporating these sites would delay them getting to site for another 5-6 months.</p>					
	<b>Single source tender</b> (please provide your evidence for this)	No						
	<b>Waiver of Council Standing Orders</b> (please provide full justification)	No						
	<b>Other options considered</b> (please provide details)	No						
	<b>Who are our potential contractors and how will we maximise responses?</b>	Not Applicable						
	<b>Above or below OJEU threshold?</b>	Below						
<b>C2</b>	<b>PROPOSED PROCUREMENT ROUTE</b> Please state proposed procurement route e.g. design and build, together with commercial reasons for this choice	The works will be procured through a traditional route, with the design provided by the client's representatives. A variation will be instructed to the existing Fire Risk Assessment Works Batch 3- Staniforth Road Depot contract.						
<b>C3</b>	<b>PROPOSED FORM OF CONTRACT</b> Please provide the proposed form of contract e.g. JCT / NEC with(out) quantities, Option A, B, C - together with an explanation of our commercial reasons for this choice	The form of contract will be the JCT Standard Form of Contract 2011 Without Quantities- Work Schedules.						
<b>C4</b>	<b>PROPOSED FORM OF PQQ</b> (if applicable)	The use of the standard Crown Commercial Services or PAS91 PQQs is preferred by the Government's Crown Commercial Service and we must therefore demonstrate that we have considered which form of PQQ is most appropriate. We must also justify whether all or any additional questions are required.						
		<b>Reasons for using or not using each proposed document, or</b>			<b>Additional project-specific questions (please list here)</b>			
	<b>Crown Commercial Services</b>	No	Not Applicable					
	<b>PAS91</b>	No	Not Applicable					
	<b>SCC Works suitability assessment (contracts &lt; £164k)</b>	No	Not Applicable					
	<b>SCC Works short form (contracts &lt; £500k)</b>	No	Not Applicable					
	<b>SCC Works long form (contracts &gt; £500k)</b>	No	Not Applicable					
	Additional standard question modules for long form req'd? (please tick ✓)	<b>References</b>	N/A	<b>Employment &amp; skills</b>	N/A	<b>CDM Design</b>	N/A	

C5	TENDER EVALUATION CRITERIA	Price /100	100%	Quality /100	0%	Employment & skills /100	0%			
C6	TENDER QUALITY QUESTIONS									
	Please list your proposed tender quality questions / subjects here		Not Applicable.							
C7	KEY PROCUREMENT / BUDGETARY / COMMERCIAL RISKS									
	Risk	Mitigation		Risk	Mitigation					
C7a	The works will not be delivered on time or to budget.	Good project management processes should mitigate this risk		C7b						
C7c				C7d						
C8	OTHER CONTRACTS RELATING TO THE SAME SCHEME (e.g. professional services) Please add rows as required									
C8a	Contract subject	Asbestos project management	Value	c.£10k	Procurement route	Existing SCC contract	Form of contract	JCT Measured Term	Date of approval	LoA issued 15/12/16.

## SECTION D PROJECT IMPACT AND IMPLICATIONS

D1	TUPE									
	is this a Measured Term Contract?	No	If 'No', Cost Manager to include the non-TUPE wording instead.							
D2	EMPLOYMENT AND SKILLS BENCHMARKS									
	Please liaise with Lifelong Learning and Skills to ascertain benchmark requirements for all contracts over £164k. These should be approved by Lifelong Learning and Skills, the client and procurement professional. If using a framework procurement route – irrespective of value - please notify Futureworks and the relevant Framework Manager (as the framework may wish to require outputs for contracts below £164k).									
D2a	Work experience (14-16 years)	N/A	D2b	Work experience (16+ years)	N/A	D2c	School workshops / site visits	N/A		
D2d	Internships	N/A	D2f	Employment	N/A	D2g	Apprenticeships (project initiated)	N/A		
D2h	Trainees (project initiated L4 and higher level skills)	N/A	D2i	Graduates	N/A	D2j	Other trainees	N/A		
D2k	Apprenticeships (existing)	N/A								
	If no or only voluntary outputs are to be delivered, please state why and the date this was approved by Lifelong Learning and Skills					The value of the works is below £164k and therefore E&S targets will not apply.				
D3	HEALTH AND SAFETY - CONSTRUCTION (DESIGN AND MANAGEMENT) REGULATIONS 2015									
	Principal Designer (insert name)	CDS	Notification to Health and Safety Executive required? (i.e. over 30 days construction period PLUS >20 workers on site or 500 person days)						Yes	
D4	HIGHWAYS IMPLICATIONS									
	Will this project have any impacts on the highway? (N.B. this includes entrances to developments, landscaping works etc. – not just highways schemes)									No
	If 'yes', Cost Manager must ensure that the scheme is notified to SCC's New Works Team at <a href="mailto:NewWorks@sheffield.gov.uk">NewWorks@sheffield.gov.uk</a> so provisions such as highways inspections, commuted sums and other fees (such as Road Safety Audits – set out at C1d) are considered.									
D5	STEEL IMPLICATIONS									
	Is this project likely to have a requirement for steel exceeding c.£100k in value?	No	If 'yes', Commercial Services to update the Sheffield City Council Steel Forward Pipeline on the internet.							
D6	KEY PERFORMANCE INDICATORS									
	What project KPIs are we using?	Standard SCC KPI's are included in the Fire Risk Assessment Works Batch 3- Staniforth Road Depot contract, which these works are to be added to as an extension.								

## SECTION E INSURABLE RISKS

E1	INSURABLE RISKS									
	Please select the Insurable Risks that are relevant to this contract									
E1a	Employee risk (relevant except for sole traders)	Employers' liability	Yes	E1b	Non-delegable duty of care risk	Public liability	No			
E1c	Physical injury risk to client employees	Public liability	Yes	E1d	Physical injury risk to service users (delegable)	Public liability	Yes			

<b>E1e</b>	<b>Physical injury risk to other members of the public</b>	<b>Public liability</b>	Yes	<b>E1f</b>	<b>Material damage risk to client employees / organisation</b>	<b>Public liability</b>	Yes
<b>E1g</b>	<b>Material damage risk to service users</b>	<b>Public liability</b>	Yes	<b>E1h</b>	<b>Material damage risk to other members of the public</b>	<b>Public liability</b>	Yes
<b>E1i</b>	<b>Misuse or mismanagement of personal data risk to client organisation</b>	<b>Public liability</b>	No	<b>E1j</b>	<b>Misuse or mismanagement of personal data risk to service users</b>	<b>Public liability</b>	No
<b>E1k</b>	<b>Misuse or mismanagement (infringement) of intellectual property risk</b>	<b>Public liability</b>	No	<b>E1l</b>	<b>Financial loss risk to client from professional services</b> (consultants, architects)	<b>Professional indemnity</b>	No
<b>E1m</b>	<b>Medical or clinical negligence risk</b>	<b>Medical / clin. negligence</b>	No				

**E2 INDEMNITY LEVELS**

Please provide the indemnity levels selected for each relevant type of insurance identified

	<b>Insurance type</b>	<b>Indemnity level (£)</b>	<b>Each &amp; Every (E) or In the Aggregate (A)</b>		<b>Insurance type</b>	<b>Indemnity level (£)</b>	<b>Each &amp; Every (E) or In the Aggregate (A)</b>
<b>E2a</b>	<b>Employers' liability</b>	10,000,000	E	<b>E2c</b>	<b>Professional indemnity</b>	Not Applicable	Not Applicable
<b>E2b</b>	<b>Public liability</b>	5,000,000	E	<b>E2d</b>	<b>Medical or clinical negligence</b>	Not Applicable	Not Applicable

## CONTRACT AWARD APPROVAL

### SECTION F EXCEPTION REPORTING

<b>F1</b>	<b>Exception reporting from Procurement Strategy</b>	Not Applicable
-----------	--	----------------

### SECTION G TENDER EVALUATION AND AWARD RECOMMENDATION

<b>G1</b>	<b>TENDER DETAILS – received and adjusted</b> (please add rows as required). If using an in-house provider or have only engaged a single provider, please insert the price agreed. If a tenderer withdrew or did not return, please state in 'Comments' column							
	<b>Tenderer</b>	<b>Original submitted price</b>	<b>Amended final price</b> (if applicable)	<b>Price score</b> (if applicable)	<b>Quality Score</b> (if applicable)	<b>Total score</b> (price+ quality)	<b>Rank</b>	<b>Comments</b>
<b>G1a</b>	CHG Electrical	£105,852.83	Not Applicable	Not Applicable	Not Applicable	Not Applicable	N/A	As the price has been negotiated as an extension to an existing contract, only 1 price has been received, excluding the price previously received from Kier services (see G3), which can no longer be accepted.
<b>G2</b>	<b>ARITHMETICAL CHECK</b>			<b>G3</b>	<b>TECHNICAL CHECK</b>			
	An arithmetical check of the CHG Electrical price has been carried out and no errors were identified.				The submitted CHG Electrical price of £105,852.83 is £4,459.04 above the price of £101,393.79 submitted by Kier Services when the works were intended to be issued as an order under the CSSR contract, however this is no longer possible as this contract is ending. The difference between the prices is 4.2%, which is considered a reasonable margin and substantiates the price level submitted by CHG Electrical. In addition, the KierServices price was subject to market testing as part of the CSSR contract conditions, to ensure it represented value for money.			
<b>G4</b>	<b>TENDER QUALIFICATIONS AND CLARIFICATIONS</b>			<b>G5</b>	<b>ADDENDA ISSUED DURING THE TENDER PERIOD</b>			
	Not applicable				Not Applicable			
<b>G6</b>	<b>PRELIMINARIES</b>			<b>G7</b>	<b>PROVISIONAL SUMS and DAYWORKS</b>			
	The preliminary cost within the price of CHG Electrical is £14,420 or 13.62% of the overall price, which is considered reasonable.				Not Applicable			
<b>G8</b>	<b>CONTINGENCIES (outside contract sum)</b>			<b>G9</b>	<b>BOND / ULTIMATE HOLDING COMPANY GUARANTEE</b> Please state if requiring and reasons for this decision			
	£10,500 is recommended as a contingency (10%)				A bond has been taken out for the existing Fire Risk Assessment Works Batch 3- Staniforth Road Depot contract. The works will be added to this contract as an extension and if the Contractor fails to perform, the bond will pay an amount equal to 10% of the original contract sum, which is considered sufficient for this extension.			
<b>G10</b>	<b>QUALITATIVE ASSESSMENT QUESTIONS</b>			<b>G11</b>	<b>ASSESSMENT CRITERIA</b>			
	Not applicable				Not Applicable			
<b>G12</b>	<b>FINANCIAL STANDING OF PREFERRED TENDERER</b> (do not complete if using an in-house provider)							

<b>Tenderer:</b>	Not Applicable	<b>Recommendation:</b>	Based on the information analysed, this company is medium risk, proceed with contract monitoring. A Guarantee Bond has been taken out with the Contractor (see G9 above).				<b>Date of approval:</b>	17 <sup>th</sup> December 2015
<b>H1 ACTUAL TOTAL PROJECT COSTS</b> (see definitions at section C of the Procurement Strategy above)								
		<b>Procurement Strategy</b>	<b>Contract Award</b>	<b>Reasons for any differences</b>				
<b>H1a</b>	<b>Total project budget</b>	146,500.00	146,500.00					
<b>H1b</b>	<b>Construction cost</b>	98,000	105,852.83					
<b>H1c</b>	<b>Fees</b>	20,500.00	20,500.00					
<b>H1d</b>	<b>Client costs capital</b>	9,647.17	9,647.17					
<b>H1e</b>	<b>Allowances for contingency</b>	10,500.00	10,500.00					
<b>H1f</b>	<b>Revenue cost implications</b>	N/A	N/A					
<b>H1g</b>	<b>Estimated contract value for each contract</b> (see section D8 above)	N/A	N/A					
<b>H2 COMPARISON WITH PRE-TENDER ESTIMATE</b> including reasons for differences								
Not Applicable (No pre tender estimate carried out)								
<b>H3 RECONCILIATION TO BUDGET</b>								
Is the tender price greater than:								
<b>H3a</b>	<b>Total project budget</b> (see C1a above)	No	<b>H3b</b>	<b>Construction cost</b> (see B1b above)	No	<b>H3c</b>	<b>Approved Q-tier / CAF</b> (if different to C1a above)	No
<b>H3d</b>	<b>If so, how will you reconcile this?</b> This could include altering scope or using contingency monies. If scope change, does it still fall within OJEU notice (if applicable) and is it covered by previous delegated authority?							
Not applicable								
<b>H4 ESTIMATED CASH FLOW</b>								
<b>H4a</b>	<b>Date of contract start</b>	TBC (Est March 2017)	<b>H4b</b>	<b>Date of contract end</b>	TBC (Est July 2017)	<b>H4c</b>	<b>End dates of any contract extensions</b>	The existing contract completion date will be extended to allow a reasonable period to complete these additional works. The estimated dates shown in H4a and H4b assume a 4 month duration and refer to the works covered under this Commercial Strategy Approval Form only.
<b>ANTICIPATED CASH FLOW PROFILE</b>								
		<b>2016/17 £</b>	<b>2017/18 £</b>	<b>2018/19 £</b>	<b>2019 / 20 £</b>	<b>2020 / 21 £</b>	<b>Total £</b>	
<b>H4d</b>	<b>Contract delivery</b>	0.00	104,300.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	104,300.00	
<b>H4e</b>	<b>Retention</b>	0.00	0.00	1,552.83	0.00	0.00	1,552.83	
<b>H4f</b>	<b>Total</b>	0.00	104,300.00	1,552.83	0.00	0.00	105,852.83	
<b>H5 ACTUAL CONTRACT SAVINGS</b>								
Summation of actual contract construction cost at contract award stage, versus anticipated costs at procurement strategy stage (annual breakdown of figures provided at H1b above)								
		<b>2016/17 £</b>	<b>2017 / 18 £</b>	<b>2018 / 19 £</b>	<b>2019 / 20 £</b>	<b>2020 / 21 £</b>	<b>Total £</b>	
<b>Savings</b>		0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	
<b>H6 DETAILS OF ANY OTHER SAVINGS OR BENEFITS</b>								

Not applicable										
<b>I1</b>	<b>EMPLOYMENT AND SKILLS OUTPUTS</b>									
	<b>I1a</b>	<b>Work experience (14-16 years)</b>	N/A	<b>I1b</b>	<b>Work experience (16+ years)</b>	N/A	<b>I1c</b>	<b>School workshops / site visits</b>	<b>N/A</b>	
	<b>I1d</b>	<b>Internships</b>	N/A	<b>I1f</b>	<b>Employment</b>	N/A	<b>I1g</b>	<b>Apprenticeships (project initiated)</b>	<b>N/A</b>	
	<b>I1h</b>	<b>Trainees (project initiated L4 and higher level skills)</b>	N/A	<b>I1i</b>	<b>Graduates</b>	N/A	<b>I1j</b>	<b>Other trainees</b>	<b>N/A</b>	
	<b>I1k</b>	<b>Apprenticeships (existing)</b>	N/A							
	<b>If these differ from the benchmarks set in the Procurement Strategy, please state why here</b>						Not applicable			
<b>I2</b>	<b>Are there any TUPE implications which have not previously been identified or addressed?</b> If yes, how are these now being addressed?									No
	Not applicable									
<b>I3</b>	<b>Are there any legal implications which have not previously been identified or addressed?</b> If yes, how are these now being addressed?									No
	No									
<b>I4</b>	<b>Are there any lessons learned to inform future procurement strategies?</b>									
	No Change of priorities as described previously. Lessons learnt around fixing site list and budget for large programmes of work and Measured Term Contracts.									