

<b>Item No.</b>	<b>Classification:</b> Open	<b>Date:</b> 23 September 2020	<b>Meeting Name:</b> Strategic Director of Housing and Modernisation
<b>Report title:</b>		<b>Gateway 2 - Contract Award Approval</b> Asbestos Removal Works Contracts (Contract A and Contract B)	
<b>Ward(s) or groups affected:</b>		All	
<b>From:</b>		Director of Asset Management	

## RECOMMENDATIONS

That the Strategic Director for Housing and Modernisation;

1. Approves the award of Contract A - Asbestos Removal Works to Ductclean (UK) Limited (Ductclean) for the estimated sum of £1.1m per annum for a period of 4 years from 15 December 2020 with the option to extend by a further 2 year period in yearly increments, making a total estimated value of £6.6m.
2. Approves the award of Contract B - Asbestos Removal Works to Franklyn Shaw Associates Limited (Franklyn Shaw) for the estimated sum of £1.1m per annum for a period of 4 years from 15 December 2020 with the option to extend by a further 2 year period in yearly increments, making a total estimated value of £6.6m.
3. Notes that Ductclean and Franklyn Shaw will act as back up contractor to each other on each of their own tendered rates when required.

## BACKGROUND INFORMATION

4. The planned procurement strategy was the subject of a Gateway 1 report approved by the Cabinet Member for Housing Management and Modernisation on 18 March 2019. The approved EU restricted procedure procurement strategy was followed.
5. The scope of works for these two contracts are:
  - asbestos removal;
  - encapsulation of existing asbestos materials;
  - associated minor repairs and reinstatement works;
  - emergency response and out of hours service for making safe and disposing of asbestos; and
  - scaffolding mobile towers and all work platforms required to facilitate the works.
6. These contracts are based on a geographical split (north and south) of the borough (Contract A – north – Walworth, Borough and Bankside, Bermondsey and Rotherhithe and Contract B – south – Camberwell, Peckham, Nunhead and Peckham Rye, Dulwich each providing all of the works noted at paragraph 5 above.
7. The total estimated value for the contracts stands at £13.2 million, broken down as follows: - total cost for the initial four year period: £8.8m - total cost for the additional two year period: £4.4m.
8. The schedule of rates (SORs) are fixed for the duration of these contracts and are not subject to an annual increase.

## Procurement project plan (Key Decision)

9.

Activity	Completed by/Complete by:
Forward Plan for Gateway 2 decision	09/04/2020
Briefed relevant cabinet member (over £100k)	11/03/2019
Approval of Gateway 1: Procurement Strategy Report	18/03/2019
Issue Notice of Intention (Applies to Housing Section 20 Leaseholder Consultation)	26/03/2019
Invitation to tender	10/01/2020
Closing date for return of tenders	12/02/2020
Completion of evaluation of tenders	27/03/2020
Issue Notice of Proposal (Applies to Housing Section 20 Leaseholder Consultation)	20/05/2020
DCRB Review Gateway 2:	03/08/2020
Notification of forthcoming decision – Five clear working days	27/08/2020
Approval of Gateway 2: Contract Award Report	07/09/2020
Scrutiny Call-in period and notification of implementation of Gateway 2 decision	14/09/2020
Debrief Notice and Standstill Period (if applicable)	25/09/2020
Contract award	28/09/2020
Add to Contract Register	28/09/2020
Publication of award notice in Official Journal of European (OJEU)	12/10/2020
Publication of award notice on Contracts Finder	15/10/2020
TUPE Consultation period ends	14/12/2020
Contract start	15/12/2020
Contract completion date	14/12/2024
Contract completion date – if extension(s) exercised	14/12/2026

## **KEY ISSUES FOR CONSIDERATION**

### **Description of procurement outcomes**

10. This procurement exercise was delivered to ensure two contracts are in place for asbestos removal and encapsulation so the council can meet its legislative obligations as a social landlord. The provision of these works is considered to be essential to the health, safety and quality of life of council residents and employees.

### **Covid-19 Implications**

11. The standard operating procedures for asbestos removal exceed those for Covid-19 in terms of health and safety. The wearing of full Personal Protective Equipment, exclusion of residents, and members of the public from the working area and full risk assessments are standard in the industry to prevent exposure to asbestos.

12. It is essential that these contracts are in place to ensure asbestos is removed or encapsulated when void properties are refurbished to reduce the impact on homelessness.

### **Key/Non Key decisions**

13. This report deals with a key decision.

### **Policy implications**

14. These works provided through these contracts will ensure that the council ensures its conformance with Control of Asbestos Regulations (2012) and will contribute to the council's objectives as outlined in the Fairer Future Commitments, specifically:

- Theme 1: A place to call home
- Theme 2: A place to belong
- Theme 3: A greener borough
- Theme 4: A full employment borough
- Theme 7: A safer community

### **Tender process**

15. Following the placement of the OJEU advertisement on 3 September 2019, the PAS91 Pre-Qualification Questionnaire (PQQ) documents and the Invitation to Tender (ITT) were uploaded to the council's portal system (Pro-Contract 3) and Contracts Finder website for tenderers to view and download.

16. The PQQ contained the following criteria:

- Section C1 – Supplier identity, key roles and contact information (information Only)
- Section C2 – Financial Information (Pass/Fail)
- Section C3 Mandatory Exclusion (Pass/Fail)
- Section C3 Discretionary Exclusion (Pass/Fail)
- Section C4 – Health and Safety Policy and Capability (Pass/Fail)

- Section O1 – Equal Opportunity and Diversity Policy and Capability (Pass/Fail)
  - Section O2 – Environmental Management Policy and Capability (Pass/Fail)
  - Section O3 – Quality Management Policy and Capability (Pass/Fail)
  - Table 13 – Supplementary/Additional questions including in respect of organizational technical and/or professional capability.
  - Section S1 - Technical and Professional Capability contained 12 questions, 6 of which were technical questions and an additional 6 quality questions to designed to ensure applicants met the council's requirements and were fully evaluated.
17. The PQQ response deadline was originally 1 October 2019. However, during compliance checks it was noted that bidders had misinterpreted a reference in the tender documents. In order to allow extra time for bidders to review their submissions and submit amendments the deadline was extended by 17 days to 18 October 2019.
18. A total of 25 companies returned completed PQQ submissions by the revised deadline of 5pm on 18 October 2019.
19. The PQQ set out that the top five highest ranked applicants would be invited to tender but reserved the right to invite further applicants should they obtain a score that was within 2 marks of the fifth ranked applicant's score. The sixth ranked applicant did not achieve a score within 2% of the fifth ranked applicant.
20. The PQQs were evaluated by asset management asbestos and procurement team officers.
21. The top five applicants were invited to tender. These are detailed below:
- Ductclean (UK) Ltd;
  - Franklyn Shaw Associates Ltd;
  - Erith Contractors Ltd;
  - Cablesheer (Asbestos) Ltd; and
  - Keltbray Ltd
22. The shortlisted companies were invited to tender on 10 January 2020 with the instruction to return a completed tender by 12 February 2020.
23. All five tenders were returned via Pro-Contract 3 on or by 1pm on 12 February 2020 and were electronically opened on 13 February 2020 by the monitoring officer's authorised representative in accordance with contract standing orders (CSO) 7.2.5 in the presence of engineering and compliance officers. These were then checked for compliance

### **Tender evaluation**

24. The Tender Evaluation Panel (TEP) consisted of council officers from asset management.
25. The price submissions were evaluated by asset management's quantity surveyors. The quality submissions were evaluated by asset management's asbestos team's officers.
26. Tenders were evaluated on the basis of M.E.A.T (most economically advantageous tender) using a weighted model of 60:40 price and quality.

27. All tenders were initially checked for completeness and compliance with the ITT documents as set out in the Tender Evaluation Methodology (TEM) and to ensure that the tenderer was the same company shortlisted at PQQ stage. All tender submissions received were compliant and released for evaluation by the TEP.
28. Tenders were evaluated using a price evaluation model that contained various annexes covering the different work streams and hourly rates. This tendering approach was intended to preclude tactical tendering of any work streams and reduce the risk of uncontrolled expenditure.
29. Each work stream annexe contained a pre-priced schedule of rates and estimated indicative quantities for each schedule, based on previous historical data and the tenderers were required to put either a +/-% against each annexe, including their hourly rate.
30. Price evaluation was marked out of 60 points composed of 35 points for the lowest lump sum price and 25 points awarded on the basis of closest proximity to the mean average price of all compliant lump sum tenders.
31. As a measured term contract is proposed, the figures and quantities used in the price evaluation were indicative only, to enable an evaluation of the relative prices of the tenders. Final spend will be demand led in accordance with the available budget. Each tendered price was scored against Best (Lowest) Price and Proximity to the Mean Average Price of all tendered prices. Tender prices submitted and the respective scores are as follows:

Position	Contractor	Tender Sum (£*)	Best Price % Score 35 Points available	Mean Avg Price % Score 25 Points available	Combined Total Price Score
1	Erith Contractors Ltd (Erith)	592,689.51	35	24.35	59.35
2	Franklyn Shaw Associates Ltd (FSA)	596,215.48	34.79	24.45	59.25
3	Ductclean (UK) Ltd (Ductclean)	613,723.73	33.80	25	58.80
4	Keltbray Ltd (Keltbray)	791,162.71	26.22	24.80	51.02
5	Cablesheer (Asbestos) Ltd (Cablesheer)	902,331.21	22.99	21.74	44.73

\*Note tender sum figures are for evaluation purposes only

32. All priced documents submitted were checked for arithmetical errors and qualifications.
33. The quality assessment was based on the information received from tenderers in response to method statements covering resources for mobilisation, occupier and property care, asbestos removal scenario, quality control and compliance and the London Living Wage (LLW).

34. Each member of the TEP independently assessed each method statement response in accordance with the scoring guidelines detailed in the Tender Evaluation Methodology. The TEP then checked the scoring for consistency and agreed a consensus score. Final scores were calculated to ascertain the tenderer's overall score.

35. A Summary of results from the quality evaluation is shown in the table below;

ITT Quality Score Summary 0~5 Scores	Resources - Method Statement 1 Page Limit: Four (4)		Occupier and Property Care - Method Statement 2 Page Limit: Five (5)			Asbestos Removal Scenario - Method Statement 3 Page Limit: Ten (10)			Quality and Compliance - Method Statement 4 Page Limit: Eight (8)		London Living Wage (LLW) - Method Statement 5 Page Limit: Two (2)		
	A. Resources for Mobilisation	B. Information Technology and Communication	A. Prior to Works Commencing	B. During the Works	C. On Completion of the Works	A. Planning and Prioritising	B. Carrying out the Works Safely i ii iii			A. Quality and Compliance During the Works	B. Compliance on Completion of the Works	A. Administer and Monitor	B. Identification of Productivity Gains
Ductclean (UK) Ltd	4	3	4	3	4	4	3	4	3	4	3	3	4
Franklyn Shaw Associates Ltd	3	3	4	4	3	4	4	4	3	3	3	3	3
Erith Contractors Ltd	3	3	2	3	2	2	2	3	1	3	3	2	3
Cablesheer (Asbestos) Ltd	3	4	3	2	4	4	2	2	2	3	3	2	3
Keltbray Ltd	2	1	1	1	1	2	1	1	1	1	1	1	2

36. Tenderers were required to submit a method statement proposal answering the questions contained within the Quality Submission Schedule attached. This method statement will be incorporated into the contract as the Contractor's planned way of working/operating throughout the contract period.

37. All submissions were scored against the same criteria / sub criteria and sub-weightings as set out in this schedule.

38. The TEM included the requirement that for method statements two (2), four (4) and five (5) a tenderer must score 2 (satisfactory) for each of the sub-criterion otherwise it may be rejected. As is shown above Keltbray Ltd did not meet the stated minimum threshold scores for method statements 2 and 4 and as they would not be shortlisted as one of the two highest scoring tenderers, it was decided not to exclude them on this basis.

39. The 0-5 scores shown above resulted in the weighted scores shown below

Tenderer	MS1: Resources	MS2: Occupier & Property Care	MS3: Asbestos Removal Scenario	MS4: Quality & Compliance	MS5: LLW	Total
	Max Score of 7	Max Score of 8	Max Score of 15	Max Score of 8	Max Score of 2	
Ductclean	5	5.8	10.4	5.8	1.4	28.4
FSA	4.2	6	11.2	4.8	1.2	27.4
Cablesheer	4.8	4.6	7.2	4.8	1	22.4
Erith	4.2	3.8	6	4.8	1	19.8
Keltbray	2.2	1.6	3.6	1.6	0.6	9.6

40. The table below shows the tenderers combined price and quality scores and identifies the two successful tenderers for Contract A and B respectively.

Tenderer	Combined Price Score 60%	Quality Score 40%	Total Score	Position
Ductclean (UK) Ltd	58.80	28.40	87.20	1
Franklyn Shaw Associates Ltd	59.25	27.40	86.65	2
Erith Contractors Ltd	59.35	19.80	79.15	3
Cablesheer (Asbestos) Ltd	44.73	22.40	67.13	4
Keltbray Ltd	51.02	9.60	60.62	5

#### Plans for the transition from the old to the new contract

41. There is no mobilisation period required for these two contracts as they are being awarded to the incumbent providers.

42. As the contractors are changing the geographical areas they currently cover, the planned mobilisation period will be utilised to review policies and practices for service delivery moving forward for life time of the contracts.

**Plans for monitoring and management of the contract**

43. Contracts A and B will managed by the asset management team.

44. The purpose of the Key Performance Indicators (KPIs) is to maximise, through measurable continuous improvement, the service provided to the council's residents and to provide best value to the council.

45. Performance against all of the KPIs, which are identified in the table below, shall be ascertained and monitored on a monthly basis at the Contract progress meetings from the commencement of the contracts.

<b>NO</b>	<b>Key Performance Indicator</b>	<b>Minimum Target Percentage %</b>	<b>Council's Aspirational Target Objective %</b>
1.	Right first time	95%	95%
2.	Percentage of Priority Code 0 and 4 Orders completed within the stipulated time periods.	95%	98%
3.	Percentage of Orders for which a Recall Notice (Default Notice) has not been issued within the calendar month	98%	99%
4.	Percentage of Planned Works completed on time.	95%	98%

46. The actual basis of calculation of KPI percentages shall be agreed by the Contract Administrator prior to any additional KPIs being implemented

47. As part of the annual performance review, the commercial team will carry out an annual check to ensure;

- compliance with the provisions of the Equalities Legislation;
- compliance with the Employment Relations Act 1999 (Blacklists) Regulations 2010;
- contractors continue to hold asbestos professional accreditation;
- compliance with LLW; and
- financial stability of contractors;

48. Quarterly checks to be carried out to ensure both Ductlean (UK) Ltd and Franklyn Shaw Associates Ltd continue to hold asbestos professional accreditation through the life of the contract.

49. LLW compliance reviewed at Annual Performance Review (APR) and office audits of contractors to be done to confirm compliance.

50. Monthly evaluations of payments to be carried out on both contracts. The contractors will schedule the required work and pre-work check. The asbestos

compliance manager will verify the work required and will authorise the work order. The contractors will then close out the works order and a quantity surveyor will verify the SORs applied on the works order are correct.

51. Annual financial checks will be carried out on Ductclean (UK) Ltd and Franklyn Shaw Associates Ltd via Bureau van Dijk (BvD).

**Identified risks for the new contract**

52. The table identifies the specific risks associated with this contract, the likelihood of occurrence and the controls in place to mitigate the risk:

R/N	Risk	Likelihood	Risk Control
R1	One or both of the contractors ceases trading, or goes into liquidation / administration	Low	<p>The contracts contain the provision for both contractors to act as back-up to each other.</p> <p>If both cease trading, the Approved List of contractors will be used whilst re-procuring the contract should this occur.</p> <p>The financial stability of the organisation will be continuously monitored throughout the contract through the contract management process. Fame credit checks were carried out as part of tendering process and will be carried out again annually as part of the contract management monitoring process.</p> <p>Retentions will be held on all interim payments to mitigate against the risks involved of company failure.</p> <p>A Parent Company Guarantee will not be taken up from Ductclean (UK) Ltd or Franklyn Shaw Associates Ltd as they do not have an ultimate holding company.</p>
R2	One or both of the contractors is unable to fulfil the requirements of the contract e.g. poor performance, leading to the need to terminate the contract.	Low	<p>The council will use back up arrangements within the contract.</p> <p>If both contractors fail, the Approved List of contractors will be used whilst re-procuring the contracts should this occur.</p> <p>The tender selection process reduces the likelihood of poor performance through the use of method statements to evaluate tenderers capacity to deliver.</p>
R3	One or both of the contractors is unable to	Low	Implementation of a standard way of working and use of PPE to ensure

	deliver the contract due to effects of Covid-19		that social distancing is enforced.
--	---	--	-------------------------------------

### **Community impact statement**

53. The two contracts will operate borough wide and will involve works to all council residential properties, communal areas and operational buildings including offices, shops, industrial units, park buildings and schools. These contracts will ensure that asbestos removal works are undertaken to current legislative requirements and all appropriate notifications are issued.
54. Both contracts will be of a medium to high impact to tenants, leaseholders and other stakeholders as any removal works will mean their exclusion from the areas affected until air monitoring has been completed and is satisfactory.
55. The removal of asbestos containing materials and replacement with fire integrity products will provide residents, leaseholders and building users with a safe property.

### **Social Value considerations**

56. The Public Services (Social Value) Act 2012 requires that the council considers, before commencing a procurement process, how wider social, economic and environmental benefits that may improve the well being of the local area can be secured. The social value considerations included in the tender (as outlined in the Gateway 1 report) are set out in the following paragraphs in relation to the tender responses, evaluation and commitments to be delivered under the proposed contract.

### **Economic considerations**

57. The full cost to the council and the life span of these contracts is set out in the paragraph 1 and 2 of this report.
58. Both Ductclean (UK) Ltd and Franklyn Shaw Associates Ltd are required to provide 1 apprentice for the initial 4 year period of the contracts.

### **Social considerations**

59. Both Ductclean (UK) Limited and Franklyn Shaw Associates Ltd have provided their own Equal Opportunities Policy as part of their PQQ submissions and are fully aware and will comply with the council's own Equal Opportunities Policy.
60. Both Ductclean (UK) Ltd and Franklyn Shaw Associates Ltd have confirmed that they will comply with the provisions of the Equalities Legislation, the Employment Relations Act 1999 (Blacklists) Regulations 2010 and the Prevent Duty under section 26 of the Counter-Terrorism and Security Act 2015.
61. Both Ductclean (UK) Ltd and Franklyn Shaw Associates Ltd have confirmed that they recognise trade union recognition in line with the council's Fairer Future Procurement Strategy pays the minimum LLW hourly rate to all relevant staff and are both licensed waste carriers. Neither Ductclean (UK) Ltd nor Franklyn Shaw Associates Ltd is accredited on the TfL Fleet Operator Recognition Scheme (FORS). Ductclean (UK) Ltd is registered with FORS only but Franklyn Shaw Associates Ltd is not registered as the size of the vehicles they operate asbestos removal works with does not require them to be registered with FORS.

## **Environmental/Sustainability considerations**

62. The use of low emissions vehicles and the planning of journeys will be encouraged within these contracts.
63. Both Ductclean (UK) Ltd and Franklyn Shaw Associates Ltd have confirmed that they will provide waste consignment to ensure materials containing asbestos are disposed of at controlled sites and not fly-tipped and have provided copies of their waste carrier licenses.

## **Market considerations**

64. Both Ductclean (UK) Ltd and Franklyn Shaw Associates Ltd are small and medium sized enterprise (SME) specialist asbestos removal contractors operating across London, the South East and the South West.
65. Ductclean (UK) Ltd is based in Welwyn Garden City, currently employs 292 people and operates across London and the South East
66. Franklyn Shaw Associates Ltd is based in Stanstead Abbots, currently employs 24 people and operates across London, the South East and the South West.

## **Staffing implications**

67. There will be no impact on staff as the existing asset management team is already performing the current contract management functions.
68. There may be TUPE implications as although the contracts are being awarded to the incumbent providers, they will be operating in different areas than the current contracts.

## **Financial implications**

69. The Asbestos Removal Works Contracts are from 15 December 2020 for a period of four years with the option to extend by a further 2 year period in yearly increments at an estimated cost of £1.1 per contract, per annum.
70. The estimated annual combined spend of £2.2m is broken down into various departments as follows:
- |  |                  |
|--|------------------|
| a) Asset management (budget)                         | £1,600,000       |
| b) Corporate Facilities Management (potential spend) | £ 300,000        |
| c) Contingency sum for other departments             | <u>£ 300,000</u> |
|  | £2,200,000       |

71. The tendered percentage adjustments against the pre priced schedule of rates are fixed for the duration of the contract period and are around 18% lower than the current prices, a reduction of c£360k p.a. on the present volumes of activity. This contract has historically overspent and this reduction in process will allow more flexibility for works to be undertaken whilst remaining within the approved budget.

## **Second stage appraisal (for construction contracts over £250,000 only)**

72. Second stage financial appraisals were obtained from Bureau van Dijk (BvD) for the successful tenderers on 28 July 2020. The table below details their credit score and risk banding. A further financial appraisal will be conducted before the award of the contracts in light of the increased financial risk posed by the Covid-19 situation.

<b>Tenderer</b>	<b>Fame Credit Score</b>	<b>Fame Risk Banding</b>
DUCTCLEAN (UK) LTD	85	Secure
FRANKLYN SHAW ASSOCIATES LTD	45	Normal

73. The economic impact upon the two companies of the ongoing Covid-19 Crisis is being monitored by the commercial team, in line with monitoring across all contracts. The procurement officers have registered with Companies House for notification by email if circumstances change.

#### **Legal implications**

74. Please see concurrent from the Director of Law and Democracy

#### **Consultation**

75. Consultation with residents will be held at the monthly Tenant and Resident Association meetings that address contract performance, planned works and other relevant matters.

### **SUPPLEMENTARY ADVICE FROM OTHER OFFICERS**

#### **Strategic Director of Finance and Governance (FIN1201)**

76. The Strategic Director of Finance and Governance notes the financial implications in para 71 including the reduction in prices and the potential for cost reduction that will help mitigate pressures elsewhere within the Housing Revenue Account.

#### **Head of Procurement**

77. This report is seeking approval for the award of two separate asbestos removal contracts for a contract period of four years with the option to extend by a further two. One contract shall cover north of the borough and the other, south of the borough for. It is intended that if required, the contractors will act as back up to each other using their own tendered rates.

78. The report confirms that the procurement strategy set out in the previously approved Gateway 1 report has been followed with a full restricted EU competitive process being undertaken. The report describes the evaluation process that was carried out and confirms that tenders were evaluated using a weighted model 60:40 price/quality to determine the most economically advantageous tender (MEAT). The report also confirms that the two top scoring tenders will each be awarded a contract and how the decision to allocate areas was undertaken.

79. The report confirms the plan for the transition of the service and describes how the contract will be managed and monitored throughout the life of the contract.

#### **Director of Law and Democracy**

80. This report seeks the approval of the Strategic Director of Housing and Modernisation to the award of two separate asbestos removal contracts - Contract A for north of the borough to Ductclean (UK) Ltd (Ductclean) and Contract B for south of the borough to Franklyn Shaw Associates Ltd (Franklyn Shaw) as further detailed in paragraphs 1 and 2. It is also noted that approval of the Strategic

Director is also sought for Ductclean and Franklyn Shaw to act as back up contractor to each other on their own tendered rates when required.

81. As the values of the intended contracts are above the relevant EU threshold, the decision to approve these contract awards are reserved to the relevant chief officer (or under his delegated authority).
82. The nature and value of these services are such that they are subject to the tendering requirements of the Public Contract Regulations 2015 (PCR 2015). This report confirms that, as required by law, tenders were sought from contractors following an EU procurement exercise and that the most economically advantageous tenders are recommended for acceptance. A contract award notice will be posted in OJEU within 30 days of the award of both contracts.
83. As these contracts are subject to PCR 2015, there is a requirement to allow a standstill period of a minimum of 10 calendar days between notification of the successful companies that they have won the contracts and the award of the contracts to those companies, so as to allow unsuccessful companies the opportunity to challenge (if they decide to) the award of these contracts.
84. CSO 2.3 requires that no steps should be taken to award a contract unless the expenditure has been approved. Paragraphs 69 to 71 confirm the financial implications of these awards.

**Director of Exchequer (for housing contracts only)**

85. Notice of Proposal was served on all leaseholders in the borough under schedule 2 of the regulations appertaining to Section 20 of the Landlord and Tenant Act 1985(as amended). The Notice was served on 22.5.20 and the observation period ended on 26.6.20. All of the observations received have been responded to and there were no issues raised that would indicate that the agreement should not be entered into. Any work to the communal and structural areas of the block will be service charged to leaseholders. Any costs that will be more that £250 gross for any leaseholder will require that further Section 20 consultation is carried out by Homeownership Services under schedule 3 of the regulations.

**PART A – TO BE COMPLETED FOR ALL DELEGATED DECISIONS**

Under the powers delegated to me in accordance with the council's Contract Standing Orders, I authorise action in accordance with the recommendation(s) contained in the above report.

Signature 

Date 6 October 2020

**Michael Scorer, Strategic Director of Housing and Modernisation**

**PART B – TO BE COMPLETED BY THE DECISION TAKER FOR:**

- 1) All key decisions taken by officers
- 2) Any non-key decisions which are sufficiently important and/or sensitive that a reasonable member of the public would reasonably expect it to be publicly available.

<b>1. DECISION(S)</b>
As set out in the recommendations of the report.
<b>2. REASONS FOR DECISION</b>
As set out in the report.
<b>3. ALTERNATIVE OPTIONS CONSIDERED AND REJECTED BY THE OFFICER WHEN MAKING THE DECISION</b>
Not applicable.
<b>4. ANY CONFLICT OF INTEREST DECLARED BY ANY CABINET MEMBER WHO IS CONSULTED BY THE OFFICER WHICH RELATES TO THIS DECISION</b>
Not applicable
<b>5. NOTE OF ANY DISPENSATION GRANTED BY THE MONITORING OFFICER, IN RESPECT OF ANY DECLARED CONFLICT OF INTEREST</b>
<i>If a decision taker or cabinet member is unsure as to whether there is a conflict of interest they should contact the legal governance team for advice.</i>
None
<b>6 DECLARATION ON CONFLICTS OF INTERESTS</b>
<p><b>I declare that I was informed of no conflicts of interests.*</b></p> <p><b>or</b></p> <p><b><del>I declare that I was informed of the conflicts of interests set out in Part B4.*</del></b></p> <p>(* - Please delete as appropriate)</p>

## BACKGROUND DOCUMENTS

Background documents	Held At	Contact
Report - GW1 Asbestos Removal Works Contracts	Housing & modernisation, asset management	Gavin Duncumb Ext 50685
Link: <a href="G:\Asset Management\Engineering &amp; Compliance\Engineering Procurement\2020 Asbestos Removal\Gateways\GW1\Report - GW1 Asbestos Removal Works Contracts.pdf">G:\Asset Management\Engineering &amp; Compliance\Engineering Procurement\2020 Asbestos Removal\Gateways\GW1\Report - GW1 Asbestos Removal Works Contracts.pdf</a>		

## APPENDICES

No	Title
	None

## AUDIT TRAIL

<b>Lead Officer</b>	David Hodgson - Director of Asset Management	
<b>Report Author</b>	Christopher Gregory – Procurement Officer	
<b>Version</b>	Final	
<b>Dated</b>	23 September 2020	
<b>Key Decision?</b>	Yes	
<b>CONSULTATION WITH OTHER OFFICERS / DIRECTORATES / CABINET MEMBER</b>		
<b>Officer Title</b>	<b>Comments Sought</b>	<b>Comments included</b>
Strategic Director of Finance and Governance	Yes	Yes
Head of Procurement	Yes	Yes
Director of Law and Democracy	Yes	Yes
Director of Exchequer (for housing contracts only)	Yes	Yes
<b>Cabinet</b>	n/a	n/a
<b>Date final report sent to Constitutional Team</b>		7 October 2020