

OPTIONS APPRAISAL AND SCORING REGIME

Option	Option 1: Re-tender on a co-sourced or outsourced basis		Option 2(a): Partnership arrangement with Portsmouth City Council after extension		Option 2(b): Partnership arrangement with Portsmouth City Council in April 2019		Option 3: Transfer service to another public-sector body		Option 4: Return to full in-house solution	
	Comments	Score	Comments	Score	Comments	Score	Comments	Score	Comments	Score
Suitability: Effectiveness Economy Efficiency	Pros: Clear, legal and accepted process. Known to deliver a viable solution (as has since 2010). Cons: Flexibility outside of contract either reduced or potentially costly. Solution must be commercially sustainable, not just economic. Not the most economic solution.	2	Pros: Like for like would be a more economic solution. Service "at cost" – no commercial imperative. Increased flexibility and coverage, within an unaltered or reduced cost envelope. Cons: There would be initial transition costs. Competition not proposed (benchmarking could be done)	3.5	Pros: Like for like would be a more economic solution. Service "at cost" – no commercial imperative. Increased flexibility and coverage, within an unaltered or reduced cost envelope. Cons: There would be initial transition costs. Competition not proposed (benchmarking could be done)	3.5	Pros: Like for like could be a more economic solution. Service may be delivered "at cost" – no commercial imperative. Could introduce an element of competition. Cons: There could be significant transition costs, as would involve a party not currently involved, in any way. Would require either competition or overt benchmarking as proposed offerings could not be compared now.	2	Pro's: Could create a totally tailored and localised audit solution. Cons: It would be extremely difficult to secure full coverage and resilience, without incurring additional cost. The service made not effectively respond to emerging requirements, and changes in demand. Reduced economies of scale.	1
	Feasibility: Deliverability Practicality	Pros: Fully viable, with at least one prospective supplier. Cons: Would require a full retendering process to be run before 2 nd extension runs out in July 2020.	2.5	Pro's: Fully viable. Alternative provider is a known entity, delivering services locally. No re-tendering process required. No proposal or imperative to change model, as might happen during re-tendering.	2.5	Pro's: Fully viable. Alternative provider is a known entity, delivering services locally. No re-tendering process required. No proposal or imperative to change model, as might happen during re-tendering.	3	Pro's: There are other public sector bodies, local to the Isle of Wight, which deliver audit services. Tendering not required. However, competition or comparison <i>would</i> be needed.	2	Pro's: Could create a totally tailored and localised audit solution. Tendering not required. However, comparisons to confirm VFM <i>would</i> be needed.

	May result in a change in costs or services.			Cons: Would require transitioning between different providers, which would have a short term impact. Lack of alignment with the audit year could impact on delivery of the agreed plan.		Cons: There would be a significant transition exercise, as would involve a party not currently involved, in any way. Considerable local know how may be at risk.	Cons: Would have to recruit a new team, then transition from the existing provider. No guarantee that a full team could be assembled within required timescales. Not as resilient as other models.	
Acceptability: Stakeholder view	Pro's: Known to be acceptable to key stakeholders in the Isle of Wight Council. Cons: Potential lack of transparency / flexibility, for commercial reasons. Assumed economy of commercial outsourced services under challenge	Pro's: The new provider is a known and trusted party. Local knowledge, and synergy with other local authorities is secured. Transparency and accountability improved. Cons: There may be some concern over the lack of a direct competition (though benchmarking is practicable)	3	Pro's: The new provider is a known and trusted party. Local knowledge, and synergy with other local authorities is secured. Transparency and accountability improved. Cons: There may be some concern over the lack of a direct competition (though benchmarking is practicable)	3	Pro's: The addition of an extra competition or comparison element would provide a more overt indication that best value had been sought. Cons: Would introduce a new party into the equation, with no track record of providing audit services to the Isle of Wight.	Pro's: Local knowledge can be readily built. Transparency and accountability totally secure. Cons: Not likely to represent best value for the residents of the Isle of Wight. Lack of resilience, flexibility or coverage may arise.	2
Overall Score			7.5		9			5
			9.5		6			

SCORING REGIME

	1	2	3	4
Criteria				
Suitability: Effectiveness Economy Efficiency	The option increases costs. The option has a detrimental impact on the effectiveness of key services provided.	The option has marginal impact on costs. The option does not change the effectiveness of service provision.	This option delivers some savings. The option will improve the effectiveness of services.	The option delivers significant savings. The option will significantly improve the effectiveness of services.
Feasibility: Deliverability Practicality	The option will be difficult to deliver and risks causing significant disruption to business as usual.	The option is challenging to deliver, but achievable. It will cause some disruption to business as usual.	The option is straight forward to deliver and disruption can be managed.	The option is straight forward to deliver and will cause minimal disruption.
Acceptability: Stakeholder view	This option is highly likely to be unacceptable to key stakeholders (Members, the Public and or Staff).	This option is likely to be unacceptable to key stakeholders (Members, the Public and or Staff).	This option may be acceptable to key stakeholders subject to a sound case.	This option is likely to be acceptable to key stakeholders.