



Havering
LONDON BOROUGH

Notice of Non-key Executive Decision

Subject Heading:	Direct Award of Map Based TMO Contract
Decision Maker:	Imran Kazalbash Director of Environment
Cabinet Member:	Cllr. Barry Mugglestone Environment
ELT Lead:	Neil Stubbings Strategic Director of Place
Report Author and contact details:	Gareth Nunn Senior Highways Engineer Schemes 01708 433139 Gareth.nunn@havering.gov.uk
Policy context:	Resources - A well run Council that delivers for People and Place.
Financial summary:	The total cost of £0.038m over two years will be met through the Schemes revenue budget.
Relevant Overview & Scrutiny Sub Committee:	Place
Is this decision exempt from being called-in?	Yes – Non Key

Non-key Executive Decision

The subject matter of this report deals with the following Council Objectives

People - Things that matter for residents	X
Place - A great place to live, work and enjoy	X
Resources - A well run Council that delivers for People and Place	X

Part A – Report seeking decision

DETAIL OF THE DECISION REQUESTED AND RECOMMENDED ACTION

This Executive Decision seeks approval to direct award a 2 year contract for a map based traffic order system through the G-Cloud 14 Framework RM1557.14 Lot 2 Cloud Software to eVO.

AUTHORITY UNDER WHICH DECISION IS MADE

Scheme 3.3.1 General Provision

5. Sub-delegations

5.1 The Chief Officers may delegate any of the powers listed in this part to another Officer, in so far as is legally permissible. Such delegation will specify whether the Officer is permitted to make further sub-delegations. Any such delegation or sub-delegation must be:

- (a) recorded in writing; and
- (b) lodged with the Monitoring Officer who will keep a public record of all such delegations.

Any such delegation / sub-delegation will become valid only when these conditions are complied with. The Strategic Director is a Chief Officer as defined in Part 3.3 of the Scheme of Delegations and has delegated his authority to the Director of Environment.

Scheme 3.3.3 Powers common to all Strategic Directors

4.2 To award all contracts with a total contract value of below £1,000,000 other than contracts covered by Contract Procedure Rule 16.3.

STATEMENT OF THE REASONS FOR THE DECISION

The current contract for the Council's existing map based traffic order system provider was originally established in August 2016, when the Borough transitioned from traditional text-based orders to map-based traffic orders following a comprehensive survey.

Since then, multiple waivers have been utilised to extend the contract beyond its initial term, with the latest contract set to expire on 31st March 2025. The option to extend the contract further has now been exhausted.

The software for hosting the Council's map-based traffic orders is currently provided by Buchanan Computing. Additionally, the mapping required for the host system is

Non-key Executive Decision

delivered by Buchanan Computing's sister company, Buchanan Order Management, under a separate agreement. This service is used on an ad hoc basis, with annual spend varying between £8,000 and £15,000, depending on the number of schemes advertised.

Failure to make provision for these services would result in the Council being unable to enforce map-based static and traffic movement restrictions across the Borough. Valid traffic management orders are a legal requirement to issue Penalty Charge Notices (PCNs) and to address any representations made against them. Without such orders, the Council will be unable to utilise its authority to manage kerbside parking granted in the Traffic Management Act 1984.

The Automated Vehicles Act 2024 received royal assent in May 2024. Section 93 of the 2024 Act specifies that local authorities in England will be required to provide information on Traffic Regulation Orders (TRO) to the Secretary of State in a digital format. This applies to permanent, experimental and temporary TRO, as well as temporary traffic regulation notices, speed limit orders, and special event orders. In order to comply with this requirement, the Council needs the contracts above in place.

Market Review

In 2023, prior to entering into the current contract, a similar review of the marketplace was conducted. A relatively new company, eVO, was identified as a potential alternative to the current provider.

eVO offered the lowest annual fees and appeared capable of delivering the majority of services provided by the current supplier. However, some concerns were noted with this provider at the time. Other providers, such as Appyway and BondApp, were also considered. However, for various reasons, including cost, these providers were not deemed suitable. As a result, a waiver to extend the contract with Buchanan for a further year was put in place.

Current Market Review

During the early stages of the current review, a similar conclusion was reached, with eVO emerging as the only viable alternative to our current provider that can deliver the required services while also offering the potential for notable cost reductions.

As a result, the rest of the review primarily focused on a detailed comparison between the services provided by our current supplier, Buchanan, and those offered by eVO.

Option to map the orders and manage the traffic order system in house

To maximise control over data and traffic orders, and to explore opportunities for cost reduction, consideration has been given to the option of mapping traffic orders and managing online consultations in house.

The current process and the proposed new process have been reviewed and deemed viable. While this approach would increase the workload for officers, the additional effort is considered manageable and is outweighed by the potential benefits.

Non-key Executive Decision

Below is a table summarising the advantages and disadvantages of managing traffic orders in-house:

Advantages	Disadvantages
<ul style="list-style-type: none">• Eliminates duplication of work in the advertising process.• Reduces costs by avoiding ad-hoc payments, giving us better control of funds.• Costs associated with mapping our own plans can be capitalised when appropriate.• Ensures consistency in drawings.• Aligns the drawings attached to resident letters with those available online, providing clarity.• Removes dependency on third-party input, granting better control over advertisement dates and allowing us to provide more accurate timelines for stakeholders.	<ul style="list-style-type: none">• Training for current staff will be required (from TMO software provider)• New staff may be less familiar with this system compared to AutoCAD and therefore will require additional training (which can likely be managed in-house)• Council staff will be required to make online consultations go live, close, confirm orders and generally maintain their traffic orders.• Council's website and any literature referring to traffweb would require updating

This option provides reduced costs while allowing the Council better control over funds and the general management of traffic orders. Although there will be a minor increase in officer workload and some manageable disadvantages, these are outweighed by the advantages. Therefore from 1st April 2025 the Council will map traffic orders internally.

eVO/Buchanan Comparison

The Council has identified its key system requirements, and both Buchanan and eVO meet these criteria. Both providers are available via the G-Cloud framework, with eVO offering these services at a lower cost.

Continuing with Buchanan as our map-based traffic order provider would have advantages such as ensuring the continuity of service and eliminate the need for data transfers. Buchanan also provides two additional services not offered by eVO: Signplot (a traffic sign design tool) and Linemap (a map displaying the locations of all dropped kerbs in the borough).

However, the Council already licenses Keysign, a preferred alternative to Signplot used by highways officers and while the value of Linemap is acknowledged, fully utilising this service would require a borough-wide review and the establishment of a process for ongoing updates. Given these considerations, it is not felt that the benefits of retaining this system outweigh the associated expenses.

Non-key Executive Decision

Recommendation

Following the review, eVO has been identified as the supplier offering the best overall value for the Council. In the previous review, concerns were raised about the public facing portal due to low user adoption at the time. However, since then, multiple authorities have adopted the platform, and its functionality has been demonstrated to be sufficient and comparable to our existing portal. Therefore, it is recommended to procure eVO as the Council's new map-based traffic order provider.

With the current contract nearing its expiration, it is further recommended to procure eVO via a direct award through the G-Cloud 14 framework lot 2. This approach offers significant time efficiencies compared to a full bidding process, assisting in enabling the Council to implement a map-based traffic order system before the existing contract expires. This will help in ensuring there is no gap in service, maintaining the continuity of traffic and parking enforcement.

While it is acknowledged that a competitive bidding process could potentially introduce the Council to new products and suppliers, most well established providers with substantial market share are already available through the G-Cloud framework which has been used to undertake the previous and existing market reviews.

However, the primary justification for pursuing a direct award is to ensure uninterrupted traffic and parking enforcement services, given the limited time available. This approach balances the need for continuity whilst also providing significant cost reductions for the Council.

A contract length of 2 years is recommended, this approach strikes a balance between avoiding the need for another procurement process in the near term and refraining from making a long-term commitment to a product that is not yet fully familiar to the Council. However, this approach will also provide the Council with the opportunity to conduct a bidding process in the medium term should the need arise.

Benefits of Recommendation

The primary benefit of procuring eVO is financial. Over a two-year contract, switching providers would save the Council up to £7,173.93 annually (for the hosting system alone) compared to the current provider.

A one-off data transfer fee of £1,700 is payable for the data transfer, it is also recommended to budget for an additional one day of training at £850.00. After this, a year one cost reduction of £4,623.93 and a year two cost reduction of £7,173.93 is still achievable. These reductions in costs occur from the hosting of map based traffic orders alone.

By mapping and managing traffic orders internally, the Council can avoid annual ad-hoc payments ranging from £8,000 to £15,000. Although this work would need to be

Non-key Executive Decision

done in house, it would be managed within existing staff budgets and some costs can be capitalised where appropriate.

In addition to significant cost reductions, mapping the Council's own restrictions and managing the map based traffic order system will provide greater operational control, allowing us to have sole control over when orders go live and close.

While two services from the current provider will no longer be included, these services are either redundant or require investments that outweigh their benefits. The recommendation ensures the Council continues to operate an effective map-based traffic order system while achieving substantial cost reductions.

OTHER OPTIONS CONSIDERED AND REJECTED

1. Do Nothing

This option was considered and rejected. Traffic management orders are legally required to enforce moving and static restrictions within the Borough. With the forthcoming expiration of the current contract, this option is not viable.

2. Extend the Current Contract via Waiver

This option was also considered and rejected, as the existing contract has already been extended through waivers to its full allowable capacity.

PRE-DECISION CONSULTATION

No external consultation has been conducted and is not required.

NAME AND JOB TITLE OF STAFF MEMBER ADVISING THE DECISION-MAKER

Name: Gareth Nunn

Designation: Senior Schemes Engineer

Signature:



Date: 03/01/2025

Part B - Assessment of implications and risks

LEGAL IMPLICATIONS AND RISKS

Non-key Executive Decision

This report seeks approval to directly award a 2 year contract to eVO for a map based traffic order provider through the G Cloud Framework. .

The Council's requires the ability to make orders, regulating or controlling vehicular traffic on roads as set out in Part I and II of the Road Traffic Regulation Act 1984 ("RTRA 1984").

The Automated Vehicles Act 2024 received royal assent in May 2024. Section 93 of the 2024 Act specifies that local authorities in England will be required to provide information on TROs to the Secretary of State in a digital format. This applies to permanent, experimental and temporary TROs, as well as temporary traffic regulation notices, speed limit orders, and special event orders.

The Council has a general power of competence under Section 1 of the Localism Act 2011 to do anything an individual can do, subject to any statutory constraints on the Council's powers. None of the constraints on the Council's s.1 power are engaged by this decision.

The existing contract value is £38,050 and therefore below the Public Contracts Regulations (as amended) 2015 (PCR) threshold for service contracts. Therefore, the contract is not caught by the PCR regime, however any variation must still comply with the Council's Contracts Procedure Rules (CPR).

The body of this report confirms that the procurement is compliant with Regulation 33(8)(a) of the PCR.

The procurement complies with the Council's Contracts Procedure Rules (CPR) which allows for a direct award through a framework:

CPR 20.4 Where a framework agreement is operational, all subsequent purchases under the framework shall either not require further competition (if a single supplier) or, if there are two or more suppliers for those goods or services on the framework, follow the express framework provisions for choosing a supplier. If there are no such express provisions a mini-competition should be held amongst the relevant suppliers.

As the framework permits a direct award the proposed contract award is compliant with the Council's CPR.

FINANCIAL IMPLICATIONS AND RISKS

As outlined in this document it is recommended that the council map orders and manage the system internally. Quotes for entering into a hosting contract with the incumbent were in excess of those published in the G-Cloud Framework for eVO, also, the mapping service currently gives rise to additional fees ranging between £8,000 to £15,000 per annum.

Non-key Executive Decision

The cost to deliver the hosting application with eVO is £17,750.00 per annum for the duration of the two-year contract.

An additional one-off cost of £1,700.00 is required for the data transfer process.

It is also recommended to budget for an additional day of training (up to 8 staff) at £850.00.

For 2025/26 and 2026/27 there is currently sufficient budget to contain the costs as set out below.

The following table shows the breakdown of costs over the two-year contract term.

Expenditure Item	Yr 1	Yr2	Cost over life of the contract
Setup / Data Transfer Cost	1,700	0	1,700
One Day Training	850	0	850
Annual Hosting Cost	17,750	17,750	35,500
Total	20,300	17,750	38,050

If agreed, the total cost for this project over a two-year contract period will be £38,050.00.

HUMAN RESOURCES IMPLICATIONS AND RISKS (AND ACCOMMODATION IMPLICATIONS WHERE RELEVANT)

The proposal can be delivered within the standard resourcing within Highways, Traffic and Parking and has no specific impact on staffing/HR issues.

EQUALITIES AND SOCIAL INCLUSION IMPLICATIONS AND RISKS

Havering has a diverse community made up of many different groups and individuals. The council values diversity and believes it essential to understand and include the different contributions, perspectives and experience that people from different backgrounds bring.

The Public Sector Equality Duty (PSED) under section 149 of the Equality Act 2010 requires the council, when exercising its functions, to have due regard to:

(i) the need to eliminate discrimination, harassment, victimisation and any other conduct that is prohibited by or under the Equality Act 2010;

Non-key Executive Decision

(ii) the need to advance equality of opportunity between persons who share protected characteristics and those who do not, and;

(iii) foster good relations between those who have protected characteristics and those who do not.

Note: 'Protected characteristics' are: age, sex, race, disability, sexual orientation, marriage and civil partnerships, religion or belief, pregnancy and maternity and gender reassignment.

The Council demonstrates its commitment to the Equality Act in its decision-making processes, the provision, procurement and commissioning of its services, and employment practices concerning its workforce. In addition, the Council is also committed to improving the quality of life and wellbeing of all Havering residents in respect of socio-economics and health determinants.

These measures improve road safety for all road users.

ENVIRONMENTAL AND CLIMATE CHANGE IMPLICATIONS AND RISKS

None.

BACKGROUND PAPERS

None.

Part C – Record of decision

I have made this executive decision in accordance with authority delegated to me by the Leader of the Council and in compliance with the requirements of the Constitution.

Non-key Executive Decision

Decision

Proposal agreed

Details of decision maker

Signed



Name: Imran Kazalbash

Director of Environment

Date: 13/02/2025

Lodging this notice

The signed decision notice must be delivered to Committee Services, in the Town Hall.

For use by Committee Administration

This notice was lodged with me on _____

Signed _____