



**OXFORDSHIRE
COUNTY COUNCIL**

Civil Enforcement Procurement

Options Appraisal Report

Prepared by

parking
matters

January 2025

Contents

Summary.....	2
1. Current Contracts	3
1.1 Compliance Management	3
1.2 Enforcement Technology	4
1.3 Enforcement Agents	5
2. Options for Service Delivery	5
2.1 Technology	5
2.2 Compliance Management	5
2.3 Other considerations	9
2.4 Ensuring the chosen option is successful.....	9
3. Procurement Options	9
3.1 Frameworks	9
3.2 Open Procurement	10
4. Contract Scope	10
4.1 Single Provider.....	10
4.2 Multiple Providers	10
5. Recommended Procurement Strategy	11
5.1 Single Provider.....	11
5.2 Technology	11
5.3 ZEZ Vehicle Checker	12
5.4 Compliance Management Contract	12
Recommendation summary.....	15

Summary

Oxfordshire County Council first took on parking enforcement powers in Oxford City in 1997, extending these powers as they became available to Civil Enforcement (under TMA 2004) covering bus lanes and, most recently, moving traffic (such as prohibited vehicles, banned turns, School Streets etc) in 2022.

The Council has expanded operations beyond the City. In October 2020 the Cabinet agreed to pursue an application to DfT to take on powers covering Cherwell, Vale of White Horse and South Oxfordshire. Enforcement of these districts went live in November 2021. Agreement was reached with West Oxfordshire District Council to take on the West Oxfordshire on-street enforcement, which went live in April 2023. Negotiations were also concluded with Cherwell District Council to undertake the off-street enforcement of their car parks via an agency agreement. This went live in September 2023.

The Zero Emission Zone is also managed by the Civil Enforcement team since its inception in 2022.

The Civil Enforcement operation in 2024 was three times the size of the service in 2020. The current operation manages over 22,000 parking spaces (on and off street), issues nearly 200,000 PCNs annually with a revenue of £9.6m and an expenditure of £5m.

The extent of Civil Enforcement operations has resulted in the need to contract with specialist providers to assist with day-to-day operations, as well as providing specialist personnel, equipment and services. Many of these contracts will expire in the coming years and will need to be re-procured. In addition, the Thornhill and Oxford Parkway Park and Rides are currently managed through an Agency agreement with the City Council that expires in 2026.

The Council is undertaking an exercise to evaluate potential options to replace the current contracts and Agency Agreements. In order to review and, where possible rationalise the contracts, the extensions to the current contracts have been triggered for an additional year and there is the option to extend for a further year if needed.

This paper details the areas of operation, the current contracts and the options going forward.

1. Current Contracts

1.1 Compliance Management

These contracts cover the day-to-day operations including required personnel and supporting assets as detailed in Table 1 below. Operations include on and off street enforcement by CEO patrols, review of ANPR evidence packs and issue of PCNs, and Pay and Display machine maintenance. Correspondence processing (scanning incoming correspondence, printing and posting outgoing letters) is also part of the Compliance Management contract.

<i>Personnel</i>	<i>Equipment</i>
Civil Enforcement Officers (CEOs) - Patrol streets and car parks ANPR review officers - Office based, reviewing evidence packs from ANPR	Handheld devices Mobile printers Vehicle (suspensions and frontline P&D maintenance) Vehicles (CEO transport)
<i>Premises</i>	Office equipment for operation Comms/radio system
Building(s) for CEO base and vehicles	
<i>Other services</i>	<i>Innovations</i>
Print, scan and post service P&D ticket rolls Uniforms - CEOs	Spotter (ANPR) vehicle

Table 1: Civil Enforcement Contract Scope

1.1.1 PCN and Permit Processing

The processing of PCNs of all types (parking, ZEZ, Bus Lanes, Moving Traffic), including replying to challenges and handling appeals, as well as the issuing and management of permits are currently managed by in-house teams.

1.1.2 Factors determining contract scope

The operation of the service is constrained by the legislation, affecting not only the contract scope but also the efficiency of the services provided. For example:

- For the majority of parking contraventions, a Civil Enforcement Officer must observe the vehicle parked in contravention for a period before physically placing a PCN on the vehicle. ANPR devices can only be used in very limited circumstances to enforce parking contraventions.
- Evidence of each contravention from ANPR devices (for bus lanes and moving traffic contraventions) must be reviewed by a trained officer before a PCN can be issued
- Whilst the Council can accept challenges by email, some outgoing correspondence has to be in the form of a physical letter, printed and posted.
- Whilst the initial (informal) challenge to a PCN could be handled by contracted personnel, formal representations and appeals made to the Traffic Penalty Tribunal (TPT) must be considered by an officer employed by the Council.

1.1.3 Park and Ride Agency Agreement

Thornhill and Oxford Parkway are currently enforced by ODS through an Agency Agreement with Oxford City Council. The functions covered by this agreement are very similar to the scope of the Civil Enforcement scope. This agreement is due to expire 30 August 2025 however this can be extended by a further year.

The Agreement covers:

- Parking enforcement in Thornhill and Oxford Parkway P&R car parks through Excess Charges
- Provision and maintenance of ticket machines at the above sites
- First & second line appeals
- Opening and closing the buildings at Thornhill and Oxford Parkway
- Management of the pay by phone contract
- Cleaning the building and site
- CCTV daily check
- Call-out when required

1.2 Enforcement Technology

The hardware and software required to manage the deployment of CEOs, vehicle observations, PCN issue and processing is amongst the most specialised employed by the Council. Procurement must be divided according to the specialties in the market (e.g. ANPR suppliers, PCN systems, etc).

The scope of the current contracts are listed in Table 2.

<i>PCN Software</i>	<i>ANPR (bus lane and moving traffic)</i>
CEO deployment	Fixed roadside cameras
Handheld software	ANPR review suite
<i>Innovations</i>	
ANPR Cameras for ZEZ	
ZEZ Vehicle checker	
Payment mechanism	

Table 2: Hardware and software scope

1.2.1 ZEZ Contract

The current contract is a direct award, made due to the innovative nature of the requirement. However, the initial contract has expired and attempts to extend this through a framework contract have been unsuccessful as the supplier is not currently on any framework.

1.2.2 ANPR Cameras

The Council has a programme to extend ANPR camera usage beyond the scope of the current contract. As ANPR cameras have to be approved by the Vehicle Certification Agency for use in enforcement, a call-off contract with a specialised supplier will need to be put in place to fulfil the requirements of the programme.

1.3 Enforcement Agents

There are certain elements of the Civil Enforcement service that have been excluded from the review process as they require specialist providers, or the function has to remain within the Council. Enforcement Agents (Bailiffs) are a specialised field with a small number of suppliers with the required nationwide coverage. The contract for Enforcement Agents is a nil cost contract and was recently procured, having 3.5 years remaining.

2. Options for Service Delivery

As a Highway Authority, Oxfordshire County Council is committed under the Traffic Management Act 2004 (TMA) to making sure traffic moves freely and quickly on its roads. TMA gives councils the tools to manage parking policies and enforce some moving traffic offences, enabling the Council to maintain the network functionality, whilst also facilitating more sustainable travel choices. Without enforcement the Council will encounter issues with road safety, increased pollution, delays to all users on the network and impact the emergency services.

It is therefore assumed that, for the purposes of this document, the Council wishes to maintain a Civil Enforcement service.

2.1 Technology

As stated above, the technology is highly specialised and provided by a small number of suppliers. Whilst the number of suppliers is not ideal, the systems are relatively inexpensive (given their complexity) and generally fit for purpose.

As far as we are aware, no councils processing PCNs under TMA have attempted to create their own software. This would be prohibitively expensive, requiring a significant initial investment and an 18 month to two year initial development time as well as an ongoing commitment to bug fixing and support. The resulting software is unlikely to be an improvement on commercially available systems.

It is therefore recommended that the Council seeks to procure replacement contracts for hardware and software.

2.2 Compliance Management

The main consideration for the Council is whether to continue to outsource the compliance management service or whether to bring this in-house.

Parking Matters carried out a research exercise on delivery models in 2021 to advise a client in southern England. During this work they spoke to a number of local authorities in southern and south-western England including urban unitary authorities and larger rural counties.

When considering the high-level options for service delivery there are broadly, three models for service delivery currently deployed across the country:

1. **In-house:** day-to-day delivery is entirely or largely delivered within the local authority by directly employed staff.
2. **Contracted:** day-to-day delivery is entirely or largely delivered by a contractor appointed by a local authority.

3. Third Party Agreement: whereby a third party, for example a neighbouring council (or even a JV company) is employed to carry out parking management and enforcement.

Across England almost all authorities either deliver services in-house or through a contract with a supplier (options 1 or 2). Many have a 'hybrid' arrangement, in which some functions are outsourced while others are delivered in house.

Other models for resourcing contracts (such as long-term concessions, private finance or creating public-private joint ventures) are not considered appropriate by councils or suppliers in the market.

In the research they conducted, Parking Matters found that most authorities made the decision on their delivery models at the point they adopted civil enforcement. There have been relatively few cases of wholesale change in delivery model. Many councils that have considered changing often conclude that the financial cost and culture changes required will be too expensive and/or too great a risk to a key source of revenue.

2.2.1 In-house delivery

Parking Matters estimate around half of authorities deliver their parking services in-house including some of the country's largest cities (e.g. Newcastle and Bristol), counties (e.g. Devon), unitary authorities (e.g. Bath and NE Somerset and Swindon), and numerous districts (often off-street only). This does not mean that all services are delivered in-house, but that the majority of the team, including the Civil Enforcement Officers and notice processors are employed directly by the council.

Commonly cited strengths of this model are the direct and easy access to the civil enforcement service, the ability to direct and change the service to respond to policy changes and the shared services with other departments. The risks with an in-house service lie with the need for sufficient high quality managers and the difficulty in recruiting and retaining staff. One authority has a perpetual advert for Civil Enforcement Officers. and authorities seem especially susceptible to high rates of sickness and absence, creating a need for a dedicated HR resource.

An In-house operation would still require some contracts, however each of these would be small in value and there is potential to use some existing contracts already within the Council such as fleet vehicles, cleaning services etc

Figure 1 summarises the benefits, weaknesses and threats of a service delivered fully in house, as identified by the authorities that operate in this way.

<p>Strengths</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Easy Access and influence. • Complete control over quality of delivery • Intimate understanding of the local area and authority • Ability to reach back into other council services • Intangible customer service benefits e.g. enforcement staff working for their own communities ('civic pride'). • Staff can be redeployed to deal with other issues including litter, graffiti, blocked drains • Intangible benefit of having council representatives on the street. 	<p>Weaknesses</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Ongoing need for training and continued professional development often overlooked • Fewer economies of scale when purchasing equipment • Difficult to scale up or down • Corporate policies / priorities can reduce the efficiency and professionalism of the service • Slower to procure services and equipment • Slower to recruit and replace staff. • Inability to incentivise performance
<p>Opportunities</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Some shared services or shared economies (e.g. CCTV, Cash Collection) • Better quality of delivery and customer service leading to reputational benefits • Branding and communications.. • Overhead savings from use of other council departments and premises. 	<p>Threats</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Corporate policies such as recruitment freezes or carte blanche cost-cutting • Senior salaries often lower than market rate; • Junior staff pay & benefits often lead to higher costs • High sickness and vacancy rates • Inappropriate corporate projects (i.e. with software or corporate systems).

Figure 1: In House delivery SWOT Table

2.2.2 Contracted

Letting a contract for specialist services can be beneficial to Civil Enforcement services and provide managed, efficient, resilient and cost-effective solutions if the contract is well specified, the performance targets are achievable and fair, and internal contract management is consistently applied. Importantly, risk is transferred from the commissioning body to the contractor.

Cost savings can arise from economies of scale, as being part of a larger operation results in a pool of expertise which is kept up-to-date and can be deployed to other operations by the supplier. Contractors are often keen to adopt new technologies especially where these deliver efficiencies.

The most common method of operation is to let a large main contract, typically for a 5-year term, sometimes including break options and/or extensions, which encompasses all elements of the service. This requires careful specification (usually with assistance, if this is the first time such a contract is let), and an open tendering process.

A client team will still be required to interface with councillors and suppliers as well as perform some duties which have to be considered by the Local Authority (formal challenges and appeals). Any issues with staff retention or the recruitment of new staff to carry out these duties will impact this part of the service. Figure 2 summarises the benefits, weaknesses and threats of a fully contracted out service, as identified by the authorities that operate in this way.

<p>Strengths</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Pool of expertise to draw from which is kept well trained and knowledgeable • Economies of scale • Easier to scale up or down • Risk transfer to provider • New services can be brought in quickly without large capital investment. • Contract management can incentivise and encourage performance 	<p>Weaknesses</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Although margins are low, a proportion of the price will be taken as profit • Pricing can be high for services out-of-contract • Sub-contracting carries a management fee • Intangible customer service implications resulting from staff employed by a third party.
<p>Opportunities</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Benefit from industry change and innovation • Adopt new technologies quicker • Quicker procurement and equipment renewal • Expertise and economies of scale for purchasing. 	<p>Threats</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Poor contracts / procurement can lead to inflexibility • Poor future proofing post contract with knowledge loss a risk. • Complicated ownership of assets (e.g. handheld devices) • Bankruptcy or insolvency.

Figure 2. Outsourced delivery SWOT table

2.2.3 Third Party Agreement

A small number of authorities have entered into joint agreements to manage parking. This usually involves one authority acting for both, or a new joint venture being set up (either of which may then be outsourced). These arrangements are usually entered into by large authorities (e.g. the London Boroughs of Wandsworth and Richmond) and are often part of larger collaborations. However, the agency agreement with ODS (owned by the City Council) is an example of this type of arrangement, even though this accounts for a relatively small part of the overall service.

Whilst there may be some cost savings through joint management, the disadvantage of third part agreements is that the Council risks losing some policy independence and may find it difficult to control costs.

2.2.4 Hybrid

In practice, many councils operate parts of the service through contracts and part in-house. This is the current situation in Oxfordshire.

A hybrid approach is very flexible as it enables some of the more difficult elements of the service (e.g. recruiting and training Civil Enforcement Officers) to be contracted out, whilst elements that the council wishes to be flexible and responsive to policy (e.g. PCN processing) can be employed directly. Most councils adopting this strategy will outsource functions such as PCN issuing (including CEOs and ANPR reviewers, their deployment, supervision and management) and correspondence handling (both incoming and outgoing).

2.3 Other considerations

The Compliance Management activity requires the use of accommodation for CEOs and ANPR review officers, vehicle parking, storage, etc. In the current enforcement contract, the contractor is obliged to source and to service their own accommodation, the costs of which are included in the contract.

The Council's property policy is to own rather than rent and it may be possible to purchase a building for use by Compliance Management regardless of whether the service is outsourced or provided in-house, using the savings to repay the capital outlay. A building would need to be sourced as there is no suitable property within our current Council Portfolio. This would take around 12 months however the contractor's existing building can be used until the new premises are ready.

2.4 Ensuring the chosen option is successful

In Parking Matters' experience, a high-quality efficient service can be achieved by any of the options above. However, there are a number of issues that are key determinants of service quality regardless of the option taken.

2.4.1 Management

The provision by the Council of sufficient management resource (both quantity and appropriate experience) of suitable seniority is a key determinant of success. Poorly managed or resourced parking services can perform very badly with low PCN rates and high rates of PCN appeals, putting revenue and reputation at risk.

A fully contracted out service (or continuing with the current hybrid arrangement) will require adequate contract management resource, whilst changing to an in-house service will require the recruitment of a significant number of operational managers with appropriate experience.

2.4.2 Ensuring responsiveness and performance

Even with sufficient management, contracts need to be properly framed to enable the Council to direct resources where it considers they are needed and to review and promote performance. In-house services also need to be seen as business units with clear functions. Both contracted and in-house services must be provided with operational targets and key performance indicators that are regularly reviewed, with incentives for meeting these targets.

3. Procurement Options

Civil Enforcement procurement has to be carefully managed as some potential bidders have a long history of challenging Councils' decisions. This section assumes that some procurement will be required.

As with other areas of Council activity, there are two main approaches to contract procurement in Civil Enforcement:

3.1 Frameworks

Frameworks help councils to procure goods and services from a list of pre-approved suppliers, with agreed terms and conditions and legal protections. Many (such as ESPO or Crown Commercial Service) are owned by local or central government bodies. From the

Council's perspective, frameworks can make the procurement process cheaper, faster and less prone to challenge.

Frameworks create 'lots' that consist of a coherent scope of works (e.g. parking enforcement technology) and invite suppliers to 'bid' to join the framework as a supplier for one or more lots. Once the lot is in place, councils can use the documentation and supplier's bids as the basis for a 'mini competition.'

3.2 Open Procurement

If not offered through a framework, tenders for contracts with a large value must be advertised in an open, regulated process. This is usually more work for the procurement team and therefore more expensive than using a framework.

In practice, councils use frameworks where possible, only resorting to open procurement where an appropriate framework lot is not available.

4. Contract Scope

If one or more elements of the Civil Enforcement service are to be contracted out, consideration must be given to the scope of the contract(s). Councils follow one of two models:

4.1 Single Provider

All contract elements are procured from a single supplier, including all parts of the compliance management and enforcement technology.

This approach can place the maximum cost risk with the supplier, potentially reducing costs for the Council. However, there are a number of weaknesses in this approach:

Suppliers will cost the extra risks into their bid, negating the potential savings for the Council

The breadth of contract scope may make it difficult to ensure that the contract is flexible enough to cover any changes the Council may want to make to the service

No one potential supplier that can undertake all of the items the Council is looking to procure. There is a potential that suppliers may subcontract or form a consortium. However, concerns remain that it would limit the market and thereby limit competitive tendering.

4.2 Multiple Providers

Elements of the Civil Enforcement service are grouped into 'lots', each is procured either through a matching framework lot or by open procurement as necessary.

The specialist nature of Civil Enforcement does lend itself to procuring contracts with multiple providers and frameworks do exist for a large number of the elements. However, there is no framework contract for compliance management so this would still need to be procured through an open tender (Crown Commercial Service are working on an enforcement framework contract but this will not be available in time).

Recent market testing by the Council has indicated that companies are interested in tendering for elements of the service and that procurement in lots would attract eligible companies from specialist fields, thus maximising the competition.

The Multiple Providers approach will also align with the Hybrid service delivery option, enabling the Council to only scope those elements that it wishes to outsource.

5. Recommended Procurement Strategy

Given the nature of the service, some contracts will be required to facilitate the Civil Enforcement service. This section breaks down the elements of the service, based on the specialist areas in the market, identifies the options and recommends an approach for each.

5.1 Single Provider

As discussed above, one option would be to outsource all elements of the service that can be contracted out to a single provider. Given the nature of the Council's Civil Enforcement service and the drive to innovate within the Council, it would be difficult to create a specification that would provide the flexibility required. Such a contract may also prove to not be cost effective given the perceived risk and range of sub-contractors that potential suppliers are likely to price for.

*It is therefore recommended that the Council **does not** pursue the Single Provider route.*

5.2 Technology

5.2.1 PCN (Enforcement) Software

This market has established contractors with mature products. A suitable framework lot exists for this and early market engagement has indicated a strong interest in bidding for the work as a single lot. As part of the tender it is recommended that each tenderer is given the opportunity to demonstrate their software which will then form part of the evaluation.

PCN software is normally provided with an integrated permit management module. Separate permit management software was recently procured as part of the Traffic Filters project. However, should Traffic Filters not be implemented or made permanent within the timescale for PCN Software procurement, the option to include a permit module should be included in the tender as this would remove the need for a further separate tender exercise.

It is recommended that PCN Software be procured through a framework with the option to supply permit software included.

5.2.2 ANPR Cameras

There are a number of VCA certified providers of ANPR cameras and associated evidence review software in an established market. However, the Council is not aware of a suitable framework for this lot. This forms a separate market from PCN software although all suppliers are able to interface with each other, enabling any evidence review software to send PCN data to any PCN software.

Offering this as a separate lot would enable the Council to purchase cameras needed for any Civil Enforcement requirement (including Traffic filters, weight limit monitoring, etc) and will enable the Council to equip its programmes for School Streets and Moving Traffic, covering the purchase, installation and ongoing yearly software hosting and maintenance of the cameras. This lot would also be used for purchasing cameras to enforce the current ZEZ and proposed expansion.

It is recommended that ANPR cameras and associated software be procured through an open tender.

5.3 ZEZ Vehicle Checker

As noted above, a direct award contract was made in August 2021 to supply the pilot ZEZ system. This contract covered:

- ANPR cameras (to enforce Zone)
- Vehicle checker (to confirm charge for entering the ZEZ).
- Online Payment (to enable the public to pay the ZEZ charge).

Contracts are required to replace the above functions as follows:

5.3.1 ANPR Cameras

It is anticipated that the ANPR Camera lot supplier will be able to supply suitable certified equipment for the ZEZ and this will be included in the specification for the ANPR Camera lot (see 5.2.2 above).

5.3.2 Vehicle Checker

The Vehicle Checker is highly specialised software and not available as a commercial product. The Council will therefore need to procure a developer to code the checker, with the Council owning the resulting product. This will enable the Council to specify a product that allows changes to the ZEZ configuration (e.g. amending the cost of entering the Zone) by Council staff and enable IT colleagues to make small changes to the software as requirements change (e.g. linking to the new DVLA/UKVD API link).

It is recommended that the development of the ZEZ Vehicle Checker be procured through an open tender.

5.3.3 Online Payment

The payment API may be provided by a specialist supplier that would link into the Council's Pay360 solution, ensuring that payments are made directly into the Council's account. However, it may also be possible to provide a cheaper alternative by using the National Parking Platform (NPP) to collect charges, a payment method already established within Oxfordshire.

Discussions with the NPP will need to establish whether this is a viable alternative and the Council will need to decide on the most appropriate route.

It is recommended that the payment of ZEZ charges be discussed with the NPP and a decision made to either use the NPP or procure a new payment service through an open tender.

5.4 Compliance Management Contract

This is the largest of the lots in terms of value and early market engagement has indicated that contractors want to bid for this work. This lot contains most strategic options which will be covered in more detail below. Even within this lot there are options, either to let all the functions as one lot (single supplier) or to break down the functions and decide whether to include them in the procurement scope or to manage them in-house. Each part of the service has been broken down and the options identified, the route to market for each will depend on the options chosen. Note however that a very restricted scope may

not be commercially attractive to many suppliers and this will need to be taken into account when choosing and combining options.

5.4.1 PCN and Permit Processing

It is assumed within these options that PCN and Permit Processing will continue to be delivered in-house. Whilst there may be some minor cost savings in outsourcing these, this would potentially be at the expense of responsiveness and quality as discussed above.

It is recommended that PCN and Permit Processing continue to be delivered in-house.

5.4.2 Civil Enforcement Officers and ANPR review

As discussed above, CEOs and ANPR Review Officers are currently outsourced. However it could be possible to bring CEOs and ANPR review officers into Council employment. This also includes the team providing first line P&D maintenance.

The Council may have better control over the patrol routes that are undertaken and direct enforcement to areas where members have concerns. Staff who would be employed by the Council are also likely to be paid more and have better terms and conditions than if they were employed in the private sector. However, these benefits could be delivered through well-defined specification and contract terms, and the potential benefits of direct employment need to be balanced with the risks. Civil Enforcement Officers are out in all weathers dealing with unhappy motorists who have received PCNs. Sickness absence can be an issue and the current contractor has also found it difficult to retain and recruit CEOs. There is also little or no cost benefit to direct employment of CEOs and ANPR Review Officers

On balance it is recommended that the employment of CEOs and ANPR Review Officers are included in the Compliance Management contract scope.

5.4.3 Correspondence Management

Contractors provide highly efficient Printing, scanning and posting services and it is unlikely that this could be provided as efficiently in-house.

It is recommended that Correspondence Management is included within the Compliance Management contract scope

5.4.4 Facilities

As discussed above, accommodation for contract staff, vehicles etc could be better provided directly by the Council.

It is recommended that Contractors are provided with premises by the Council.

5.4.5 Equipment

Many Councils supply high cost equipment such as vehicles, scan bikes etc through their authority-wide leasing arrangements. This may have some cost benefits for the Council so should be investigated as an option in any tender issued. Low value equipment (such as uniforms, handheld devices and printers) should be treated as consumables and provided by the contractor.

It is recommended that Contractors provide pricing for equipment but the Council retains the option to provide high value items directly.

5.4.6 Park and Ride

As described above, the Oxford Parkway and Thornhill park and ride car parks are currently enforced by Oxford City Council through an Agency Agreement. It is proposed that this agreement is not renewed and that the park and rides are included in the Compliance Management scope.

Tasks outside the usual Compliance Management scope (such as the cleaning of the buildings) can be added to existing contracts with our Facilities Team's responsibility.

It is recommended that the Agency Agreement ends, and the activities are undertaken by the Council's Civil Enforcement service

Recommendation summary

2. Options for Service Delivery			
Section		Recommendation	Description
2.1	Technology	The Council seeks to procure replacement contracts for hardware and software.	Hardware and software to support the Civil Enforcement service is too complex to be provided in house. Attempting to provide this in-house would create an unnecessary risk to revenue.
2.4.1	Management	The Council ensures that there are adequate resources to manage the chosen solution.	Services perform poorly when there is inadequate or inappropriate management. Significant loss of revenue often results, far outstripping any cost savings from reduced management.

5. Recommended Procurement Strategy			
Section		Recommendation	Description
5.1	Single Provider	The Council does not pursue the Single Provider route.	A single supplier contract is unlikely to provide the control and flexibility required by the Council. Multiple contracts will be required.
5.2.1	Technology	PCN (Enforcement) Software	PCN software should be procured through a framework with the option to supply permit software included
5.2.2	Technology	ANPR Cameras	ANPR cameras and associated software should be procured through an open tender.
5.3.1	ZEZ Vehicle Checker	ANPR Cameras	Include this in the specification for the ANPR Camera lot (5.2.2)
5.3.2	ZEZ Vehicle Checker	Vehicle Checker	The development of the ZEZ Vehicle Checker should be procured through an open tender
			No viable framework exists for this; therefore an open tender is the only practical option.
			The requirement is very similar to the wider ANPR cameras, therefore both can be included in the same lot.
			This is a highly specialised requirement that will need to be created for the Council. A small separate tender is the most likely to be successful.

	ZEZ Vehicle Checker	Online Payment	The payment of ZEZ charges should be discussed with the NPP and a decision made to either use the NPP or procure a new payment service through an open tender.	The Council already uses the NPP for parking payments, adding the ZEZ may be a simple way of providing a very flexible payment route for customers.
5.4.1	Compliance Management	PCN and Permit Processing	PCN and Permit Processing continue to be delivered in-house	This part of the service is provided efficiently by the in-house team, therefore there is no need to outsource.
5.4.2	Compliance Management,	CEOs and ANPR review	The employment of CEOs and ANPR Review Officers should be included in the Compliance Management contract scope.	This part of the service is already outsourced, the costs and disruption of moving in-house is unlikely to be offset.
5.4.3	Compliance Management	Correspondence Management	Correspondence Management should be included within the Compliance Management contract scope	This is a highly specialised activity and a high volume, highly automated service can be provided by most suppliers. This would be more efficient than a service provided in house.
5.4.4	Compliance Management	Facilities	Contractors should be provided with premises by the Council.	This would follow Council policy to provide buildings for its services and may result in cost savings
5.4.5	Compliance Management	Equipment	Contractors should provide pricing for equipment, but the Council retains the option to provide high value items directly.	An evaluation of the relative benefits of procuring from the compliance management contractor or using other Council contracts can be made at the time of procurement.
5.4.6	Compliance Management	Park and Ride	When the Agency Agreement ends, the activities should be undertaken by the Council's Civil Enforcement service	The service will be more efficient and there will be cost savings if this is included in the wider contracts and existing in-house services within Civil Enforcement.