

# Contract for learning management software

Cabinet Member for Finance and Commissioning

Date: 17<sup>th</sup> of June 2022  
Agenda Item: N/A  
Contact Officer: Kevin Sleeman  
Tel Number: 01543 308120  
Email: Kevin.sleeman@lichfielddc.gov.uk  
Key Decision? YES  
Local Ward Members N/A



**CABINET MEMBER  
DECISION**

## 1. Executive Summary

- 1.1 We have a requirement to purchase software through the “Performance Management (People)” workstream of “Being a better council”. This software that will enable us to deploy training courses and policies to staff along with enhancing the staff appraisal processes and recently introduced “Objectives and Key Results”.

## 2. Recommendations

- 2.1 That a contract is entered into with Accipio Ltd as the implementers of the software platform for a minimum period of 2 years and the option to extend for up to a further 2 years.

## 3. Background

- 3.1 The BABC programme has the workstream “Performance Management (People)” under the work strand “Better Performing”. This work strand has introduced the “Objectives and Key Results (OKR) for all staff and enables the performance conversations to move from being a yearly performance development review (PDR) to a continuous conversation between employee and manager where appropriate.
- 3.2 Following a trial of electronic PDRs in 2020, one of the outcomes of the trial highlighted the investment needed by a manager to determine all the criteria to assess an employee ahead of the PDR meeting. The corporate wide OKRs address this concern.
- 3.3 Through a series of discussions with key stakeholders it was agreed that performance management would be split into two areas, people performance management and corporate performance management. In the short-term corporate performance management would remain on the existing system with people performance management (covering training and performance reviews) would be on a separate system.
- 3.4 For various reasons the management of training had been split across two systems, one for IT policy acceptance and training, and the other via a contract with another local authority.
- 3.5 During the Autumn of 2021 both training systems were reviewed for their suitability to become a new single platform for both training and the OKRs. Neither product at that point could deliver what was needed.

- 3.6 The system for IT policy acceptance and training, which was coming to an end in March 2022 would not support the OKRs and hadn't been widely adopted for policy compliance and training outside of the IT team. Through conversations with the supplier, the future development roadmap did not align to our direction of travel, and whilst having nice features such as alerting non-compliance to managers, the lack of support for OKRs and no plans to integrate with tools such as Microsoft Teams outweighed the benefits.
- 3.7 The system procured through another local authority was a relatively new implementation with them having moved from another package. The product in use is made up of three modules. The other local authority had only purchased the module to allow for training courses. As a result of trying to shoehorn us into the contract it limited the amount of functionality available for us and resulted in manual work to maintain accounts in the system. Having had demonstrations from one of the companies who implements the platform it was clear the system can do much more than the current contract provides including the ability to address the OKR requirement.
- 3.8 Following the research phase a procurement exercise was launched to look at purchasing the product through an agency who can host it via the G-Cloud/Digital Marketplace.
- 3.9 The initial search of the G-Cloud framework resulted in 22 results from a long list of 13 companies. Following an initial review, approved by the former procurement manager several companies were discounted based on costs and a short list of 5 companies produced.
- 3.10 The published service descriptions varied dramatically rendering it impossible to evaluate on a level playing field. A specification of features and support requirements was produced, and the former procurement manager sought and gained the approval of Crown Commercial Services to issue the specification as a clarification question.
- 3.11 The responses were evaluated under the MEAT (Most Economically Advantageous Tender) approach with a split of 75% quality and 25% price. The maximum number of points achievable under the quality element was 215 points and the pricing element was determined using the standard approach of the cheapest bid being awarded the full marks and then scoring declining based on the dividing the tendered price by the lowest price and multiplying by the pricing proportion. This results in the following scoring table.

	Functionality Scoring (75%)	Percentage	Costs (25%)	Percentage	Total	Rank
Supplier A	206	71.86%	£82,080	14.74%	86.60%	1
Supplier B	165	57.56%	£48,400	25.00%	82.56%	3
Supplier C	179	62.44%	£108,696	11.13%	73.57%	5
Supplier D	176	61.40%	£57,181	21.16%	82.56%	4
Supplier E	183	63.84%	£61,500	19.67%	83.51%	2

- 3.12 Based on the highest overall score of both price and quality it is recommended that the contract is awarded to Supplier A who are Accipio Ltd.

Alternative Options	1. Do nothing – this would mean the council would not have effective methods of delivering and monitoring training (including statutory training).
Consultation	Not applicable
Financial Implications	1. There is an existing budget for the previous training package in the MTFS.
Approved by Section 151 Officer	Yes

Legal Implications	1. The procurement will be via direct award on the G-Cloud framework. This a framework that has already been tendered and this approach is a permitted and legally compliant method of using the framework.
Approved by Monitoring Officer	Yes

Contribution to the Delivery of the Strategic Plan	1. The provision of the training and OKR management system contributes towards the strategic aim of “a council that is fit for the future” as well as a part of the “Better Performing” workstream of “Being a Better Council”.
--	---

Equality, Diversity and Human Rights Implications	Not applicable
---	----------------

Crime & Safety Issues	Not applicable
-----------------------	----------------

Environmental Impact	Not applicable
----------------------	----------------

GDPR / Privacy Impact Assessment	Not applicable
----------------------------------	----------------

	Risk Description & Risk Owner	Original Score (RYG)	How We Manage It	Current Score (RYG)
A	The budget for the contract is not made available.  Kevin Sleeman	Red (severe)	Confirm the budget is available through the Finance and Procurement team.	Green (tolerable)

	Background documents
--	----------------------

	Relevant web links
--	--------------------