

25 September 2020

To: The Leader and Deputy Leader of the Council;
Councillors Jeff Cant, Jo Day, Sue Farrant, Jon Gage, Stephen Masters, Gary Norman, Elizabeth O’Keeffe, Erik Pattenden,

Substitutes: Councillors Jeff Beck, Roger Hunneman, David Marsh, Martha Vickers and Tony Vickers.

Also: All Members of the Council for information.

Dear Councillor

You are summoned to attend a meeting of the **Policy & Resources Committee** to be held on Zoom on **Wednesday 30 September at 6.00 pm.**

Join Zoom Meeting

<https://us02web.zoom.us/j/85669649544?pwd=dW1ORHNSakZmL1dSemM2dmV1WFpmQT09>

Meeting ID: 856 6964 9544

Passcode: 121052

Yours sincerely,

Hugh Peacocke,
Chief Executive Officer

AGENDA

1. Apologies for absence

Chairperson

2. Declarations of interest and dispensations

Chairperson

To receive any declarations of interest relating to business to be conducted in this meeting and confirmation of any relevant dispensations.

3. Exclusion of the press and public

Chairperson

To move: That under Section 1, Paragraph 2 of The Public Bodies (Admission to Meetings) Act 1960 the press and public be excluded from the meeting for the following items of business because publicity would be prejudicial to the public interest by reason of the confidential financial nature of the business to be transacted.

4. Newbury Town Council website

Chairperson

To appoint a supplier to deliver a new website, support and training

(Please see attached report from Mint Consultants)



64 ,The Priory,
London Road,
Brighton,
BN1 8QT

www.mintconsultancy.co.uk

Re: Newbury Town Council Website

Introduction

This document has been put together to run alongside the 6 supplied quotes from suppliers to produce the new Newbury Town Council website.

The comments in this document are solely those of Stephen Sharp based on proposals submitted by the companies and brief initial conversations on the phone with each.

The comments are not to be published externally or shared with any of the companies.

The comments are made based on what Stephen has in front of him and from his experience in this field.

I have weighted my judgements on Creativity V Technical, Useability Internally v Secure .

Style v Compliant

Process

Following the review of this document and reading of the 6 proposals I suggest drawing up a short list of two companies.

Speaking with several of their clients for references and holding a further 30-minute interview – I have already carried this out with AppCentric & AP&C.

Then we make a quick decision on which company to work with. To reach target dates suggest we appoint by 1st October.

Stephen Sharp
Managing Director

Selection Process

There are many elements to judge the chosen supplier by, as a successful website is multi layered.

The suggested areas we should judge by are

1. Design and creativity
2. Technical ability (Not bespoke Software)
- 3. Understanding of new “Local Government Accessibility Laws”**
4. Cost
5. Account management and responsiveness
- 6. On Going Support & Training**
7. Hosting and security Knowledge

I have scored each company so far from 1-5 against these criteria.

The key steps of the process are

1. Site map
2. Copy
3. Design
4. Photography Selection
5. Software Platform choice
6. Staging server set up
7. Programming & Build
8. Testing
9. Migration from current site
10. Hosting
11. Internal training
12. Continued support

From my experience not necessarily one company will be best at all these steps and some of the above is best kept in house or spilt amongst a couple of suppliers.

Once selection of main supplier is done, I will suggest which stages we may consider splitting.

This may be better for skill sets, cost, speed, and control.

I would like to be transparent from the start I see a role for ongoing support and advice to NTC re their digital footprint and would like to be considered for this , but will clearly map out that role so it can also easily be rewarded internally or to another third party.

The Candidates

AP&C – Apple Print

Newbury based company with a decent portfolio of clients. The MD Andrew Watts is a nice guy and would be easy to work with.

Their quote was incredibly open ended but they have requoted, and I now feel they are a serious contender for the project. They show creativity and a customer service focus, slightly less technical but enough with my input on the project. Cost is now good.

Proposal lacks the detail of others, but they talk the talk on the phone. I would need to manage them closely, but their lower cost gives this option within budget.

I have spoken with two of their clients who speak very highly of AP& C but a slight concern over design ability .

Scoring

1. Design and creativity	3
2. Technical ability (Not bespoke Software)	2
3. Understanding of new “Local Government Accessibility Laws”	2
4. Cost	4
5. Account management and responsiveness	4
6. On Going Support & Training	3
7. Hosting and security Knowledge	3
8. Locality	5
Total	26

Creotec

A local Newbury company, their proposal is clear and professionally written.

Spoke with Michael Gbadebo – Director, not a brilliant communicator and quite technical

The company has some good work examples and their cost is extremely competitive.

I have slight concerns over customer service & creativity I think we would need to add some additional third-party cost to their proposal.

1. Design and creativity	2
2. Technical ability (Not bespoke Software)	3
3. Understanding of new “Local Government Accessibility Laws”	2
4. Cost	5
5. Account management and responsiveness	2
6. On Going Support & Training	3
7. Hosting and security Knowledge	3
8. Locality	5
Total	25

Maxx Design

Based in Newbury a very highly polished company, demonstrating a very slick approach.

Their proposal is more about them than use. Spoke with Jackie Balker – Director – who again is very professional and slick.

They are much more about design than technical, very expensive. Do not recommend.

1. Design and creativity	4
2. Technical ability (Not bespoke Software)	2
3. Understanding of new “Local Government Accessibility Laws”	2
4. Cost	0
5. Account management and responsiveness	4
6. On Going Support & Training	3
7. Hosting and security Knowledge	2
8. Locality	5

CONFIDENTIAL **Total 22**

Firtsy

Without doubt the best prepared proposal. they do not spend half the space talking about themselves but going though in detail.

They know their stuff and fully understand what is required. Not highly creative so would need support on this side. Biggest issue is cost which is too high to carry out the project within budget

1. Design and creativity	3
2. Technical ability (Not bespoke Software)	4
3. Understanding of new "Local Government Accessibility Laws"	3
4. Cost	0
5. Account management and responsiveness	3
6. On Going Support & Training	4
7. Hosting and security Knowledge	3
8. Locality	5

Total 25

CONFIDENTIAL

TEEC

A local company specialising in Local parish Council websites. they have very good understanding of the new Accessibility rules.

They have their own Software system but can also do the site in WordPress.

In my opinion they show a lack of creativity. Spoke with owner Michael Germany who has lots of views, found them harder to deal with on the phone than any other supplier.

Their cost is as good but be aware of additional cost.If we want very safe and the same as everyone else pick this company , but I think you will be disappointed with the result .

1. Design and creativity	1
2. Technical ability (Not bespoke Software)	3
3. Understanding of new “Local Government Accessibility Laws”	5
4. Cost	3
5. Account management and responsiveness	3
6. On Going Support & Training	3
7. Hosting and security Knowledge	3
8. Locality	4
Total	25

AppCentric

Last company to tender via Vaughan's recommendation.

Spoke with Adam many times over the weekend. I really like this company they are very responsive and keen. They have a good selection of clients and a good technical knowledge. Higher priced but would be easier to work with. After speaking with Adam they have reduced their cost by £1k . I have spoken with two of their clients who speak very highly of AppCentric . Not based in Newbury.

I really like their creative style , its fresh , modern , they have never done a Council website but many charities , but I think this would give us a "best of breed" website to showcase .

1. Design and creativity	4
2. Technical ability (Not bespoke Software)	4
3. Understanding of new "Local Government Accessibility Laws"	3
4. Cost	3
5. Account management and responsiveness	4
6. On Going Support & Training	4
7. Hosting and security Knowledge	3
8. Locality	2

Total 27

Recommendations

As mentioned above I think we should select two suppliers and then hold an interview with those companies.

My suggestions would be those marked in Green

Appcentric - They have now reduced cost by £1,000

AP&C - I now have full breakdown and am happy

Cost Breakdown

<u>AP&C</u>	<u>Appcentric</u>
Agency Design & Build	
£9,000	£12,225
Copywriter	
£1,000	£1,000
Project management	
£4,000	£3,000
Migration of existing Content	
£1,000	£1,000
Training	
£500	£500
Hosting Set Up / Switch	
£500	£500
Total £16,000	£18,225

Both these quotes give us some contingency monies if required which is often the case to stay within budget.

On Going Monthly costs to be considered

Hosting **£150**

Maintenance **£150**

Optional to be discussed

Search Engine Optimisation **£500**

To include 2 written blogs and Monthly reports

Summary & Recommendations

We have had some very good proposals, very varied thou which I am not sure in any other industry you would find, it makes the selection process hard.

I have re-read the proposals many times and spoken with each company.

To me one candidate jumps out and that is Adam at AppCentric – I know they are not based in Newbury but I am very reassured by the way they work (it matches the way I do)

I have selected two companies but to me its very clear Number One.

Two and Three is closer with AP&C second, TEEC third. AP&C are a good solid local company but lack creativity. TEEC are the cheapest but found their sites to look too samey and not creative enough -p they would be a safe bet but I think we have an opportunity here to produce something for people to copy in the future , not for us to copy .

Two key points stressed by Hugh have always been “ Ease of use “ by the internal team ongoing – the two chosen proposals tick that box very strongly , Compliance the same.