

Appendix 1 – Green Deal Options Assessment

Option	Description	Pros	Cons	Financial implications	Ranking
Option 1 - Promoter	Do minimum, promote the initiative and provide information but leave it to providers to develop delivery.	Relatively straightforward to deliver and minimises the council's input to delivery and minimises direct association with the initiative which may not be well received by the public.	Could be confusing to residents as many providers are likely to be operating in the city and there may be a high risk of miss-selling. A lack of direct involvement may not reduce the extent to which the council is associated with the initiative. The council would have very little influence over the delivery of the initiative locally.	This is the lowest cost option. Most costs will be associated with officer time relating to promotional activities and information provision.	2
Option 2 - Promoter with preferred local provider	As above but also develop a partnership with a 'preferred' or endorsed local delivery agent via a procurement exercise and a memorandum of understanding. Possible preferred providers include Gentoo and the energy providers.	Developing a preferred local delivery agent would enable some degree of influence over delivery. May reduce the numbers of providers operating in the city and therefore reduce confusion to residents.	Links the council more closely with the delivery of an initiative that is an unknown quantity in terms of public opinion. May not reduce the activities of other providers in the city.	It is likely that the above costs could be shared with the preferred provider but there will also be some initial procurement costs	2

<p>Option 3 - Partner with Providers</p>	<p>Council uses procurement/selection process to identify one or more approved partner providers. SCC joining Warm Up North (WUN) is consistent with this option</p>	<p>Relatively low cost after procurement/selection. Provides for control and targeting of activity. Clearer delivery for residents with Council's endorsement of a single provider providing confidence.</p>	<p>Costs incurred and resources required for procurement/selection. Higher level of officer engagement. Greater responsibility for effective delivery. Risk management issues. Council reputation. The requirement for the council to make a financial commitment to the model has been replaced by the use of the Green Deal Finance Company but there is a possibility that the GDFC may not be operational at the start of the WUN initiative.</p>	<p>The option to join WUN will require a contribution of £40k. towards the initial procurement exercise. Subsequent costs are relatively low with the provider taking responsibility for promotion and delivery.</p>	<p>1</p>
<p>Option 4 - Provider</p>	<p>Council has sole control and responsibility including procurement of installation services</p>	<p>Full control over delivery and quality of service lies with Council. The offer is clear to residents and would reduce confusion. Control provides the basis on which local priorities may be targeted and it would be easier to monitor delivery.</p>	<p>High cost option requiring significant internal resource to operate the scheme and manage delivery of the scheme. Absolute responsibility for all outcomes, good and bad would rest with the Council. It is probably too late to consider the development of this option.</p>	<p>High cost option requiring the development of a dedicated delivery mechanism.</p>	<p>3</p>