

London Borough of Hammersmith and Fulham Record of Cabinet Member Decision

The call-in has expired and this decision can be implemented.

- ❖ Draft Decision List published on: 13 December 2021
- ❖ Confirmed Decision List published on: 16 December 2021

1. **TITLE: Whole-home zero-carbon retrofit award of contract**

2. **DECISION MADE BY:** Cabinet Member for Housing

3. **DECISION:**

That the Cabinet Member for Housing

1. Notes that Appendix A is exempt from disclosure on the grounds that it contains information relating to the financial or business affairs of any particular person (including the authority holding that information) under paragraph 3 of Schedule 12A of the Local Government Act 1972 (as amended).
2. Approves the award of the Responsive Capital contract to Engie Regeneration Limited from November 2021 to September 2022, for a total potential value of £2,410,000.

4. **REASON FOR DECISION:**

To support the decarbonisation of 28 properties on the West Kensington estate – a valuable first step in achieving the Council's Climate Emergency objectives.

5. **ALTERNATIVE OPTIONS CONSIDERED:**

1. Option 1: Sign a contract with Engie Regeneration Limited. The advantages of this option are that the design phase of the pilot can be mobilised straight away and the project can stay on track to deliver the retrofit works within allotted time period. By using the supplier provided by us through the Innovation Partnership, LBHF will be able to draw down the 40% project grant funding. The only disadvantages would be if LBHF had any concerns about the contractors that we have been matched with, and this is not the case.
2. Option 2: Do not sign a contract with Engie Regeneration Limited. This would cause a lot of disadvantages in terms of delaying, possibly terminating, the retrofit pilot on the West Kensington estate and would lose LBHF access to the 40% funding. There would only be advantages if LBHF felt it could procure a better value contractor through its own

competitive tender process, but the Procurement Strategy already considered this option and determined it was not a viable one for LBHF to pursue.

3. Option 3: Seek a different contractor from the GLA Innovation Partnership. This may be possible if LBHF has reason not to want to use Engie Regeneration Limited, though LBHF would need a very good reason, and none has been identified. The terms of the Innovation Partnership and the call-off contract already enable LBHF to exit the contract at the end of the design phase if LBHF does not want to pursue the design solution produced by Engie Regeneration Limited. In these circumstances the Innovation Partnership would attempt to find another contractor for LBHF, to prepare another design.

6. **CONFLICTS OF INTEREST DECLARED AND DISPENSATIONS GRANTED:**

None

Date of Decision
12 December 2021