



Efficiency and Performance Sub (Finance) Committee

Date: WEDNESDAY, 18 MAY 2016
Time: 12.00 pm
Venue: COMMITTEE ROOMS - WEST WING, GUILDHALL

Members: Jeremy Mayhew (Chairman)
Deputy Roger Chadwick (Deputy Chairman)
Randall Anderson
Nigel Challis
Deputy Anthony Eskenzi
Alderman Peter Estlin
Deputy Jamie Ingham Clark
Deputy Alastair King
Ian Seaton
Deputy John Tomlinson
Philip Woodhouse

Enquiries: Chris Braithwaite
tel.no.: 020 7332 1427
christopher.braithwaite@cityoflondon.gov.uk

Lunch will be served in the Guildhall Club at 1pm
NB: Part of this meeting could be the subject of audio or video recording

John Barradell
Town Clerk and Chief Executive

AGENDA

Part 1 - Public Agenda

1. **APOLOGIES**
2. **MEMBERS' DECLARATIONS UNDER THE CODE OF CONDUCT IN RESPECT OF ITEMS ON THE AGENDA**
3. **MINUTES OF THE PREVIOUS MEETING**
To agree the public minutes and non-public summary of the meeting held on 7 March 2016.
For Decision
(Pages 1 - 4)
4. **OUTSTANDING ACTIONS**
Report of the Town Clerk.
For Information
(Pages 5 - 10)
5. **SERVICE BASED REVIEW ROADMAP**
Report of the Town Clerk.
For Information
(Pages 11 - 22)
6. **QUESTIONS ON MATTERS RELATING TO THE WORK OF THE COMMITTEE**
7. **ANY OTHER BUSINESS THAT THE CHAIRMAN CONSIDERS URGENT**
8. **EXCLUSION OF THE PUBLIC**
MOTION - That under Section 100(A) of the Local Government Act 1972, the public be excluded from the meeting for the following items on the grounds that they involve the likely disclosure of exempt information as defined in Part I of the Schedule 12A of the Local Government Act.
For Decision

Part 2 - Non-Public Agenda

9. **NON-PUBLIC MINUTES OF THE PREVIOUS MEETING**
To agree the non-public minutes of the meeting held on 7 March 2016.
For Decision
(Pages 23 - 26)
10. **SERVICE BASED REVIEW SAVINGS - DEPARTMENTAL MONITORING**
Report of the Chamberlain.
For Information
(Pages 27 - 38)
11. **SERVICE BASED REVIEW: DEPARTMENTAL MONITORING - CHAMBERLAIN'S DEPARTMENT**
Report of the Chamberlain.
For Information
(Pages 39 - 42)

12. **NON-PUBLIC QUESTIONS ON MATTERS RELATING TO THE WORK OF THE COMMITTEE**
13. **ANY OTHER BUSINESS THAT THE CHAIRMAN CONSIDERS URGENT AND WHICH THE COMMITTEE AGREE SHOULD BE CONSIDERED WHILST THE PUBLIC ARE EXCLUDED**

This page is intentionally left blank

EFFICIENCY AND PERFORMANCE SUB (FINANCE) COMMITTEE

Monday, 7 March 2016

Minutes of the meeting of the Efficiency and Performance Sub (Finance) Committee held at the Guildhall EC2 at 1.45 pm

Present

Members:

Jeremy Mayhew (Deputy Chairman)
Randall Anderson
Nicholas Bensted-Smith
Nigel Challis
Deputy Anthony Eskenzi

John Fletcher
Deputy Jamie Ingham Clark
Deputy John Tomlinson
Philip Woodhouse

Officers:

Susan Attard	- Deputy Town Clerk
Christopher Braithwaite	- Town Clerk's Department
Neil Davies	- Town Clerk's Department
Peter Kane	- Chamberlain
Caroline Al-Beyerty	- Chamberlain's Department
Christopher Bell	- Chamberlain's Department
Peter Bennett	- City Surveyor
Professor Barry Ife	- Principal, Guildhall School of Music and Drama

1. APOLOGIES

Apologies were received from Deputy Roger Chadwick and Ian Seaton.

2. MEMBERS' DECLARATIONS UNDER THE CODE OF CONDUCT IN RESPECT OF ITEMS ON THE AGENDA

There were no declarations.

3. MINUTES OF THE PREVIOUS MEETING

RESOLVED – That the public minutes and non-public summary of the meeting held on 13 January 2016 be agreed as an accurate record.

4. OUTSTANDING ACTIONS

The Sub-Committee considered a report of the Town Clerk which set out the outstanding actions from previous meetings of the Sub-Committee.

The Chairman explained that a report on the Staff Suggestion Scheme would be submitted to the Sub-Committee at its next meeting.

The Sub-Committee also noted that there were indications that the future funding of Local Government finance may not be as positive as had previously been forecasted. Therefore, the Sub-Committee noted that it was vital that the

Corporation published an Efficiency Plan to achieve four-year certainty of Government funding.

RESOLVED – That the Committee notes the report.

5. **SERVICE BASED REVIEW ROADMAP**

The Sub-Committee considered a report of the Deputy Town Clerk which provided the latest update in respect of the agreed Service Based Review projects and cross-cutting reviews in the format of the Service Based Review Roadmap

The Chairman commented that he had requested an update on progress with the remodelling of Libraries project at that morning's Culture, Heritage and Libraries Committee. He explained that he had been assured that any delay with this project would not have any impact on the department's budget savings.

The Deputy Town Clerk advised Members that all Committees which would gain responsibility for making thematic grants were due to receive a report outlining their responsibilities.

RESOLVED – That the Sub-Committee notes the report.

6. **INCOME GENERATION - REPORT OF A CROSS-CUTTING SERVICE BASED REVIEW**

The Sub-Committee considered a report of the Chamberlain (on behalf of the Performance and Strategy Summit Group) which provided information regarding the outcomes of the cross-cutting review of Income Generation opportunities, which had been commissioned as part of the Service Based Review.

Members noted that it was vital that there was clarity regarding which department was responsible for delivering income generation in each area, particularly noting the potential for confusion in areas where the City Surveyor provided services to other departments of the Corporation, such as housing.

RESOLVED – That the Committee:

- a) endorses the report and recommendations;
- b) agrees headline recommendation 1 ("Harmonise the approach to setting all charges, fees and debt recovery for City Fund services with those of other relevant authorities within 12 months, unless a compelling business case is agreed for individual exceptions").

7. **WORK PLAN FOR FUTURE MEETINGS**

The Sub-Committee considered a report of the Town Clerk which set out the work plan for future meetings.

RESOLVED – That the Sub-Committee notes the report.

8. **QUESTIONS ON MATTERS RELATING TO THE WORK OF THE SUB-COMMITTEE**

There were no questions.

9. **ANY OTHER BUSINESS THAT THE CHAIRMAN CONSIDERS URGENT**

There were no items of urgent business.

10. **EXCLUSION OF THE PUBLIC**

RESOLVED - That under Section 100(A) of the Local Government Act 1972, the public be excluded from the meeting for the following items on the grounds that they involve the likely disclosure of exempt information as defined in Part I of Schedule 12A of the Local Government Act.

Item(s)

11-17

Paragraph(s)

3

11. **NON-PUBLIC MINUTES OF THE PREVIOUS MEETING**

The non-public minutes of the meeting held on 13 January 2016 were agreed as an accurate record.

12. **SERVICE BASED REVIEW SAVINGS - DEPARTMENTAL MONITORING - QUARTER 3**

The Sub-Committee noted a report of the Chamberlain which provided the quarterly budget monitoring update for Departments' Service Based Review savings programmes.

13. **GUILDHALL SCHOOL OF MUSIC AND DRAMA - OPERATING MODEL REVIEW**

The Sub-Committee noted a report of the Chamberlain which provided information regarding the operating model of the Guildhall School of Music and Drama.

14. **STRATEGIC ASSET MANAGEMENT SERVICE BASED REVIEW - PROCURING AND MANAGING SERVICES**

The Sub-Committee considered and approved a joint report of the Chamberlain and the Comptroller and City Solicitor which provided details of the outcome of the review of Procuring and Managing Services which had been commissioned as part of the Service Based Review.

15. **STRATEGIC ASSET MANAGEMENT SERVICE BASED REVIEW - ASSET AND FACILITIES MANAGEMENT**

The Sub-Committee noted a report of the Deputy Town Clerk which provided the Committee with information of the outcomes of the review of Asset and Facilities Management which had been commissioned as part of the Service Based Review.

16. **NON-PUBLIC QUESTIONS ON MATTERS RELATING TO THE WORK OF THE COMMITTEE**

There were no questions.

**17. ANY OTHER BUSINESS THAT THE CHAIRMAN CONSIDERS URGENT
AND WHICH THE COMMITTEE AGREE SHOULD BE CONSIDERED
WHILST THE PUBLIC ARE EXCLUDED**

There were no items of urgent business.

The meeting closed at 3.10 pm

Chairman

**Contact Officer: Chris Braithwaite
tel.no.: 020 7332 1427
christopher.braithwaite@cityoflondon.gov.uk**

EFFICIENCY AND PERFORMANCE SUB-COMMITTEE – OUTSTANDING ACTIONS

Item	Date	Action	Officer responsible	To be completed/ progressed to next stage	Progress Update
1.	January 2016	Staff Suggestion Scheme Officers to report back on the evaluation of the pilot scheme run from July-September 2015.	Deputy Town Clerk	May 2016	Update note attached at Appendix 1
2.	January 2016	Publication of an Efficiency Plan Officers to report on the Secretary of State for Communities and Local Government's offer for Local Authorities to qualify for a four-year settlement where they set out an "efficiency plan".	Chamberlain	July 2016	Potential plans for publishing an Efficiency Plan will be discussed at the Resource Allocation Sub-Committee Away Day. A report will be brought to the Committee following that event.
3.	March 2016	Strategic Energy Review Officers to provide a further update on the work of the Programme Board and implementation of the Strategic Energy Review recommendations.	Deputy Town Clerk	July 2016	The Programme Board is working with the lead officers for the individual recommendations to quantify potential savings and assign a priority rating to the recommendations that are still worth pursuing. An update report will be provided to the next meeting. The Sub Committee will also receive the annual energy consumption report for 2015/16 at its July 2016 meeting.

STAFF SUGGESTION SCHEME

Summary

In March 2016, the Chief Officer Summit Group received an evaluation report on the Staff Suggestion Scheme pilot and agreed:

- i. That the use of the Hunchbuzz software would not be extended, and
- ii. That a new Opportunity Outline would be developed, potentially by a group of the City Corporation's Graduate Trainees, to investigate alternative methods for capturing feedback and suggestions from staff, including face-to-face methods, and the potential for building a scheme that would:
 - reduce or spread more evenly the resource requirements of scheme administration and Chief Officer/senior manager involvement;
 - replicate the advantages of Hunchbuzz into the redevelopment of the Intranet, and
 - empower staff to link up with colleagues across the City Corporation to take forward their suggestions.

Evaluation Report

Background

1. The Staff Suggestion Scheme was relaunched in July 2015, for a three-month pilot using Hunchbuzz software on the Intranet to submit, record and publicise suggestions. Prior to the relaunch, meetings were held with the City Police to examine their system for recording and responding to suggestions.
2. The first stage of the pilot ran from July to September with the objective of collecting ideas from staff via the online system. This was to test whether the use of an online system would make any difference in terms of engagement in such a scheme.
3. The second stage of the pilot was to run the ideas collected in the first stage through a governance process involving an Ideas Board chaired by the Deputy Town Clerk. This process aimed to ensure that ideas were properly considered by departments, to monitor progress of ideas as they are developed, and to report on what impact the Suggestion Scheme is having on the organisation in terms of driving innovation. Chief Officers were asked to provide an initial response to each idea before consideration by the Board.
4. Following the end of the pilot period, the suppliers of Hunchbuzz quoted the following rates for extended use of the software:
 - i. for a further 12 months: c.£1,999/month (total c. £24,000)
 - ii. for a further 24 months: £1,600/month (total £37,400)

Evaluation

Hunchbuzz software platform

5. The Hunchbuzz software chosen for the pilot is designed to encourage, capture and recognise new ideas and suggestions from staff. Technically, the software worked well: single sign-on was enabled; staff were able to view/comment on suggestions made by colleagues; and participation and two-way communication across departments was encouraged.
6. A survey was sent to staff who had registered to use Hunchbuzz, with the following headline results (based on c.100 responses):
 - 74% agreed that it was important to them to be able to submit ideas for consideration by senior officers.
 - 48% said that having an online platform encouraged them to post ideas.
7. The three features of the online platform that respondents felt added most value were (in order): to see other people's ideas; to vote on other people's ideas; and to comment on and contribute to other people's ideas. The main issue arising from the open ended survey questions was the need for improved feedback, both generally and on specific ideas, and to be able to see the end result of successful suggestions ("you said, we did").

Idea generation

8. Ideas were invited under the following themes:
 - Engaging wellbeing initiatives
 - De-jargoning the workplace
 - Making better use of Guildhall Yard
 - Simplifying the way we work
 - Saving money on energy
9. Eighty-four suggestions were generated, far in excess of the number being submitted under the previous arrangements (two or three per quarter). A number of these (roughly 16%) were staff using the system to make comments ("venting"), rather than submit ideas. The majority of ideas submitted (c.67%) were department specific, rather than cross-cutting. (NB: the previous restriction on staff making suggestions in respect of their own department was lifted for this pilot.)

Administration

10. The generation of so many ideas over a short period created a significant administrative workload: sorting and submitting ideas to Chief Officers for comment; chasing responses; updating the system; preparing papers for the Ideas Board meetings; following-up after Ideas Board.
11. The pilot also reinforced the main issue with the previous system, which was that suggestions often fell down at departmental level with some colleagues either failing to reply, or giving very loose reasons why suggestions could not be taken

forward. This contributed to the sense amongst staff that suggestions were not taken seriously or just disappeared.

Ideas Board

12. The Ideas Board met twice to review Chief Officer responses. The Board provided a valuable “sense check” to the ideas suggested, but also requires a level of resourcing for preparation and follow-up.

Conclusions and Issues to be addressed

13. The relaunched staff suggestion scheme, using the software platform, significantly increased the number of suggestions made, demonstrating that there is a demand for a means by which staff can direct comments/venting and make suggestions for improvements, etc. where these can be acknowledged and resolved with minimal resource input.
14. There also needs to be a route for taking well thought-out ideas through to completion. This needs to be end-to-end, simple, and easy to resource. The suggested routes would be for:
 - Departmental ideas to be discussed at the relevant Departmental Management Team/Senior Leadership Team – ideally though encouraging staff to communicate directly with their line managers/Chief Officers, and
 - Cross-cutting ideas to be referred to the relevant Chief Officer Steering/Delivery Group.
15. However, the pilot has shown that the software cannot address the behavioural issues of the previous scheme, and that any scheme will not succeed without the buy-in of Chief Officers and their senior managers. As a result, it is doubtful whether this pilot system has significantly improved the experience for staff making suggestions.

Next steps

- The ideas suggested during the pilot are being pursued with departments.
- The Customer Services Delivery Group is being asked to consider the prioritisation and resourcing of work on a new Opportunity Outline, as agreed by the Summit Group.
- The outline will encompass the wider issues of staff engagement, and address the lessons learned by this pilot (as above), and also from the collection of staff suggestions as part of the Service Based Review process.
- As part of this process, a further meeting has been held with the City of London Police, to discuss their Staff Suggestion Scheme, in particular the methodology for engaging staff and ensuring suggestions were taken forward. A discussion was also held around how the City of London and City of London Police can work together and share best practice with regard to their respective suggestion schemes.
- A visit has also been made to the London Borough of Croydon to discuss their staff suggestion scheme and develop a better understanding of best practice elsewhere.

This page is intentionally left blank

Committee:	Date:
Efficiency and Performance Sub-Committee	18 May 2016
Subject: Service Based Review update	Public
Report of: Deputy Town Clerk	For Information
Report author: Neil Davies, Head of Corporate Performance and Development	

Summary

This report presents the Sub Committee with the latest update in respect of the Service Based Review cross-cutting reviews and key departmental projects in the format of the Service Based Review Roadmap. None of the projects has changed status since the last meeting. Updates in respect of the reviews are given in the main body of the report, in paragraphs 4 to 14.

All of the final cross-cutting review reports have been approved by Members and the reviews are now moving into the implementation stages. Chief Officer responsibility for oversight and monitoring of the cross-cutting reviews has been transferred to the new Chief Officer Delivery Groups, and other groups reporting to the Summit Group. Following a discussion at the final meeting of the Service Based Review Steering Group, a lessons learned report was produced, which is appended to this report.

Recommendation

Members are asked to note the report.

Main Report

Background

1. Members agreed to receive an update report at every meeting showing progress on the delivery of Service Based Review projects and programmes, including any actions to address problems identified. Progress is reported on a "Roadmap", attached as Appendix 1. This is in a common format, developed by the Corporate Programme Delivery Unit, who also work with Chief Officers to ensure that projects and programmes are delivered.
2. As the Service Based Review Steering Group met for the final time in March, oversight and monitoring of the cross-cutting reviews has transferred to the new Chief Officer Delivery Groups, and other groups reporting to the Chief Officer Summit Group, chaired by the Town Clerk.

Service Based Review Roadmap

3. The Service Based Review Roadmap (Appendix 1) lists cross-cutting reviews agreed by the Policy and Resources Committee in September 2014, together with other work arising from the Service Based Review Challenge Meetings, or requested by the Policy and Resources Committee. It records the key activities for each of the projects. Appendix 2 contains an outline of each of the reviews reported on the Roadmap.

Detailed Commentary – updates since the last report

Cross-cutting Reviews

4. Strategic Asset Management. This is the overarching proposal covering Facilities Management, Contract Management and Operational Property to ensure that there is integration across the three reviews. Membership of the Programme Board, which will be chaired by the Comptroller and City Solicitor, has been agreed. The Board will meet for the first time in May, to agree their terms of reference and receive update reports from each of the three reviews.
5. Facilities Management. A Project Manager has been appointed for the Facilities Management review, and a project team and board formed for initial work at the Central Criminal Court. This project will pilot the new agreed operating model and approach prior to rolling it out to other buildings/areas. The complete process will cover: data collection, options analysis, consultation, transitional planning, and implementation. The data collection has been completed and the analysis of the findings is underway. A paper on the approach, plan, and initial findings will be presented to the first meeting of the Strategic Asset Management Programme Board. Funding from the Transformation Fund for a Business Analyst to support this review has been approved by the Chief Officer Summit Group.
6. Contract Management. The final review report was agreed by the Efficiency and Performance Sub Committee in March, and the project is now in the implementation phase. Funding is being sought for the new Commercial Contract Team, initially from realised procurement savings from 2015/16. Any shortfall will be bid for from the Transformation Fund, with any funding from this source repaid as the new team contributes towards future savings. A consultant will be appointed to assist in the development of the agreed Contract Management framework and toolkit.
7. Operational Property. Work continues on seeking approval from relevant Service Committees to initiate implementation projects for the identified rationalisation opportunities. In March, the Port Health and Environmental Services Committee agreed proposals in respect of parts of the City of London Cemetery that had been highlighted as underutilised or surplus to requirement. Following the deferral of a proposal to allow the City of London Police to use part of the underutilised London Wall Car Park, a revised and more fully explained proposition will be presented to the Planning and Transportation Committee in May. Following concerns expressed by the Epping Forest and City Commons Committee over a proposal in respect of Warren House, an updated report will go

to the July Committee. Work on developing the cross-cutting car parks work stream and the linked Accommodation and Ways of Working programme has commenced.

8. Income Generation. The final review report has been approved by the Finance, and Policy and Resources Committees, and all of the Service Committees responsible for specific areas covered by recommendations within the final review report. The key issues relate to:

- Increasing charges to levels more approaching London averages.
- Taking a more overtly commercial approach in certain areas.
- Working more in partnership with the City's cultural and artistic institutions when seeking to secure corporate sponsorship and giving.

A bid is being made to the Transformation Fund in respect of the Heathrow Animal Reception Centre, to appoint a consultant to explore the potential business case for expanding the animal transit and inspection services on a more commercial basis to maximise potential income, in line with the second recommendation noted above.

9. Grants. In March, the Resource Allocation Sub Committee and Policy and Resources Committee received an update on the work to implement the agreed recommendations of this review, and approved:

- The current grant programmes which were in scope for immediate centralised administration;
- Overarching funding themes for the Central Grants Programme (2016-18): Stronger Communities; Education and Employment Support; Enjoying Open Spaces and the Natural Environment, and Inspiring London through Culture;
- The transfer of funding commitments from the Finance Grants Sub Committee;
- The allocation of funding across the four themes, and
- A review of the new arrangements, to take place in 2018, to align with the City Bridge Trust's quinquennial review.

Members questioned the proposed level of staffing resources for the new Central Grants Unit, and referred the matter back to officers for further consideration during the next stage of the implementation.

10. In order to progress with the introduction of the new approach, reports will be presented to the Committees that are assuming grant-giving functions, namely: the Community and Children's Services Committee; the Education Board; the Open Spaces and City Gardens Committee, and the Culture, Heritage and Libraries Committee. These will request agreement of sub-themes, eligibility criteria and other specific conditions or restrictions in respect of grant giving. Following these decisions, the resources needed to support the agreed schemes will be reviewed, and a revised resourcing proposal presented to the Policy and Resources Committee.

11. Effectiveness of Hospitality. Following consultation with the General Purposes Committee of Aldermen, and all Members at the informal Court of Common Council meeting in February, amended recommendations were approved by the Policy and Resources Committee in April. Implementation of the recommendations will be led by the City Events Management Group, chaired by

the Remembrancer, with Chief Officers or senior representatives from: Mansion House; Economic Development Office; Culture, Heritage and Libraries; Central Criminal Court; Barbican/GSMD, and the Museum of London. The Director of Communications will also be invited to attend. This Group will report regularly on its work to the Chief Officer Summit Group. Future reporting to Members will be primarily through the Hospitality Working Party and Policy and Resources Committee and reports to the Court.

Departmental Reviews

12. Remodelling Libraries. In April, the Projects Sub Committee agreed a request to halt work on the project for the transformation of Barbican Library due to pressures on internal resources and uncertainty over the future configuration of the Barbican Library in relation to the wider development of the Cultural Hub. The position is to be reinvestigated once the future shape of the Cultural hub is clearer.
13. The Shoe Lane project has proceeded to the stage of costed estimates and drawings, but progress was slower than anticipated due to the use of a new procurement framework and pressures on internal resources. Design options and costings have come in higher than anticipated and officers are considering all available options. This will include review of the feasibility and business case, in the light of higher costs, and further reports will follow. As noted at the Sub Committee's previous meeting, there are no Service Based Review financial targets dependent on the completion of this work.
14. Barbican Centre. Progress is reported regularly to the Barbican Centre Board and its Finance Sub Committee, in the form of a Barbican SBR Roadmap. Two areas are currently rated Amber: staffing and security/Front of House. The security proposals are rated Amber in response to the events in Paris in November; with work now underway to review security across the whole of the City Corporation, including the Centre. The aim is to deliver a service that is efficient, robust and responsive to the prevailing security status. The staffing proposals are rated Amber due to concerns over the timing of the reviews taking place of facilities and engineering staffing, which are anticipated to make up the bulk of the saving. All of the recommendations arising from the effectiveness review, conducted by AEA, have been incorporated into the Centre's strategic planning process, and regular updates on the Strategic Plan are also reported to the Board. A meeting of the officer Barbican Review Steering Group reviewed progress on 3 May. The Barbican Centre confirmed that their overall SBR savings target will be achieved.

Service Based Review Steering Group

15. The Service Based Review Steering Group met for the final time in March, and discussed the learning points from the Service based Review process to date. A full note of the discussion is attached as Appendix 3.

Conclusion

16. All of the final cross-cutting review reports have been approved by Members and the reviews are now moving into the implementation stages. Chief Officer responsibility for oversight and monitoring of the cross-cutting reviews has been transferred to the new Chief Officer Delivery Groups, and other groups reporting to the Summit Group.

Appendices

- Appendix 1 – Service Based Review Roadmap
- Appendix 2 – Outline of reviews
- Appendix 3 – Service Based Review Steering Group: Lessons Learned

Neil Davies

Head of Corporate Performance and Development

T: 020 7332 3327

E: neil.davies@cityoflondon.gov.uk

This page is intentionally left blank

Service Based Reviews Roadmap

Appendix 1

Page 17

Programme / Project	2016						February RAG	March RAG	
Last updates: end of March 2016	Feb	Mar	Apr	May	June	July --			
Cross Cutting									
Strategic Asset Management <i>Sponsor: Susan Attard</i>		• Update to Efficiency and Performance Sub Committee	• Project Manager appointed	• First Programme Board meeting			A	A	
>> Strategic Review of Operational Properties <i>Lead: Caroline Al-Beyerty, Peter Bennett</i>	• RASC agreed Barbican /GSMD Cap proposals • Cem & Crem opportunity agreed by PHES		• West Ham Park options to Officer Project Board	• Opportunities presented to P&T; EF&CC	• Update to CASC	• Opportunities presented to EF&CC	A	A	
>> Facilities Management <i>Sponsor: Susan Attard Lead: Richard Horner</i>	• Update to Steering and Summit Groups	• Update to Efficiency and Performance Sub Committee	• Central Criminal Court pilot: data collection and review				A	A	
>> Contract Management (Procuring and Managing Services) <i>Sponsor: Michael Cogher Lead: Chris Bell</i>		• Report to Efficiency and Performance Sub Committee	• Development of projects and programmes	• New Commercial Contract Team established	• Progress report to Project Sub (June) and Efficiency & Performance Sub (July)		G	G	
Income Generation <i>Sponsor: Peter Kane Lead: Matt Lock</i>	• Report to Policy & Resources; Finance, and other relevant Service Committees						G	G	
Effectiveness of Grants - Implementation <i>Sponsor: Susan Attard Lead: Scott Nixon</i>		• Report to Policy and Resources Committee		• Report to C&CS Committee and Education Board	• Report to Open Spaces Committee	• Report to CHL Committee	G	G	
Effectiveness of Hospitality <i>Sponsor: Paul Double Lead: Nick Lefton</i>	• Report to GP Aldermen • Consultation with all Members		• Report to Policy and Resources Committee		• Agreement of terms of reference, etc. for City Events Management Group	• Review of processes and sharing of best practice	G	G	
Independent Schools – fees, bursaries, scholarships							Closed		
Departmental									
Remodelling Libraries (Shoe Lane) <i>Sponsor: David Pearson / Ade Adetosoye Lead: Rosalina Banfield</i>		• Revised design and costings from Consultant	• Gateway 1/2 to Corporate Project Board	• Finalise design; approve cost; obtain landlord consent	• Invite tenders	• Appoint contractor	• (July-Sept) Construction	A	A
Barbican Centre <i>Sponsor: Nick Kenyon Lead: Sandeep Dwesar/Sarah Wall</i>		• Update to Barbican Finance Sub Committee and Board		• Meeting of Review Steering Group	• Update to Barbican Board		G	G	

R Project is in a critical state, guaranteed to go, or has gone beyond agreed tolerances (financial, benefits, timescales, quality)

A Project is slipping, has slipped or is about to slip within agreed tolerances

G Project is on track

This page is intentionally left blank

Service Based Review:

Outline of reviews included on Service Based Review Roadmap

Cross-cutting

1. Strategic Asset Management. A number of opportunities to mitigate cost and risk across the City Corporation's asset base have been identified. Due to the diversity, scope and complexity of the different suggestions, an overarching proposal has been created to ensure that the strategic aims are aligned across all the asset-related opportunity outlines. Where appropriate joint working will be utilised to achieve better outcomes overall.

Beneath the overarching proposal sit four work streams:

- Operational Property;
- Procuring & Managing Services (Contract Management);
- Project Management (All Project / Programme Management), and
- Facilities Management

The key issue to be addressed is that current arrangements for providing these services are inconsistent across the organisation. There is a lack of shared organisational understanding or consistency in the levels of service and how these are identified, delivered and measured, resulting in duplication of effort in some areas and a number of pinch points. Through these reviews, the opportunity to consolidate and rationalise, in order to deliver consistent and appropriately defined services in a more efficient and cost effective manner will be thoroughly tested.

Note: In March 2015, it was agreed to defer the review of Project Management until later in the overall programme.

2. Income Generation. The majority of the departmental proposals agreed by the Policy and Resource Committee in September 2014 relate to reducing costs, although several income generating proposals were put forward as part of this exercise. However, it was felt by Members that these proposals were not ambitious enough and that further opportunities should be explored. This review aims to identify both departmental and cross-cutting opportunities, such as promoting the city as a place to visit, and consequently increase income.
3. Effectiveness of Grants. This review examined the potential to improve the many different City Fund and City's Cash grant giving functions across the City Corporation to achieve better transparency and accountability, improved value for money, greater traction and administrative efficiencies. The final review report has been approved by the Policy and Resources Committee and the relevant spending Committees.

4. Effectiveness of Hospitality. This review will comprise a thorough examination of all aspects of the City Corporation's hospitality activities and how these link to the Corporation's Strategic Aims. Hospitality linked to events takes place in numerous ways and in different departments; and this review will examine how such hospitality can be coordinated so far as possible to maximise efficiency and effectiveness, and to achieve effective sharing of best practice.

Departmental

5. Remodelling Libraries. At the December 2014 meeting of the Policy and Resources Committee, Members received a report outlining transformation opportunities for the City Corporation's Library services. They agreed that the principle of ongoing transformation of the services should be pursued and that further work should take place on planning and costing a range of options relating to two of the City's Lending Libraries: Barbican and Shoe Lane. The proposal was to introduce more flexible, multi-use spaces which can be operated in partnership with Community and Children's Services.
6. Barbican Centre. As part of the Service Based Review process, Adrian Ellis Associates (AEA) Consulting was commissioned to provide a review of the Barbican Centre's current operations and to identify areas in which there might be scope for improvements in efficiency and effectiveness. They also scrutinised and assessed the Centre's Service Based Review proposals. An implementation plan has been developed to encompass both the Service Based Review proposals and the AEA recommendations. Progress against the plan will be monitored through the standard Corporate Programme Delivery Unit processes, and reported to a separate Barbican Review Steering Group which has been established, and includes the Chamberlain, the Managing Director and the Deputy Town Clerk.

Service Based Review Steering Group: Lessons and Reflections

Report of the Chamberlain



Background

The Service Based Review (SBR) Steering Group met for the final time on 07 March. At this meeting Steering Group attendees reflected upon the SBR process and explored lessons for the organisation. These items are detailed below.

Reflections of the Group

It was noted that there may have been too much focus on savings rather than opportunities for transformation. Transformation is much more difficult to communicate and this may have meant that there was more of a focus on the cost saving elements.

We need to be clear about the messages we are giving from the beginning, ensuring the messages are appropriate for different audiences: Members, Staff, Public and Communities we serve. We need to ensure these messages are then effectively promoted.

The balance between a 'strategic review' and a 'salami slice' was considered. Whilst the former was the intention of the process, it requires the organisation to be advanced in its thinking, especially with regards to identifying priorities. An understanding of this importance has developed through the process, and it ultimately resulted in Policy and Resources Committee starting to consider prioritising competing demands. This is a significant change in thinking.

Securing buy-in from Members was particularly important, when savings directly impacted on them. A shared understanding of 'what we are here for' is instrumental. Changing our ways of working, particularly with increased collaboration, will assist in this process.

The financial challenge has been met and this is a good result. The longer term result of transforming the organisation is still in progress. However, it is essential that the momentum gained through the SBR process is maintained and we need to embed SBR/Challenge as a continuous process.

We do not yet have an optimal way of challenging ourselves and are still too departmentally focussed.

We could do much more with our assets, and this could drive income generation. Income Generation and Marketing will need further work.

It was noted that there are many ways of communicating and identifying efficiency, particularly through the involvement of staff. Whilst this may delay improvements, it ensured greater traction and better results.

It was reflected that the addition of dedicated resources was able to move a number of projects forward. Whilst the organisation cannot rely entirely upon outside assistance, projects need to be appropriately resourced with the right skills to deliver change in the timeframes desired. We need to be much clearer about how long real change takes and realistic about achieving outcomes. Strategic Resources Group will oversee the work on improving project and programme management across the organisation.

By virtue of paragraph(s) 3 of Part 1 of Schedule 12A
of the Local Government Act 1972.

Document is Restricted

This page is intentionally left blank

By virtue of paragraph(s) 3 of Part 1 of Schedule 12A
of the Local Government Act 1972.

Document is Restricted

This page is intentionally left blank

By virtue of paragraph(s) 3 of Part 1 of Schedule 12A
of the Local Government Act 1972.

Document is Restricted

This page is intentionally left blank

By virtue of paragraph(s) 3 of Part 1 of Schedule 12A
of the Local Government Act 1972.

Document is Restricted

This page is intentionally left blank