



Efficiency and Performance Sub (Finance) Committee

Date: MONDAY, 7 MARCH 2016
Time: 1.45 pm
Venue: COMMITTEE ROOMS - WEST WING, GUILDHALL

Members: Deputy Roger Chadwick (Chairman) John Fletcher
Jeremy Mayhew (Deputy Chairman) Deputy Jamie Ingham Clark
Randall Anderson Ian Seaton
Nicholas Bensted-Smith Deputy John Tomlinson
Nigel Challis Philip Woodhouse
Deputy Anthony Eskenzi

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

Lunch will be served in 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 13 January 2016.

For Decision
(Pages 1 - 4)
4. **OUTSTANDING ACTIONS**
Report of the Town Clerk.

For Information
(Pages 5 - 8)
5. **SERVICE BASED REVIEW ROADMAP**
Report of the Town Clerk.

For Information
(Pages 9 - 16)
6. **INCOME GENERATION - REPORT OF A CROSS-CUTTING SERVICE BASED REVIEW**
Report of the Chamberlain (on behalf of the Performance and Strategy Summit Group).

For Decision
(Pages 17 - 28)
7. **WORK PLAN FOR FUTURE MEETINGS**
Report of the Town Clerk.

For Information
(Pages 29 - 30)
8. **QUESTIONS ON MATTERS RELATING TO THE WORK OF THE SUB-COMMITTEE**
9. **ANY OTHER BUSINESS THAT THE CHAIRMAN CONSIDERS URGENT**
10. **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 Schedule 12A of the Local Government Act.

For Decision

Part 2 - Non-Public Agenda

11. **NON-PUBLIC MINUTES OF THE PREVIOUS MEETING**
To agree the non-public minutes of the meeting held on 13 January 2016.
For Decision
(Pages 31 - 34)
12. **SERVICE BASED REVIEW SAVINGS - DEPARTMENTAL MONITORING - QUARTER 3**
Report of the Chamberlain.
For Information
(Pages 35 - 44)
13. **GUILDHALL SCHOOL OF MUSIC AND DRAMA - OPERATING MODEL REVIEW**
Report of the Chamberlain. This report will also be considered by the Finance Committee on 15 March 2016 and the Finance and Resources Committee of the Board of Governors of the Guildhall School of Music and Drama on 11 April 2016.
For Information
(Pages 45 - 48)
14. **STRATEGIC ASSET MANAGEMENT SERVICE BASED REVIEW - PROCURING AND MANAGING SERVICES**
Joint report of the Chamberlain and the Comptroller and City Solicitor.
For Decision
(Pages 49 - 68)
15. **STRATEGIC ASSET MANAGEMENT SERVICE BASED REVIEW - ASSET AND FACILITIES MANAGEMENT**
Report of the Deputy Town Clerk.
For Information
(Pages 69 - 80)
16. **NON-PUBLIC QUESTIONS ON MATTERS RELATING TO THE WORK OF THE COMMITTEE**
17. **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

Wednesday, 13 January 2016

Minutes of the meeting of the Efficiency and Performance Sub (Finance) Committee held at the Guildhall EC2 at 11.30 am

Present

Members:

Deputy Roger Chadwick (Chairman)	Deputy Jamie Ingham Clark
Jeremy Mayhew (Deputy Chairman)	Ian Seaton
Randall Anderson	Deputy John Tomlinson
Nigel Challis	Philip Woodhouse
Deputy Anthony Eskenzi	

Officers:

Susan Attard	- Deputy Town Clerk
Christopher Braithwaite	- Town Clerk's Department
Neil Davies	- Town Clerk's Department
Peter Kane	- Chamberlain
Christopher Bell	- Chamberlain's Department
Mark Jarvis	- Chamberlain's Department
Paul Nagle	- Chamberlain's Department
Peter Bennett	- City Surveyor
Sue Ireland	- Director of Open Spaces

1. APOLOGIES

Apologies were received from Nick Bensted-Smith and John Fletcher.

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 4 November 2015 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.

Members discussed whether the proposed Barbican Centre Service Based Review savings would be achievable without changes to the pay and conditions of employees. The Chamberlain and a Member, also the Chairman of the Barbican Centre Board, confirmed that the Managing Director of the Barbican Centre was committed to delivering the agreed Service Based Review savings

the Barbican Centre, and alternative savings proposals had been identified in the event that the initial proposals were not achievable.

RESOLVED – That the Committee notes the report.

5. **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)	Paragraph(s)
6-15	3

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

The non-public minutes of the meeting held on 4 November 2015 were agreed as an accurate record.

7. **SERVICE BASED REVIEW: DEPARTMENTAL MONITORING - OPEN SPACES DEPARTMENT**

The Sub-Committee noted a report of the Director of Open Spaces which provided an update in relation to that Department's performance against Service Based Review savings targets.

8. **CROSS CUTTING REVIEW UPDATE - STRATEGIC REVIEW OF ASSET MANAGEMENT**

The Sub-Committee noted a presentation from the Deputy Town Clerk which provided an update about the Strategic Review of Asset Management, and set out the recommendations which had emerged from the review.

9. **NON-PUBLIC APPENDIX TO SERVICE BASED REVIEW ROADMAP - REVIEW OF INDEPENDENT SCHOOLS**

The Sub-Committee noted a non-public appendix to the report of the Deputy Town Clerk setting out the Service Based Review Roadmap, which provided an update on Independent Schools.

10. **SERVICE BASED REVIEW SAVINGS PROGRAMME - PROFILING CHANGES**

The Sub-Committee noted a report of the Chamberlain which summarised the changes to Departmental Savings Programmes which had been agreed by Service Committees as part of the Service Based Review process.

11. **SERVICE BASED REVIEW: DEPARTMENTAL MONITORING - TOWN CLERK'S DEPARTMENT**

The Sub-Committee noted a report of the Town Clerk which provided an update in relation to that Department's performance against Service Based Review savings targets.

12. **ENERGY TARGETS UPDATE - HALF YEAR REVIEW - APRIL - SEPTEMBER 2015**

The Sub-Committee noted a report of the City Surveyor which provided the half yearly update on energy reduction targets as part of the Carbon Descent Plan 2015.

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

There were no questions.

14. **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.

15. **MEMBERS ONLY APPENDIX TO SERVICE BASED REVIEW: DEPARTMENTAL MONITORING - TOWN CLERK'S DEPARTMENT**

The Sub-Committee noted a confidential appendix to the report of the Town Clerk which provided the Committee with details of the Service Based Review savings which had been identified by that Department.

Admittance of the public

Following consideration of this item, Members resolved to readmit the public to the meeting.

16. **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.

The Sub-Committee was informed that the Service Based Review Steering Group had agreed that the Review of Operational Property and the Review of Grants would now be rated as Green.

RESOLVED – That the Sub-Committee notes the report.

17. **WORK PLAN FOR FUTURE MEETINGS**

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

The Chamberlain highlighted to the Sub-Committee that the Government had indicated in the Autumn Statement that authorities which published an efficiency plan would receive four-year certainty of funding from Government. He explained that a report would be submitted to the next meeting of the Sub-Committee to provide information regarding the requirements for publishing such an efficiency plan, should such information be available at that time.

RESOLVED – That the Sub-Committee notes the report.

18. **CIPFA VALUE FOR MONEY INDICATORS - 2014/15**

The Sub-Committee considered a report of the Chamberlain which outlined the CIPFA Public Sector Corporate Services Value for Money Indicators for Finance, Human Resources and Legal Services for 2014/15 and compared movement to the previous submission for 2013/14.

A Member asked for clarification regarding indicators LS5 and LS8, which indicated that the Corporation was slightly above average for the cost of legal function per employee but was in the top quartile for the cost per hour of legal work. The Chamberlain agreed to provide a response to this question directly to the Member following the meeting.

RESOLVED – That the Committee notes the report.

19. **QUESTIONS ON MATTERS RELATING TO THE WORK OF THE SUB-COMMITTEE**
There were no questions.
20. **ANY OTHER BUSINESS THAT THE CHAIRMAN CONSIDERS URGENT**
There were no items of urgent business.

The meeting closed at 1.00pm

Chairman

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

Efficiency and Performance Sub-Committee – Outstanding Actions – March 2016

Item	Date	Action	Officer responsible	To be completed/ progressed to next stage	Progress Update
1.	January 2013	Staff Suggestion Scheme Officers to report back on the incentives offered to staff who suggest good ideas through the City Corporation's Staff Suggestion Scheme and also the level of uptake.	Deputy Town Clerk	March 2016	The Customer Services Delivery Group will consider the full evaluation report of the three-month pilot scheme in March and make a recommendation to the Performance and Strategy Summit Group on the future operation of the scheme.
2.	January 2016 (item 8)	Strategic Asset Management (cross-cutting review) An update report to be submitted in March 2016 on the outcomes from the Strategic Asset Management cross-cutting reviews.	Deputy Town Clerk	March 2016	Report to the Efficiency and Performance Sub Committee in March 2016.
3.	January 2016 (item 12)	Energy costs Members commented that the circulated report did not provide information regarding the amount spent on energy, and discussed issues relating to energy spend.	City Surveyor	February 2016	A report on the City Corporation's energy procurement contract was agreed by the Finance Committee on 16 th February, recommending that the Court of Common Council approve the appointment of a managing agent to procure the City Corporation's energy requirements.

Item	Date	Action	Officer responsible	To be completed/ progressed to next stage	Progress Update
4.	January 2016 (item 12)	Strategic Energy Review Officers to report back to the next meeting on the work of the Energy Programme Board and implementation of the Strategic Energy Review recommendations.	Deputy Town Clerk	March 2016	An update in respect of the Strategic Energy Review Programme Board is attached to this schedule (Appendix 1).
5.	January 2016 (item 17)	Publication of an Efficiency Plan The Secretary of State for Communities and Local Government has stated that Local Authorities may qualify for a four-year settlement where they set out an “efficiency plan”.	Chamberlain	tba – further guidance awaited from DCLG	The Strategic Resources Group has discussed this proposal, which could provide certainty around Government funding up to and including 2019/20. It is likely that the Medium Term Financial Strategy will provide Local Authorities with the basis for their efficiency plans. A deadline of 14 October has been established for authorities to respond to this offer.

STRATEGIC ENERGY REVIEW PROGRAMME BOARD

1. In May 2013, the City Corporation commissioned a consultancy firm (AECOM) to carry out a strategic energy review of the operational estate. The overall aim of the review was to prepare a roadmap for how the City Corporation can reduce its energy use by 40% by 2025 against a 2008/09 baseline. As a result of this study a set of recommendations were put forward, and agreed by the Chief Officer Summit Group in January 2014. By reducing the demand for energy the City is also aiming to reduce its energy costs which at present are on a constant upward trajectory.
2. Below is a summary of the recommendations that have been agreed:
 - Identification of the most appropriate technology to use;
 - Identification of the most appropriate properties for prioritisation;
 - Optimising building and space planning and location utilisation;
 - Optimisation of the Building Management System;
 - Onsite energy generation and distribution (including renewables);
 - Server room utilisation;
 - Financing options and mechanisms for implementing the energy reduction measures;
 - Changes to operational procedures; and
 - Behavioural and corporate culture issues.
3. One of the recommendations was to set up an Energy Efficiency Fund, which would allow for an easy access to finance, enabling the City Corporation to make strategic investments in its operational properties in order to reduce energy consumption and counter the impact of rising energy prices. The Efficiency and Performance Sub Committee received a report on the proposed fund in September 2014. In March 2015, final Member approval was received on setting up a £2.5 million pilot fund (which will be an interest free repayable loan for five years) with funding of £500,000 each year for five years.
4. An officer Strategic Energy Review Programme Board has been established, consisting of:
 - Susan Attard (Deputy Town Clerk) – Programme Sponsor
 - Sue Ireland (Director of Open Spaces)
 - Mansi Sehgal (Corporate Energy Manager, City Surveyor's Department) – Programme Lead
 - Paul Friend (Head of Asset Management, City Surveyor's Department)
 - Hazel Lerigo, (Group Accountant, Chamberlain's Department)
 - Neil Davies, (Head of Corporate Performance and Development, Town Clerk's Department)
 - Natalie Evans, (Responsible Procurement Manager, Chamberlain's Department)

5. The Programme Board will:
 - Assess the viability of the recommendations in the light of the time elapsed since they were put forward;
 - Prioritise the recommendations that are still worth pursuing;
 - Work with the lead officers who have been agreed for each recommendation to develop a roadmap and action plans for individual recommendations;
 - Drive implementation of the action plans, helping to overcome any obstacles that may occur; and
 - Monitor progress and provide assurance to the Strategic Resources Group and the Summit Group.

6. The Board has met three times to date, and progress has included:
 - Approving an Opportunity Outline for implementing the AECOM recommendations;
 - Meeting with the lead officers for the individual recommendations;
 - Agreement of the detailed terms and conditions for the Energy Efficiency Fund; and
 - Starting to review the individual action plans.

Next steps

- The Board will continue to engage with the lead officers and relevant departments to progress and deliver the action plan.
- A clear communications plan will be developed, to inform staff across the City Corporation about the programme and the outcomes.
- Two Insight Lunches are being held for staff as part of the communications plan.
- The Board will meet monthly to review progress against the action plans, and report to the Strategic Resources Group and the Summit Group.
- A fuller update will be provided to the Efficiency and Performance Sub Committee for its meeting in May.

Committee:	Date:
Efficiency and Performance Sub Committee – For Information	7 March 2016
Subject: Service Based Review Roadmap	Public
Report of: The 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 agreed Service Based Review projects and cross-cutting reviews in the format of the Service Based Review Roadmap (Appendix 1). Changes since the last meeting are reported in the main body of the report, in paragraphs 6 to 12.

Separate reports are presented to the Sub Committee on:

- Asset and Facilities Management
- Procuring and Managing Services (Contract Management)
- Income Generation

All of the cross-cutting reviews have now been reported to the Chief Officer Summit Group and have begun the process of Member reporting, which will continue over the next few weeks.

Chief Officer responsibility for oversight and monitoring of the cross-cutting reviews is transferring to the new Chief Officer Delivery Groups, and other groups reporting to the Summit Group.

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.
2. 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.

3. At officer level, progress is reported monthly to the Service Based Review Steering Group, chaired by the Chamberlain, and the Chief Officer Summit Group, chaired by the Town Clerk.

Service Based Review Roadmap

4. The Service Based Review Roadmap at Appendix 1 to this report 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 as at the end of January. Appendix 2 contains an outline of each of the reviews reported on the Roadmap.
5. On the Roadmap, the status of projects is shown as follows:

- R** Project is in a critical state, guaranteed to go, or has gone, beyond agreed tolerances
- A** Project is slipping, has slipped, or is about to slip within agreed tolerances
- G** Project is on track
-  Milestone

Detailed Commentary – updates since the last report

Cross-cutting Reviews

6. Strategic Asset Management. This is the overarching proposal covering the Facilities Management, Contract Management and Operational Property to ensure that there is integration across the three reviews. Separate reports on the agenda for this meeting update Members in respect of the Facilities Management Review and the Procuring and Managing Services (Contract Management) Review.
7. Operational Property. A report was agreed by the Resource Allocation Sub Committee on 14 January which set out emerging opportunities and recommendations from the review. Work is now underway to seek agreement from relevant Service Committees to initiate implementation projects. An operational property implementation reserve has been established to provide seed funding to progress these opportunities. An implementation update report will be provided to the Corporate Asset Sub Committee at its May 2016 meeting. 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, which has been approved by the Finance, and Policy and Resources Committees, is presented as a separate report on the agenda for this meeting.

9. Grants. A detailed implementation plan has been developed and progress is being overseen by the Deputy Town Clerk and the Chief Grants Officer, reporting to the new Customer Services Delivery Group. A report has been drafted for the Resource Allocation Sub Committee and Policy and Resources Committee meetings in March, proposing:
- an approach to structuring the City Corporation's grant-making under four overarching themes linked to the City Corporation's strategic priorities;
 - which charities and trusts, and their related grant-making, could immediately be covered under this new approach, which should be further reviewed, and which are not in scope;
 - an approach to deal with existing financial commitments arising from the Finance Grants Sub-Committee, and
 - a proportionate allocation of funds available against the proposed overarching themes.
10. 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 will be presented to the Policy and Resources Committee in March.

Departmental Reviews

11. Remodelling Libraries. Consultants for the design and scoping of the projects for the transformation of the Barbican and Shoe Lane Libraries are being procured and appointed by the City Surveyor's Department. Tenders for the works to Shoe Lane are to be invited in March, and contractors expected to be appointed in April. The target date for the completion of the works at Shoe Lane is July 2016. An outline options report for Barbican Library is scheduled to be submitted to Members in March.
12. Barbican Centre. As noted previously by Members, a key output from the Effectiveness review is the new Strategic Plan for the Centre, which was presented to the Barbican Centre Board in July. In December, the Barbican Centre Finance Sub Committee and the Board received an update on the Strategic Plan, its goals and ten cross-cutting work strands. The Centre also reported the establishment of a new unit – Barbican Incubator – with the aims of ensuring substantive progress against the strategic goals, developing improved organisational capabilities and establishing better ways of working across the organisation. A more comprehensive update is to be provided to the Centre's Finance Sub Committee in March.

Service Based Review Steering Group

13. The Service Based Review Steering Group will meet for the final time in March, following which oversight and monitoring of the cross-cutting reviews will transfer to the new Chief Officer Delivery Groups, and other groups reporting to the Chief Officer Summit Group.

Conclusion

14. All of the cross-cutting reviews have now been reported to the Chief Officer Summit Group in draft or final form and have begun the process of Member reporting, which will continue over the next few weeks. Further updates will continue to be provided to the Sub Committee as the reviews move into their implementation phase.

Appendices

- Appendix 1 – Service Based Review Roadmap
- Appendix 2 – Outline of reviews

Neil Davies

Head of Corporate Performance and Development

T: 020 7332 3327

E: neil.davies@cityoflondon.gov.uk

Service Based Reviews Roadmap

Programme / Project Last updates: end of January 2016	2015		2016				December RAG	January RAG
	Nov	Dec	Jan	Feb	Mar	Apr --		
Cross Cutting								
Strategic Asset Management <i>Sponsor: Susan Attard</i>		• Discussion at Chief Officers Group	• Update to Efficiency and Performance Sub Committee		• Update to Efficiency and Performance Sub Committee		A	A
>> Strategic Review of Operational Properties <i>Lead: Caroline Al-Beyerty, Peter Bennett</i>	• Report to CASC on opportunities	• Background report to Service Committees	• Report to Resource Allocation Sub Committee	• Opportunities presented to Service Committees		• May: update to CASC	A	G
>> Facilities Management <i>Sponsor: Susan Attard Lead: David Smith</i>	• Desktop review of existing contract specifications (cleaning & security)			• Update to Steering and Summit Groups	• Update to Efficiency and Performance Sub Committee	• Collection of data to support operating model	A	A
>> Contract Management (Procuring and Managing Services) <i>Sponsor: Michael Cogher Lead: Chris Bell</i>	• Draft report completed		• Report to Summit Group		• Report to Efficiency and Performance Sub Committee	• Development of projects and programmes	G	G
Income Generation <i>Sponsor: Peter Kane Lead: Sue Baxter</i>	• Analysis of income and potential mainstream public grants	• Headline findings & recommendations to Summit Group	• Final report to Summit Group	• Report to Policy & Resources; Finance, and other relevant Service Committees			G	G
Effectiveness of Grants - Implementation <i>Sponsor: Susan Attard Lead: Scott Nixon</i>	• Update to Policy & Resources Committee	• Project Manager appointed for Implementation	• Update to Steering Group and CSD G • Report to Summit Group		• Reporting to Policy and Resources and Service Committees	• Implementation of revised approach from 1/4/16	A	G
Effectiveness of Hospitality <i>Sponsor: Paul Double Lead: Nick Lepton</i>	• Report to Summit Group	• Report to Hospitality Working Party	• Report to Policy & Resources Committee	• Report to GP Aldermen • Consultation with all Members	• Report to Policy and Resources Committee		G	G
Independent Schools – fees, bursaries, scholarships <i>Lead: Peter Lisle</i>		• Report to Education Board • Update to Steering Group	• Report to Efficiency & Performance Sub Committee				G	Closed
Departmental								
Remodelling Libraries <i>Sponsor: David Pearson / Ade Adetosoye Lead: Carol Boswarthack/Rosalina Banfield</i>	• Appointment of consultants by City Surveyor		• Finalise appointment of consultants (Shoe Lane)	• Develop design and cost project (SL)	• Gateway 3 report to Members (Barbican)	• Apr: Contractor appointed (SL) • July: works completed (SL)	A	A
Barbican Centre <i>Sponsor: Nick Kenyon Lead: Sandeep Dwesar & Sarah Wall</i>		• Update to Barbican Centre Board			• Update to Barbican Finance Sub Committee and 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. 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 the City's Lending Libraries.
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 Steering Group which has been established, and includes the Chamberlain, the Managing Director and the Deputy Town Clerk.

Agenda Item 6

Committee:	Date:
Finance Committee	16 February 2016
Policy & Resources Committee	18 February 2016
Education Board	3 March 2016
Epping Forest and Commons Committee	7 March 2016
Culture, Heritage and Libraries	7 March 2016
Efficiency and Performance Sub-Committee	7 March 2016
Port Health & Environmental Services Committee	8 March 2016
Property Investment Board	9 March 2016
Planning & Transportation Committee	10 March 2016
Community & Children's Services Committee	11 March 2016
General Purposes Committee of Aldermen	15 March 2016
Barbican Centre	16 March 2016
Subject:	Public
Income Generation - Report of a Cross-Cutting Service Based Review	
Report of:	For Decision
The Chamberlain (on behalf of the Performance and Strategy Summit Group)	
Report author:	
Susan Baxter	

Summary

A cross-cutting review of the potential for the City Corporation to exploit new sources of income was commissioned as part of the Service Based Review programme. The review was undertaken from April - September 2015, with a final report cleared by the Chief Officers Summit Group in January 2016. A summary of the review report and its recommendations are attached at Appendix 1.

The review found that there are:

- Opportunities to increase certain fees and charges to bring income into greater alignment with costs, in line with the approach taken in London local authorities;
- Opportunities to drive increased income from a more entrepreneurial approach in certain areas;
- Limited scope to increase revenues from public sector grants
- Potential opportunities to unlock increased corporate sponsorship and private giving to the benefit of the City's cultural and artistic institutions by taking a more co-ordinated approach.

Recommendations

The **Finance Committee** is asked to agree the overall report and all of its recommendations.

The **Policy & Resources Committee** is asked to agree the overall report and all of its recommendations.

All Committees are asked to endorse the overall report.

The **Planning & Transportation Committee** is asked to:

- a) approve 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.”)
- b) approve the introduction of Planning Performance Agreements to increase income from Development Control services (detailed recommendation a); and
- c) agree to review options to maximise full deployment of capacity and increase charges to align with neighbouring authorities / NCP charges to increase income from off-street parking (detailed recommendation b).

The **Education Board** is asked to note detailed recommendation i) (“that the Department of Community & Children’s Services lead the preparation of a business case presenting options, costs, resources, risks and timetables for establishing the commercial expansion of central support services tied to the expansion of academy schools over the next one to three years”).

The **Culture, Heritage and Libraries Committee** is asked to:

- a) endorse headline recommendation 5 (“That a feasibility study be commissioned to explore the potential cost-benefits of adopting a more co-ordinated approach to securing commercial sponsorship for the City’s cultural, heritage and arts institutions with the long term aim of ensuring they become less dependent upon public funding”);
- b) agree detailed recommendation c) (“that the Department of Culture, Heritage & Libraries prepare options to review charging and income generation opportunities from the City Corporation’s museums and galleries”); and
- C) endorse the recommendation g (“to adopt a proactive approach to marketing the Corporation’s filming locations ensuring consistent coverage of professional film location handling services services across the Corporation’s entire land and property portfolio”) and endorse the proposal to seek income from filming commercials on Tower Bridge.
- D) agree detailed recommendation j) (“that the Department of Culture, Heritage & Libraries commission a marketing consultancy to explore ways in which the City’s offer to visitors can be better developed, co-ordinated and promoted to increase revenues to the City Corporation”).

The **Efficiency and Performance Sub-Committee** is asked to agree 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.”)

The **Port Health & Environmental Services Committee** is asked to:

- a) agree detailed recommendation d) (“that the Department of Markets & Consumer Protection prepare a business case for expanding the animal transit and inspections services to London’s airports on a more commercial basis to maximise potential income”); and
- b) agree detailed recommendation h) (“that the Department of Markets & Consumer Protection prepare a business case for maximising the commercial potential of business regulatory advisory services via the Primary Authority

partnership model”).

The **Community & Children’s Services Committee** is asked to agree detailed recommendation i) (“that the Department of Community & Children’s Services lead the preparation of a business case presenting options, costs, resources, risks and timetables for establishing the commercial expansion of central support services tied to the expansion of academy schools over the next one to three years.”)

The **Barbican Centre Board** is asked to:

- a) endorse headline recommendation 5: (“That a feasibility study be commissioned to explore the potential cost-benefits of adopting a more co-ordinated approach to securing commercial sponsorship for the City’s cultural, heritage and arts institutions with the long term aim of ensuring they become less dependent upon public funding”);
- b) note detailed recommendation j) (“that the Department of Culture, Heritage & Libraries commission a marketing consultancy to explore ways in which the City’s offer to visitors can be better developed, co-ordinated and promoted to increase revenues to the City Corporation”).

The **Property Investment Board** is asked to agree detailed recommendation e (“That the City Surveyor prepares a business case for the relevant Committees presenting options, costs, resources required, risks and timetables for establishing an “intelligent client” service for public bodies seeking to manage and develop their property assets.”)

The **General Purposes Committee of Aldermen** is asked to endorse the recommendation g (“to adopt a proactive approach to marketing the Corporation’s filming locations ensuring consistent coverage of professional film location handling services services across the Corporation’s entire land and property portfolio”), noting the specific reference to actively marketing Mansion House as a filming location.

The **Epping Forest and Commons Committee** is asked to endorse the recommendation g (“to adopt a proactive approach to marketing the Corporation’s filming locations ensuring consistent coverage of professional film location handling services services across the Corporation’s entire land and property portfolio”), noting the specific reference to the opportunity to in relation to Burnham Beeches.

Main Report

Background

1. The review:

- Benchmarked the City Corporation’s income in relation to costs for its public services against those of London local authorities (on a consistent basis and taking account of the differences in scale);
- Assessed the opportunities to increase revenues from a more commercial approach to providing services;
- Assessed the scope to increase income from public grants and
- Considered the scope to increase income from commercial sponsorship and donations, particularly for the cultural and artistic initiatives.

Current Position

2. In relation to the City Corporation's income from fees, charges and reclaimable costs from its public services, the City Corporation compares favourably with London local authorities in over half of London's services which are almost wholly self-financing. The areas of Off-street Parking, Development Control and Museums & Galleries offer the greatest opportunities for increasing charges to achieve levels more approaching London averages for cost-efficiency.
3. Upwards of £3m in additional income could be derived by taking a more overtly commercial approach to expanded services in several areas, the top three being:
 - Animal transit and inspections at London's airports
 - Property services: provision of an 'intelligent client' service for public bodies seeking to manage and develop their property assets
 - Venue hire and events management
4. Different commercial models would be deployed according to the nature of the service and certain of the City Corporation's decision-making processes and operating procedures might require adjustment to enable these services to operate with optimum commercial efficacy.
5. There is limited scope to drive significant additional income from domestic and EU public sector grants, since these sources are geared towards supporting new public sector initiatives and/or special needs – which the City Corporation does not generally tend to focus on due to its relatively small scale and its customer base as a public authority.
6. There is more scope to work in partnership with the City's cultural and artistic institutions to take a more structured and co-ordinated approach to securing corporate sponsorship and giving. This might unlock levels of funding and patronage that organisations are currently unable to secure at an individual level.

Options, Proposals and Implications

7. These are set out for each of the areas identified above in the tables of recommendations at Appendix 1.

Appendix

Appendix 1 - Income Generation Cross-Cutting Review: Summary & Recommendations.

Background Papers

A copy of the full report and its Annexes is available to Members as a PDF on the intranet at: <http://vmtcapp12/documents/s60865/IncomeGenerationFullReport.pdf> PDF and paper copies are also available on request from the Committee and Member Services Team.

Sue Baxter, Partnership Advisor, Town Clerk's Department
T: 020 7332 3148, E: sue.baxter@cityoflondon.gov.uk

INCOME GENERATION CROSS CUTTING REVIEW : SUMMARY

WHY INCOME GENERATION MATTERS FOR THE CITY CORPORATION

The Square Mile has long been a premiere global destination for financial and blue chip businesses and in more recent years, increasing numbers of new visitors and tourists who have come to enjoy its world class attractions and cultural events. The completion of Crossrail in the next 2-3 years will bring the City within even easier reach of millions more businesses, workers and visitors. Ensuring the Square Mile continues to flourish as an engaging economic engine in a constantly evolving geo-political, financial, social and cultural environment brings ever changing challenges and opportunities for the City Corporation to extend its reach, impact and income. The current agenda of rapidly diminishing public sector financing, rising public expectations of transparency in governance, ambitions to create a cultural hub in the Square Mile, potentially with a new world class Centre for Music, means that taking a fresh look at the City Corporation's approach to income generation will help to maximise its full potential, achieve its ambitions, reduce the need to cut resources and embrace best commercial and public sector practice.

SCOPE OF THE REVIEW

This report summarises the conclusions of an exercise between May - October 2015 to assess the potential to increase income from a variety of sources. The review aimed to:

1. Compare the City Corporation's income from fees, charges and debt recovery with that of London local authorities on a service-by-service basis for 2013/14 (the latest year for which comparisons were available)
2. Identify areas where fees, charging and debt recovery could be set in greater alignment with the approach taken elsewhere in London to increase income for the Corporation
3. Highlight the potential for more effective commercial exploitation of some of the City's services and the organisational implications for achieving optimum returns
4. Assess the extent to which the City Corporation might benefit from additional public funds and grants which have previously not been explored
5. Assess the potential to secure greater private sector sponsorship to support the City Corporation's priorities and the implications for the organisation.

Excluded from the review were issues which are (or have been recently) considered elsewhere:

- Use of property assets: this is subject to a separate cross-cutting review
- Measures to review business rates: the Business Rates Premium is under consideration as part of the budget setting process for the City of London Police
- Community Infrastructure Levy (CIL): the CIL rates have recently been set at a deliberately lower rate than elsewhere in central London but this may be reviewed by the Department for the Built Environment
- The Corporation's current policy against advertising hoardings around the Square Mile: this currently remains a priority for retention by Members, although it merits periodic review in relation to income potential, particularly in relation to public information
- Departmental efficiency savings: these are covered by departmental service based reviews.

HEADLINE FINDINGS

STATUTORY SERVICES

The City Corporation boasts some unique strengths but increased income could be achieved in other areas if an approach to setting fees, charges and debt recovery was aligned to and regularly benchmarked against London local authorities.

From an assessment of comparable categories of public authority spending, the City Corporation is most distinguished from London local authorities in relation to its significantly higher City Fund-related income derived from its property portfolio, its ‘theatres’ (as a result of the Barbican Centre), its ‘port health functions’ (as a result of the Animal Reception Centre) and from its ‘cemetery and cremation services’ (these spending categories are set and defined by the Revenue Outturn Returns reporting process.) These City Fund services alone generate £34m more than the London average for the equivalent services. Other City Corporation services, such as on-street parking and trade waste also do well when income is compared to costs in areas which are readily comparable. However, it would be possible to raise even more by increasing the rate of return on investment to levels which proportionately match the London local authority average in relation to the following services:

- Off street parking
- Development control
- Museums & galleries
(in relation to the Guildhall Art Gallery, the Amphitheatre, the Roman Bath House and the Museum of London grant – ie the budgets included within this City Fund category.)

COMMERCIAL ACTIVITY & MARKETING

There is scope to refocus and expand some of the City Corporation’s services which already have a commercial or recharged element. This could increase income by around £3m and would also demonstrate the City Corporation’s commercial acumen to public and private sector stakeholders.

The City Corporation could maximise its earning potential and its reputational credibility as a public authority by working more adeptly in an increasingly commercial and competitive public sector environment. Current commercial offers across the City Corporation have evolved incidentally over time, resulting in a somewhat ad hoc and low key market presence. Whilst some services are more focussed than others on generating revenues, there is scope to augment income if the Corporation takes a fresh look at its commercial and marketing approach to services with income potential, most significantly in the areas of:

1. Animal transit & inspections at London’s airports
2. Property services: An “intelligent client” service for public bodies seeking to manage and develop their property assets
3. Venue hire and events management
4. Film location services
5. Business regulatory advisory services – via the “Primary Authority” partnership model
6. Central support services (especially for potential future academy schools)

The success of greater commercialisation in the above areas would be reliant upon a more purposeful and corporately coherent approach to their direction, promotion and support (including investment, resourcing and professional services). However, the specific form and

structure of the commercial presentation of these services to the market will vary according to the circumstances of each specific case.

PUBLIC SECTOR GRANTS

There is no significant scope to increase income from mainstream domestic grants. However, there is potential to apply for a wider range of competitive UK and EU programmes but these are geared more towards new initiatives than to supporting core business.

The relatively small scale and wealthy nature of the City detracts from its capacity to attract substantial income other than the mainstream local authority grants from central government. However, there are approximately 20 domestic sources of funding (such as the Heritage Lottery Fund in relation to historic buildings) and 13 EU programmes which could fund the Corporation's more experimental projects, such as the Safe & Smarter City Programme. These are aimed principally at enabling new initiatives and innovative ways of working (for example, many of the performing organisations which perform at City venues and festivals benefit from Arts Council England grants) rather than at meeting shortfalls in domestic mainstream funding. These programmes often require 'match-funding' although if projects are carefully constructed, match-funding can comprise existing budgets. Many larger local authorities run EU funded projects to highlight their initiative and participation on a wider stage. The Corporation has directly led a few EU funded projects within the last five years (mainly to support employment and policing) but none are currently live.

CORPORATE SPONSORSHIP & PRIVATE GIVING

As public funding for culture, heritage and the arts in London drops sharply, there is scope to help the City's organisations operating in these areas secure increased commercial sponsorship.

There is potential to lead the establishment of a more co-ordinated approach to fund-raising and seeking commercial sponsorship, while respecting the sensitive nature of sharing development contacts nurtured over long periods of time. A more structured and co-ordinated approach supported by the City Corporation might be able to unlock significant funds and patronage which smaller, individual organisations or different parts of the City Corporation are currently unable to secure on a piecemeal basis. Positive involvement by the City in developing major contacts for new projects, particularly as the plans for a new Museum of London and a world-class Centre for Music develop, would require a wholly different level of private support.

HEADLINE RECOMMENDATIONS

Recommendations	Committee approval
<p>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.</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Policy & Resources Committee; - Finance Committee; - Performance & Efficiency Sub Committee; - Relevant service committees
<p>2. Review annual performance of income recovered in relation to costs for all services from which income can be derived, benchmarking performance against London local authorities.</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Finance Committee; - Performance & Efficiency Sub Committee; - Relevant service committees
<p>3. Commission business cases containing business model options to maximise the short, medium and longer term commercial income from:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ Animal transit & inspections at London’s airports ▪ Property services: An “intelligent client” service for public bodies seeking to manage and develop their property assets ▪ Venue hire and events management – following a steer from Members on principles for free and subsidised venue hire ▪ Film location services ▪ Central support services (targeting future CoLC academy schools) ▪ Business regulatory advisory services – via the “Primary Authority” partnership model ▪ Development of a co-ordinated and marketed City ‘heritage offer’ 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Policy & Resources Committee; - Finance Committee; - Relevant service committees
<p>4. Decide which commercialised services to implement, if any, on the basis of the business cases prepared. Agree an appropriate business model for each case agreed and any associated broader organisational changes which are required to accommodate and support the commercial activity.</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Policy & Resources Committee; - Finance Committee; - Relevant service committees
<p>5. Commission a feasibility study to explore the potential cost-benefits of adopting a more co-ordinated approach to securing commercial sponsorship for the City’s cultural, heritage and arts institutions with the long term aim of ensuring they become less dependent upon public funding.</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Policy & Resources Committee; - Finance Committee; - Relevant service committees

PUBLICLY FUNDED SERVICES - BENCHMARKING FEES, CHARGES & RECLAIMABLE COSTS : DETAILED RECOMMENDATIONS

Headline recommendations	Actions	Timescales
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.	All departments: All officers responsible for recovering fees, charges and debts to review CoLC charging & recovery policies / practice in relation to those applied by individual neighbouring or relevant London boroughs and recommend any changes to their respective committees.	Immediate
2. Review annual performance of income recovered in relation to costs for all services from which income can be derived, benchmarking performance against other London local authorities.	Chamberlain's: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ Maintain a central overview of full service costs and income, ensuring that systems used to apportion income and expenditure to City's Cash and City Fund do not make the City Corporation appear unduly inefficient. ▪ Commission annual supplementary analysis from CIPFA drawn from "Income Generation Comparative Profiles" derived from revenue outturn returns to Government ▪ Analyse significant differences and the underlying reasons and propose relevant recommendations in collaboration with relevant departments. 	Immediate

Page 25

Detailed Recommendations	Actions	Timescales
a) Development Control		
Consider the introduction of Planning Performance Agreements	Department of Built Environment (DBE) to propose options.	Immediate
b) Off-street parking		
Review options to maximise full deployment of capacity and increase charges to align with neighbouring authorities / NCP charges.	DBE to propose options for maximising capacity and adjusting charging on an annual basis, following any necessary upgrades to car parks.	Immediate
c) Museums & galleries		
Review charging and income generation opportunities to increase revenues.	Department of Culture, Heritage & Libraries to propose options to increase income.	Immediate

CORPORATE COMMERCIAL ACTIVITY : DETAILED RECOMMENDATIONS

Headline recommendations	Actions	Timescales
<p>3. Commission business cases containing business model options to maximise the short, medium and longer term commercial income from:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ Animal transit & inspections at London’s airports ▪ Property services: An “intelligent client” service for public bodies seeking to manage and develop their property assets ▪ Venue hire and events management ▪ Film location services ▪ Business regulatory advisory services – via the “Primary Authority” partnership model ▪ Central support services (targeting future CoLC academy schools) <p>Recommended business models should set out:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Anticipated additional annual income against additional costs and/or other resources required - Additional organisational changes or services required to enable and support the commercial activity, including any additional central support - The scope of commercial ‘autonomy’ sought by the service in relation to the relevant department/s and committee/s; a viable proposition for the apportionment of central costs and overheads and relevant commercial incentives (eg retention of surpluses generated) 	<p>Income Generation Review implementation process to propose a framework for adopting and supporting a more commercial approach in the areas outlined in Recommendation 3. This should include operational proposals for:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Prioritising investment to increase revenue-generating activities - Retention of revenues for business reinvestment - Apportionment of central costs - Longer term options for establishing formal trading vehicles in appropriate cases. 	<p>Starting immediately and spread over the next year.</p>
<p>4. Decide which commercialised services to implement, if any, on the basis of the business cases prepared. Agree an appropriate business model for each case and any associated broader organisational changes required to accommodate and support the commercial activity.</p>		

Page 26

Detailed recommendations	Actions	Timescales
<p>d) Animal transit & inspections at London’s airports</p>	<p>Dept Markets & Consumer Protection to prepare a business case to the relevant Committees presenting options, costs / resources required, risks and timetables for establishing the commercial proposition as outlined.</p>	<p>Immediate</p>
<p>e) Property services: Management of property assets & development works</p>	<p>City Surveyor’s to prepare a business case to the relevant Committees presenting options, costs / resources required, risks and timetables for establishing the commercial proposition as outlined.</p>	<p>Within 1 year</p>
<p>f) Venue hire & events management</p>	<p>Income Generation Review implementation process to deliver a business case with options for a tighter, more integrated corporate commercial offer which addresses:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Pricing policy in relation to principles for free and subsidised hire (who, when and why) and which draws on models pursued elsewhere (eg charging on the basis of per person per hour) – following a steer by Members - Core terms and conditions of hire for incorporation into all hire contracts which cover the Corporation’s risks and liabilities associated with the commercial hire of its venues – under the auspices of the City Events Management Group proposed by the Hospitality SBR (provided this is agreed) 	<p>Within 1 year</p>

	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Functions, resources and expertise which might be shared to increase business, reduce duplication and plug gaps – under the auspices of the City Events Management Group proposed by the Hospitality SBR (provided this is agreed) - Identification of additional venues and grounds which could be hired out + any associated investments needed to bring them into use – under the auspices of the City Events Management Group proposed by the Hospitality SBR (provided this is agreed) 	
g) Film Location Services		
Adopt a proactive (rather than reactive) approach to marketing the Corporation’s filming locations.	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Income Generation Review Implementation Manager to prepare a business case to increase staff resources by one or two additional people in the Film Team on a 2 year trial basis - the arrangement to be assessed after 2 years in relation to the additional revenues generated. (There is a particular need to market the Mansion House actively as a film location to turn around industry perceptions that filming is not allowed there.) - Enlarged Film Location Services team to prepare a comprehensive prospectus of all the City’s potential filming assets (both within and outside the Square Mile) working closely with City Surveyors and Open Spaces to identify and document potential locations and indicative filming charges. This might be done as an internship project in partnership with the London Film School or University of Arts London more widely. Corporation venues also available for hire should be signalled and promoted prominently. 	Immediate
Ensure consistent coverage of professional film location handling services across the Corporation’s entire land and property portfolio.	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Enlarged Film Location Services team to establish a consistent charging policy and service across the entire land and property portfolio of the City Corporation, working closely with the relevant governing Trusts or leaseholders. (Burnham Beeches, due to its proximity to Pinewood Studios, has particular potential to generate more filming income.) 	Within 1 year
Seek income from filming commercials on Tower Bridge.	Income Generation Review Implementation Manager to propose rescinding the blanket ban on filming commercials on Tower Bridge in favour of an approach which considers the merits of every application (which would be consistent with the approach taken for all other filming and hospitality applications to use the Bridge).	Immediate
h) Business regulatory advisory services – via the “Primary Authority” partnership model	Dept Markets & Consumer Protection to prepare a business case to the relevant Committees presenting options, costs / resources required, risks and timetables for establishing the commercial proposition outlined in this report.	Immediate
i) Central support services – especially tied to the expansion of academy schools	Dept Community & Children’s Services to lead preparation of a business case to the relevant Committees presenting options, costs / resources required, risks and timetables for establishing the commercial proposition outlined in this report.	1 – 3 years
j) Development of the City’s heritage offer	Dept Culture, Heritage & Libraries (in consultation with the workstream to develop the cultural hub) to commission a marketing consultancy to explore ways in which the City’s offer to visitors can be better developed, co-ordinated and promoted, leading to increased revenues to the City Corporation.	Within 1 year

This page is intentionally left blank

Efficiency and Performance Sub Work Programme 2016/17

(Changes since the last meeting in italics)

Date	Items
18 May	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Service Based Review Roadmap (Corporate Programme Delivery Unit report) • Service Based Review financial monitoring report: Q4 • Departmental report: <i>Markets and Consumer Protection</i> • Performance monitoring report, LAPS
6 July	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Service Based Review Roadmap (Corporate Programme Delivery Unit report) • Departmental report: <i>Chamberlain</i> • Performance monitoring report • Energy Performance Report – 2015/16
12 October	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Service Based Review Roadmap (Corporate Programme Delivery Unit report) • Service Based Review financial monitoring report: Q1 • Departmental report: tba • Performance monitoring report, LAPS Q4 • Combined Heat and Power Annual Report 2015/16
30 November	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Service Based Review Roadmap (Corporate Programme Delivery Unit report) • Service Based Review financial monitoring report: Q2 • Departmental report: tba
<i>11 January 2017</i>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • <i>Service Based Review Roadmap (Corporate Programme Delivery Unit report)</i> • <i>Departmental report: tba</i>

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

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

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