



Courts Sub (Policy and Resources) Committee

Date: THURSDAY, 9 FEBRUARY 2017

Time: 10.30 am

Venue: COMMITTEE ROOM - 2ND FLOOR WEST WING, GUILDHALL

Members: Deputy Catherine McGuinness (Chairman)
Alderman Sir David Wootton (Deputy Chairman)
Alderman Sir Michael Bear
Nicholas Bensted-Smith
Mark Boleat
Deputy Alex Deane
Sheriff & Alderman Peter Estlin
Nicholas Hilliard
Michael Hudson
Adam Richardson
Sheriff & Alderman William Russell
James de Sausmarez
John Scott

Enquiries: Gemma Stokley
tel. no.: 020 7332 1407
gemma.stokley@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

1. **APOLOGIES**

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

3. **PUBLIC MINUTES**

To agree the public minutes and summary of the meeting held on 2 December 2017.

For Decision
(Pages 1 - 4)

4. **EXTERNAL REPAIR WORKS AT MAGISTRATES COURT - GATEWAY 1&2 PROJECT PROPOSAL**

Report of the City Surveyor.

For Decision
(Pages 5 - 10)

5. **MOBILE PHONE POLICY UPDATE**

Joint report of the Secondary and the Comptroller & City Solicitor.

For Decision
(Pages 11 - 14)

6. **FACILITIES MANAGEMENT REVIEW UPDATE**

Joint report of the Secondary and the Town Clerk.

For Information
(Pages 15 - 18)

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

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

9. **EXCLUSION OF THE PUBLIC**

MOTION - That under Section 100A(4) of the Local Government Act 1972, the public be excluded from the meeting for the following items of business 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

10. **NON PUBLIC MINUTES**

To agree the non-public minutes of the meeting held on 2 December 2016.

For Decision
(Pages 19 - 24)

11. **SECURITY UPDATE - CENTRAL CRIMINAL COURT**
Report of the Secondary.

For Information
(Pages 25 - 28)

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

Part 3 - Confidential Agenda

14. **STAFFING UPDATE**
Report of the Town Clerk (TO FOLLOW).

For Decision

This page is intentionally left blank

COURTS SUB (POLICY AND RESOURCES) COMMITTEE

Friday, 2 December 2016

Minutes of the meeting of the Courts Sub (Policy and Resources) Committee held at the Guildhall EC2 at 1.45 pm

Present

Members:

Deputy Catherine McGuinness (Chairman)	Nicholas Bensted-Smith
Alderman Sir David Wootton (Deputy Chairman)	Michael Hudson Adam Richardson
Alderman Sir Michael Bear	

In Attendance:

Alderman Alison Gowman

Officers:

Peter Lisle	-	Assistant Town Clerk
Gemma Stokley	-	Town Clerk's Department
Simon Latham	-	Town Clerk's Department
Emma Lloyd	-	Town Clerk's Department
Paul Double	-	City Remembrancer
Nigel Lefton	-	Remembrancer's Department
Paul Wilkinson	-	City Surveyor
Peter Young	-	City Surveyor's Department
Peter Collinson	-	City Surveyor's Department
Nia Morgan	-	City Surveyor's Department

1. APOLOGIES

Apologies for absence were received from Deputy Alex Deane, Sheriff and Alderman Peter Estlin (ex-officio), the Recorder, His Honour Judge Nicholas Hilliard QC (ex-officio), James de Sausmarez and John Scott. It was noted that the Secondary and Under Sheriff also sent his apologies.

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

There were no declarations.

3. PUBLIC MINUTES

The public minutes of the meeting held on 26 October 2016 were considered and approved as a correct record.

4. TERMS OF REFERENCE AND FREQUENCY OF MEETINGS

The Sub Committee considered a report of the Town Clerk regarding their terms of reference and asking them to note their 2017 meeting dates.

The Deputy Chairman reported that it had always been the intention that ex-officio Members of the Committee would not have voting rights if they were not also directly elected Members of the Court of Common Council. He also suggested that the revised terms of reference should make it clear that there would be no change to the role of the Court of Aldermen in relation to the appointment of the Secondary and Under Sheriff and that all matters in relation to the activities and operation of the Shrievalty would be excluded from the work of this Sub Committee.

The Town Clerk highlighted that those matters outside of a Sub Committee's remit were not normally detailed in their terms of reference and therefore suggested that these points could be added as a footnote to the existing terms of reference so as not to set a precedent.

Members disagreed with this suggestion and requested that the existing Sub Committee information be amended as follows:

- Under the heading 'Constitution' add "*the Recorder and a Sheriff who is not an Alderman or Common Councilman shall have no vote*" to the final bullet point; and
- Under the heading 'Terms of Reference' add "*but excluding the appointment of the Secondary and Under Sheriff and matters relating to the Shrievalty*".

RESOLVED – That, Members:

- a) Add the proposed wording to the information on the Sub Committee's constitution and Terms of Reference; and
- b) Note the 2017 dates for Sub Committee meetings.

5. THE CITY OF LONDON AND THE MAGISTRACY

The Sub Committee received a report of the Remembrancer setting out the constitutional background to the City's relationship with the Magistracy.

The Remembrancer undertook to produce a future report on the background to the Central Criminal Court and County Court which the Sub Committee said they would be very happy to receive as time permits.

RESOLVED – That, Members note the report.

6. QUESTIONS ON MATTERS RELATING TO THE WORK OF THE SUB COMMITTEE

There were no questions.

7. ANY OTHER BUSINESS THAT THE CHAIRMAN CONSIDERS URGENT

There were no additional, urgent items of business for consideration.

8. EXCLUSION OF THE PUBLIC

RESOLVED - That under Section 100A(4) of the Local Government Act 1972, the public be excluded from the meeting for the following items of business 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 No.	Paragraph No(s).
9	3
10	3 & 7
12	3 & 7

9. **NON-PUBLIC MINUTES**

The non-public minutes of the meeting held on 26 October 2016 were considered.

10. **MODERNISATION OF THE CITY'S COURTS**

The Sub Committee considered a late, separately circulated report of the Town Clerk & Chief Executive regarding the modernisation of the City's Courts.

11. **QUESTIONS ON MATTERS RELATING TO THE WORK OF THE SUB COMMITTEE AND WHICH THE SUB COMMITTEE AGREE SHOULD BE CONSIDERED WHILST THE PUBLIC ARE EXCLUDED**

There were no questions raised in the non-public session.

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

With the Chairman's permission, the Sub Committee received a report of the City Surveyor regarding the City of London Magistrate's Court, 1 Queen Victoria Street. Matters regarding the Central Criminal Court capital/improvement works and IT capabilities were also raised.

The meeting closed at 2.35 pm

Chairman

Contact Officer: Gemma Stokley
tel. no.: 020 7332 1407
gemma.stokley@cityoflondon.gov.uk

This page is intentionally left blank

Agenda Item 4

Committees:		Dates:
Corporate Projects Board Projects Sub Courts Sub		10 January 2017 31 January 2017 9 February 2017
Subject: External Repair Works at Magistrates Court	Gateway 1&2 Project Proposal Regular	Public
Report of: City Surveyor Report Author: Alison Hurley – Head of Facilities Management		For Decision

Recommendations

1. Approval track and next Gateway	Approval track: 2. Regular Next Gateway: Gateway 3/4 - Options Appraisal (Regular)													
2. Resource requirements to reach next Gateway	<table border="1"> <thead> <tr> <th>Item</th> <th>Reason</th> <th>Funds/ Source Funding</th> <th>of</th> <th>Cost (£)</th> </tr> </thead> <tbody> <tr> <td>Engage Consultants</td> <td>Undertake survey of works required and produce proposal options</td> <td>Local risk maintenance budget</td> <td></td> <td>£15,000</td> </tr> </tbody> </table>				Item	Reason	Funds/ Source Funding	of	Cost (£)	Engage Consultants	Undertake survey of works required and produce proposal options	Local risk maintenance budget		£15,000
Item	Reason	Funds/ Source Funding	of	Cost (£)										
Engage Consultants	Undertake survey of works required and produce proposal options	Local risk maintenance budget		£15,000										
3. Next steps	Engage a consultant to review the works required and produce a survey of options for consideration at Gateway 3 / 4 stage.													

Project Summary

4. Context	<p>4.1 The Magistrates Court is a grade II listed building and as much requires the City to maintain it to the appropriate standard.</p> <p>4.2 The forward maintenance plan for the Magistrates Court has identified a significant amount of external works required in the next few years.</p> <p>4.3 The building itself is in a poor state and hasn't had any work spent on the external façade for at least 30 years and the work is now urgently required.</p> <p>4.4 A recent external façade inspection has identified areas of stonework that require repair and it is anticipated that these works will be included into the overall project.</p>
-------------------	---

	<p>4.5 It would make practical sense that all of the external works are combined and completed at the same time. This will assist with reducing the cost of the overall project.</p>
<p>5. Brief description of project</p>	<p>5.1 The forward maintenance plan has identified the following external works required for completion in year 18/19:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • External Decorations including cleaning of the stonework • Roof Replacement • Replacement of the tank room on the roof • Window Refurbishment including replacement • External stonework repair <p>5.2 Initially we need to engage a consultant who will be able to review the work required and identify the overall value of the project.</p>
<p>6. Consequences if project not approved</p>	<p>6.1 If the project is not approved the condition of the external façade of the building will continue to decline. This will ultimately increase the maintenance costs for the building and reduce the value of the asset.</p> <p>6.2 The poor repair of the building will have a detrimental effect on the delivery of the Court Service at 1QVS and in the latter's perception of the City's commitment to it. It will also have a reputational impact on the City as it will be deemed as an eyesore by its neighbours and not fitting with the area it is situated.</p>
<p>7. SMART Objectives</p>	<p>7.1 This project identifies specific external works which are required on the building. The City has set itself a clear timescale to achieve these works and the outcome of the project will be measurable by the improved condition of the building and the improved conditions for the current occupiers.</p>
<p>8. Success criteria</p>	<p>8.1 The building fabric of the Magistrates Court will be improved and brought up to a modern standard which will allow the building to continue to provide the service it does for a long time in the future.</p> <p>8.2 This project will assist with reducing the Bow Wave of maintenance that has built up for the operational property portfolio.</p>
<p>9. Key Benefits</p>	<p>9.1 The City maintains a building that is kept in a good to fair condition</p> <p>9.2 It continues to allow the City to provide good accommodation for the Magistrates Court service to remain within the City boundary</p>
<p>10. Notable exclusions</p>	<p>Decanting of occupants</p>

11. Governance arrangements	Spending Committee: Policy and Resources Committee Senior Responsible Officer: Alison Hurley Project Board: Yes
------------------------------------	--

Prioritisation

12. Link to Strategic Aims	2. To provide modern, efficient and high quality local services, including policing, within the Square Mile for workers, residents and visitors
13. Links to existing strategies, programmes and projects	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> The proposals in this list support the theme “Protects, promotes and enhances our environment” within the City Together Strategy. This scheme continues the City’s on-going Corporate Property Asset Management Strategy and the strategic objectives contained therein to manage the City’s operational assets effectively, efficiently and sustainably to deliver strategic priorities and service needs. Furthermore consideration will be made to any other strategic asset management decisions, which reflect the wider corporate objectives to ensure that the City can meet its overall criteria relative to the management of its property assets. <p>2013 – 2017 Corporate Plan Strategic Aims</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> SA2. To provide modern, efficient and high quality local services and policing within the Square Mile for workers, residents and visitors with a view to delivering sustainable outcomes. <p>KPP4. Maximising the opportunities and benefits afforded by our role in supporting London’s communities.</p>
14. Project category	7a. Asset enhancement/improvement (capital)
15. Project priority	A. Essential

Options Appraisal

16. Overview of options	1. Consolidate Projects Bundle all of the required works together in line with the Forward Maintenance Plan and Façade Inspection to allow all of the works to be carried out within a definitive time period. This approach should allow for cost savings such as only needing to hire scaffold once.
--------------------------------	--

	<p>2. Individual Projects</p> <p>Take each project as identified in the forward maintenance plan and façade inspection forward as individual projects.</p> <p>3. Continue to defer the external works</p> <p>Defer the works year on year adding to the back log of maintenance works for the operational property portfolio</p>
--	--

Project Planning

17. Programme and key dates	<p>Overall programme: September 2018</p> <p>Key dates:</p> <p>April 2017 – Engage Consultant</p> <p>May 2017 – Survey of works</p> <p>July 2017 – Gateway ¾ and Listed Building Consent</p> <p>October 2017 – Tender works</p> <p>March 2018 – Works commence on site</p> <p>September 2018 – Works completed</p>
18. Risk implications	<p>Overall project risk: Green</p> <p>The continued deterioration of the building if the work is not completed.</p>
19. Stakeholders and consultees	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. Her Majesty’s Court Service 2. City of London Aldermen 3. Mansion House and other local businesses due to noise disruption

Resource Implications

20. Total estimated cost	<p>Likely cost range: Figures at: Current Prices (Longer Term Projects)</p> <p>2. £250k to £5m</p>							
21. Funding strategy	No funding confirmed	Mixture - some internal and some external funding						
	<table border="1" style="width: 100%;"> <thead> <tr> <th style="width: 70%;">Funds/Sources of Funding</th> <th style="width: 30%;">Cost (£)</th> </tr> </thead> <tbody> <tr> <td> To be funded through a mixture of: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • HMCTS contributions, • Possible CWP provisions aligned with the 20 year cyclical maintenance plans • request for a contribution from the City’s Cash Annual Provision for New Schemes </td> <td style="text-align: right; vertical-align: top;">£3,000,000</td> </tr> <tr> <td style="text-align: right;">Total</td> <td style="text-align: right;">£3,000,000</td> </tr> </tbody> </table>		Funds/Sources of Funding	Cost (£)	To be funded through a mixture of: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • HMCTS contributions, • Possible CWP provisions aligned with the 20 year cyclical maintenance plans • request for a contribution from the City’s Cash Annual Provision for New Schemes 	£3,000,000	Total	£3,000,000
	Funds/Sources of Funding	Cost (£)						
To be funded through a mixture of: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • HMCTS contributions, • Possible CWP provisions aligned with the 20 year cyclical maintenance plans • request for a contribution from the City’s Cash Annual Provision for New Schemes 	£3,000,000							
Total	£3,000,000							

	<p>S29 of the Courts Act 1971 provides the overarching basis for the legal relationship between the City and HMCTS under which the City is obliged to provide the building for occupation by HMCTS.</p> <p>A Memorandum of Understanding between the Parties dated 24 March 2005 sets out that HMCTS can give 3 months' notice of its intention to vacate but also provides the obligation for the City to keep the Premises in "appropriate repair and condition subject to agreement (with HMCTS) as to programme, scope and cost of repairs."</p> <p>Under the terms of the MoU, HMCTS is obliged to reimburse the City annually for costs in excess of £85,000 index linked (currently at £114,000) incurred in keeping the Property in appropriate repair and condition.</p> <p>Owing to the limited works undertaken by the City to date and the effect of budget rollover, HMCTS's commitment to expenditure on the property has not been tested. The City will seek approval from HMCTS for their contribution towards any works prior to committing to the same.</p> <p>The City's emerging Courts Strategy to be developed in consultation with HMCTS will help to address these risks to future planned maintenance and repair.</p>
22. On-going revenue implications	The on-going revenue costs will be picked up as part of the Building, Repairs and Maintenance budgets held by the City Surveyors Department.
23. Investment appraisal	Not Applicable
24. Procurement strategy/Route to Market	The Consultant Team and Main Contractor procurement will be via and open tender advertised on the City's Esourcing portal
25. Legal implications	None
26. Corporate property implications	<p>The Corporate Property Group supports the recommendation which addresses the Key Strategic Objectives set out in the City's Corporate Asset Management Strategy 2012/2016:-</p> <p>S01 Operational assets remain in a good, safe and statutory complaint condition; and</p> <p>S02 Operational assets are fit for purpose and meet service delivery needs.</p>
27. Traffic implications	None
28. Sustainability and energy implications	There is potential for the property to have reduced energy costs due to the installation of new windows and roof to allow the building to become more energy efficient.

29. IS implications	None
30. Equality Impact Assessment	An equality impact assessment will be undertaken

Contact

Report Author	Alison Hurley
Email Address	Alison.Hurley@cityoflondon.gov.uk
Telephone Number	020 7332 1069

Committee(s)	Dated:
Courts Sub (Policy and Resources) Committee	09/02/2017
Subject: Mobile Phone Policy Update	Public
Report of: Charles Henty, Secondary of London Michael Cogher, Comptroller and City Solicitor	For Decision
Report author: Charles Henty, Secondary of London	

Summary

1. At the meeting of 26th October 2016, Members requested further clarification as to the risk of permitting mobile phones and other smart technology into the public galleries at the Central Criminal Court. The previous report prepared by the Secondary and Comptroller and City Solicitor stated that the current prohibition remained appropriate, proportional reasonable and lawful but further stated this policy should be reviewed by this committee on an annual basis.

This report seeks to provide further explanation of to the risks and and for the committee to decide to retain the current position or to change the previous policy which has been agreed to be reviewed on an annual basis.

Recommendation

That the current position of retaining the prohibition of mobile phones and other recordable devices in the public galleries remains until reviewed in October 2017.

Main Report

Background

2. Members will be aware from the October 2016 meeting that this issue had been raised following a comprehensive security review of the Central Criminal Court by the City of London Police. Aside from the main report a separate report analysing the risks posed by mobile technology being brought into the public galleries was also submitted with the recommendation that this prohibition was maintained. This policy also takes into consideration and is consistent with the policy followed by Her Majesty's Courts and Tribunal Service (HMCTS). This report was also supported by a Risk Assessment from the Head of Health and Safety from the City of London, all of which supported the current position.

Current Position

3. Following the October meeting, as no final decision was made, the Secondary of London was requested to analyse the risks further and submit a future report. The prohibition therefore remains in place and has done so without issue.

The prohibition is clearly sign posted on the internet and by signage inside and outside the entrances to the Public Galleries.

4. Since the report from last year, the case profile has increased in severity in terms of classes of crimes committed to the Central Criminal Court. From June 2016 following a profile review by HMCTS and the Senior Judiciary, it was decided that the Central Criminal Court would almost exclusively deal with Class 1 cases (Homicide and Terrorism and any cases involving death including children and death by dangerous driving). Class 1 cases frequently involve gangs or groups of people and multi-defendant cases which involve amongst other high numbers of family and supporters who gain access to trials via the public galleries in addition to casual visitors and groups of students often from overseas.

Further Explanation of Risk.

5. The following comments should be in addition to the risks previously identified.

6. Devices: Mobile telephones are relatively easy to detect as they are usually picked up by the initial body search. Most visitors understand the signage and generally deposit their mobile phones elsewhere away from the Court in advance to arriving. Those which do not are detected and refused entry until they have deposited their phones elsewhere. Over the past few years the Court has encountered visitors trying to bring in recordable devices in the form of camera spectacles and recordable wrist devices/smart watches/smart specs. Again these are picked up during the search process. As has already been evaluated, due to the very small size of the gallery entrances, there is no space to store devices. Additionally, as previously explained, actually storing devices poses other security issues. We are not aware of any occasion where devices have successfully been brought into the court to record proceedings, however this has happened in other courts in the country.

7. Risk to Proceedings: The unauthorised recording of proceedings either by sound or vision is a criminal offence. The court layout with raised public galleries is unusual being above the level of the court. To detect violations of proceeding unless a security officer is deployed within the public gallery would be a considerable challenge. To apprehend and remove persons involved with recording proceedings would require considerable skill and could cause greater friction in the galleries themselves which could disturb proceedings. The current complement of staff is not able to deploy a security officer in every gallery to monitor this sort of activity. Though the risk is individual, the consequence of compromising a trial or the safety of a person within the court during a trial would initially fall to the City of London Corporation to answer being responsible for the security of the court. This is an acute risk for witnesses on occasion, but would be more serious to Jurors identification if broadcast on some form of social media with or without our knowledge. Members will be aware of how swiftly transmissions can be put on the internet and other systems. The risk is mainly the identification of witnesses and

Jurors being identified and associated with a particular trials. The secondary risk is should a trial being broadcast it could lead to the trial being compromised and thereby require a re-trial. Aside from the safety issue there is an obvious financial element involved should this be necessary.

8. Intervention: Should this policy change and recordable devices be permitted, to monitor activity would be difficult to achieve, not least because of staffing but no CCTV being deployed to monitor the gallery. Currently there is only CCTV in the corridors as not allowed in a court room.

Proposals

9. In light of the previous report it is proposed that the current arrangements are maintained but reviewed as proposed on an annual basis.

Implications

10. Should Members wish to change the current policy, to ensure a period of 3 weeks be given to the Secondary of London to update the signage and policies and to record any incidents and report back to committee annually .

Conclusion

11. Officers have carefully reviewed the policy and remain of the view that the current prohibition of mobile phones and other smart devices remain in place and reviewed as stated.

Background Papers

Courts Sub: 26th October 2016
Agenda Item 10: Non Public Mobile Telephones and Members of the Public,

Charles Henty
Secondary of London 0207 248 3277

T: 020 7248 3277
E:charles.henty@cityoflondon.gov.uk

This page is intentionally left blank

Committee(s)	Dated:
Courts Sub, Policy and Resources Committee	09/02/2017
Subject: Facilities Management Review Update	Public
Report of: The Secondary and the Town Clerk	For Information
Report author: Charles Henty, Secondary of London Richard Horner, Town Clerk's	

Summary

This report updates Members on departmental progress in relation to the Corporation's Strategic Asset Management - Facilities Management (FM) Review Project.

Recommendation(s)

Members are asked to:

- Note the report.

Main Report

Background

1. In May 2016 the City Corporation's Strategic Asset Management (SAM) Programme Board selected the Central Criminal Court as the first department to undertake a FM review.
2. The objectives of this initial 'pilot' of the FM review process was to set up a project team to work with the CCC to:
 - Establish base-line information on the current structure and models for FM management services including staff numbers and reporting lines.
 - Update all contract details including values and renewal dates across the department assessing any potential contract and resource changes required.
 - Create and support the implementation of service specifications, service and operating level agreements, quality and key performance indicators.

- Recommend alignment and simplification of responsibilities necessary to implement the new operating model, including identification of potential savings from new staffing structures.
- Assist the implementation of the new operating model across the City Corporation.
- Investigate the role, merits, models, possible composition, remit and location of an Asset Management Team and develop an asset management plan.
- Provide regular programme implementation updates to SAM Programme governance groups.

Current Position

3. This pilot is now complete, with the following implementation activities being progressed.
 - The review of the FM operating model identified a number of gaps and operational risks. In line with the approved corporate operating model we have now appointed an interim Business Services Manager and we are progressing the appointment of a Building Manager. This will help mitigate some of the identified 'key personnel' risks and the insufficient 'intelligent client' roles.
 - The CCC boiler maintenance staff are being transferred via TUPE to Interserve, the company who are replacing the old steam boilers through the capital programme of works. The intention was to reduce the operational risk to the City Corporation and provide greater opportunity for the staff involved. However on-going discussions with Interserve have highlighted a potential cost issue and different options are being explored. A verbal update on the current position will be given to the Committee at the meeting.
 - The in-house cleaning services have been reviewed and tested for value for money and an opportunity to make savings has been identified. The FM Review team are currently addressing a few remaining details requiring further clarification in the cleaning specification, primarily in dealing with non-core cleaning functions which the team currently carry out. A committee report is being drafted to seek approval from the Establishment Committee to consult with staff on the option to outsource this service.
 - A similar value for money exercise of the security services has identify little cost benefit from changing the current arrangements, but work is now required to establish better practices around quality and performance management of the in-house team in line with corporate best practices. The security service has been reviewed a number of times over the past 18 months. After the last review in 2016 and completion of a service specification, a request was made to HMCTS to agree the staffing uplift indented by the Police Review. This was passed to HMCTS in November

and we currently await a decision. Should no decision be forthcoming, a request will be made for the City Corporation in February to agree the uplift which should be possible within the provisions of the Corporate Security Budget. The uplift is required to cover the increase in risk and profile of cases following the HMCTS and Senior Judiciary's review in 2016. Not only will the case profile increase, the complement has not been uplifted in response to the general threat on mainland UK. Whilst it would be possible to contract out this service, the current complexities and profile would make a transition to an external supplier challenging.

- We are now completing a review of the maintenance teams, which has concluded that a smaller in-house team is required to be based at the CCC to perform reactive and emergency works. This service will be supplemented as required with additional maintenance staff based at the Guildhall and through greater use of the new Buildings Repairs and Maintenance contract when that becomes operational in the July 2017.

4. The next steps:

- Take a proposal to the Summit Group prior to seeking Committee approval to consult with staff on proposed changes to the delivery of cleaning services.
- Produce Operating Level Agreements/Service Level Agreements to provide greater clarity around roles and responsibilities and Key Performance Indicators to help monitor quality and performance.
- Work with Corporate Property Group of City Surveyors to produce an Asset Management Plan for the CCC to bring together departmental and corporate initiatives.
- Review and where possible, standardise Job Descriptions and Person Specifications.
- Continuing to engage with HMCTS to establish their degree of satisfaction with the CCC FM services provided, develop Service Level Agreements and an up-to-date Memorandum of Understanding for the delivery of these services.

5. Members should note that funding for both service areas are governed by the Schedule of Responsibility with Her Majesty's Courts and Tribunal Service, (HMCTS) who pay 95% of those costs. Consequently financial savings would be passed back to HMCTS on the same ratio.

Conclusion

6. It is planned that the new FM operating model and associated plans to delivery transformation changes and deliver savings will be completed within the next 6 months.

7. The Committee will be informed of any decisions to change the current in house services in due course.

Appendices

- None.

Charles Henty, Secondary of London, Town Clerk's Department

T: [020 7248 3277]

E: Charles.hentye@cityoflondon.gov.uk

Richard Horner, SAM Programme – FM Review Town Clerk's Department

T: [020 7332 1403]

E: richard.horner@cityoflondon.gov.uk

By virtue of paragraph(s) 3, 7 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) 7 of Part 1 of Schedule 12A
of the Local Government Act 1972.

Document is Restricted

This page is intentionally left blank