

Committees:	Dates:
Finance Committee of the Barbican Centre Board Barbican Centre Board Projects Sub Committee	11 January 2017 25 January 2017 31 January 2017
Subject: Gateway 7 Outcome Report: Replace Theatre Main House Dimmers and Pit Theatre Dimmers and Control	Public
Report of: Chief Operating and Financial Officer Report Author: Richard O'Callaghan – Project Manager	For Decision

Summary

Project Status Compared to GW2	Budget : green Specification: green Programme: green												
Project Status Compared to GW5	Budget: green Specification: green Programme: green												
Timeline	The project is complete pending approval of this report and final Contractor and Consultant's payment.												
Total Estimated Cost @ Gateway 5	£ 439,045 (plus staff costs of £25,000)												
Currently Approved Budget	£ 439,045 (plus staff costs of £25,000)												
Spend / committed to date	£ 438,125 (plus staff costs of £9,908)												
Spend Profile	<table border="1"> <thead> <tr> <th>Year</th><th>Expenditure (£)</th></tr> </thead> <tbody> <tr> <td>2015/16</td><td>12,200</td></tr> <tr> <td>2016/17</td><td>416,001</td></tr> <tr> <td>2017/18 (retention)</td><td>9,924</td></tr> <tr> <td></td><td></td></tr> <tr> <td>TOTAL</td><td>438,125</td></tr> </tbody> </table>	Year	Expenditure (£)	2015/16	12,200	2016/17	416,001	2017/18 (retention)	9,924			TOTAL	438,125
Year	Expenditure (£)												
2015/16	12,200												
2016/17	416,001												
2017/18 (retention)	9,924												
TOTAL	438,125												
Overall project risk	Green												

Recommendations

It is recommended that the lessons learnt be noted and, following the end of the defects liability period and payment of any retention, the project is closed.

Main Report

1. Brief description of project	<p>Removal of the existing dimmer racks and dimmers.</p> <p>Provision of new dimming racks for both the Main Theatre and the Pit Theatre as follows.</p> <p>482 new Sensor third generation units providing each of the outlets within the Main Theatre with three sources of power; dimming, hard wired and independent.</p> <p>222 new Sensor third generation units providing each of the outlets within the Pit Theatre with three sources of power; dimming, hard wired and independent.</p> <p>Replacement of dimming system(s) control processors.</p> <p>Replacement of the production lighting rig in the Pit Theatre, including reconfiguration of the existing ventilation ductwork to allow installation of the new lighting grid. Installation of new low intensity general (wayfinding) lighting.</p> <p>Any provision of production lighting fittings was excluded</p>
2. Assessment of project against SMART Objectives	<p>Although a list of smart objectives was not required at scheme inception had these been included they would have been as follows:-</p> <p>Project completed to the required specification, on time and within the available budget without disrupting the use of either venue. These were all achieved.</p>
3. Assessment of project against success criteria	<p>Project completed to the required specification, on time and within the available budget without disrupting the use of either venue. This was achieved.</p> <p>Replacement of the Theatre and Pit stage/production dimming systems with more flexible and reliable equipment. This was achieved</p> <p>The systems' electrical infrastructure brought into line with current electrical safety regulations. This was achieved</p>
4. Key Benefits	<p>Replacement of existing near obsolete Theatre Main House and Pit Theatre Dimmers and Control and Pit Production Lighting Grid, removing any Health and Safety concerns by ensuring that the electrical infrastructure complies with current legislation.</p> <p>Replacement also provides increases in capacity and greater flexibility allowing the use of more technically advanced lighting.</p>
5. Was the project specification fully delivered (as agreed	<p>Yes</p>

at Gateway 5 or any subsequent Issue report)																									
6. Programme	The project was completed within the agreed programme																								
7. Budget	<div>The project was completed within the agreed budget</div> <table><tr><th>ELEMENT</th><th>GATEWAY 2 BUDGET (£)</th><th>GATEWAY 5 BUDGET (£)</th><th>OUTCOME COST (£)</th></tr><tr><td>Main Works</td><td>418,000</td><td>399,495</td><td>396,987.60</td></tr><tr><td>Fees</td><td>32,000</td><td>39,550</td><td>41,137.50</td></tr><tr><td>Sub-total</td><td>450,000</td><td>439,045</td><td>438,125.10</td></tr><tr><td>Staff Costs</td><td>25,000</td><td>25,000</td><td>9,908.10</td></tr><tr><td>Grand-total</td><td>475,000</td><td>464,045</td><td>448,033.20</td></tr></table>	ELEMENT	GATEWAY 2 BUDGET (£)	GATEWAY 5 BUDGET (£)	OUTCOME COST (£)	Main Works	418,000	399,495	396,987.60	Fees	32,000	39,550	41,137.50	Sub-total	450,000	439,045	438,125.10	Staff Costs	25,000	25,000	9,908.10	Grand-total	475,000	464,045	448,033.20
ELEMENT	GATEWAY 2 BUDGET (£)	GATEWAY 5 BUDGET (£)	OUTCOME COST (£)																						
Main Works	418,000	399,495	396,987.60																						
Fees	32,000	39,550	41,137.50																						
Sub-total	450,000	439,045	438,125.10																						
Staff Costs	25,000	25,000	9,908.10																						
Grand-total	475,000	464,045	448,033.20																						
Final Account Verification	<div>Verified</div> <div>The main contractor and the lead consultant’s final accounts have been verified</div> <div>The final payment will be released following completion of the defects liability period and assuming that there are no outstanding defects at that time.</div>																								

Review of Team Performance

8. Key strengths	<p>The project was an all-round success for the following reasons:-</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> a) The overall performance of the specialist contractor. b) The client department's technical expertise in their clarity of the requirements. c) The good communication between the all parties involved in the scheme. d) The contractor's good communication with the Project Manager on a daily basis.
9. Areas for improvement	<p>Three tenders were received but the 'most economically advantageous bid' could not be accepted due to it being over budget, as was the case with the next most advantageous submission. The third bid, whilst being within budget was not acceptable for quality reasons.</p> <p>Therefore the scheme had to be re-tendered. This delayed</p>

	<p>the appointment of a contractor which put severe pressure on the project manager's ability to ensure that the project could be delivered in the summer dark period.</p> <p>Because of the urgency the second tendering exercise (to the same companies that bid the first time round) was based on the use of a maximum cost figure, with evaluation scoring above and below the budget line forming the price evaluation criteria. This is a way of ensuring that prices come in that we can afford.</p> <p>Theoretically this could mean that everyone bids at just under the maximum value stipulated but given there is still competition it is clear to bidders we are expecting bids under this value and the lowest below this will be competitive.</p> <p>Giving suppliers a target price or maximum price cap would only be used when there has been a failed tender process due to excessive prices being submitted or in circumstances where we know the marketplace has bidders who will price high. <u>It is not something that would be done regularly.</u></p> <p>Earlier tendering would have enabled this issue to be resolved in a less pressured environment.</p>
10. Special recognition	<p>The contractor's performance was very good. Their communication with the team happened on a daily basis (as mentioned in section 8) and their site manager was proactive and always willing to help to resolve any issues that arose.</p> <p>The contractor's expertise/specialist knowledge of Theatre production lighting and controls was also a great bonus ensuring a smooth installation and handover back to the Client Department despite the delays in appointment which brought about a reduced lead in time.</p> <p>Additionally City Procurement should receive credit for 'saving the day' by ensuring that the retendering exercise was on a basis that would allow ensure that bids were within budget.</p>

Lessons Learnt

11. Key lessons	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • A project is more likely to succeed when a client department proactively assists in specifying their requirements • The use of specialist contractor with expertise in Theatre electrical installation's brings major advantages over using a general electrical contractor reducing the risk of failure and delays to performances.
------------------------	---

	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Tenders should be assisted through the bidding process so as to ensure that their bid meets all the 'quality' requirements. • Sufficient 'lead in time' to enable early site investigation is essential for this type of project and because of the need to re-tender the lead in time was severely limited.
12 .Implementation plan for lessons learnt	<p>The projects team will:-</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • continue to seek the full involvement and co-operation of the client departments and other stakeholders. • seek bids from specialist contractors where appropriate. • will discuss with City Procurement how best to avoid the scenario that led to the need to retender. • be proactive in assisting bidders through the tender process to ensure that all 'quality' requirements will be covered. • endeavour to programme projects with sufficient 'lead in' times and allow time in the overall programme to retender the project should the original tender exercise fail

Contact

Report Author	Richard O'Callaghan
Email Address	richard.ocallaghan@barbican.org.uk.
Telephone Number	020 7382 2331