



## Policy and Resources Committee

**Date:** THURSDAY, 9 JUNE 2022

**Time:** 1.45 pm

**Venue:** COMMITTEE ROOMS, 2ND FLOOR, WEST WING, GUILDHALL

**Members:**

Deputy Christopher Hayward (Chairman)	Alderman Ian Luder
Deputy Keith Bottomley (Deputy Chairman)	Alderman & Sheriff Nicholas Lyons
Tijs Broeke (Vice-Chair)	Catherine McGuinness
Mary Durcan (Vice-Chair)	Wendy Mead
Munsur Ali	Deputy Andrien Meyers
Deputy Rehana Ameer	Deputy Brian Mooney
Deputy Randall Anderson, (Ex-Officio Member)	Deputy Alastair Moss (Ex-Officio Member)
Deputy Henry Colthurst, (Ex-Officio Member)	Benjamin Murphy
Deputy Simon Duckworth Chief Commoner (Ex-Officio Member)	Ruby Sayed (Ex-Officio Member)
Deputy Marianne Fredericks	Alderman Baroness Scotland (Ex-Officio Member)
Alderman Timothy Hailes	Tom Sleigh
Caroline Haines	Deputy Sir Michael Snyder
Wendy Hyde (Ex-Officio Member)	Deputy James Thomson
Deputy Shravan Joshi	James Tumbridge
The Rt Hon. The Lord Mayor Vincent Keaveny (Ex-Officio Member)	Deputy Philip Woodhouse
Deputy Edward Lord	Alderman Sir David Wootton

**Enquiries:** Polly Dunn  
[polly.dunn@cityoflondon.gov.uk](mailto:polly.dunn@cityoflondon.gov.uk)

### Accessing the virtual public meeting

Members of the public can observe this virtual public meeting at the below link:

[≤https://youtu.be/F54bz8CjrCU ≥](https://youtu.be/F54bz8CjrCU)

A recording of the public meeting will be available via the above link following the end of the public meeting for up to one municipal year. Please note: Online meeting recordings do not constitute the formal minutes of the meeting; minutes are written and are available on the City of London Corporation's website. Recordings may be edited, at the discretion of the proper officer, to remove any inappropriate material.

**John Barradell**  
Town Clerk and Chief Executive

# **AGENDA**

NB: Certain items presented for information have been marked \* and will be taken without discussion, unless the Committee Clerk has been informed that a Member has questions or comments prior to the start of the meeting. These for information items have been collated into a supplementary agenda pack and circulated separately.

## **Part 1 - Public Agenda**

### **1. APOLOGIES**

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

### **3. MINUTES**

To consider minutes as follows:-

- a) To agree the public minutes and non public summary of the Policy and Resources Committee meeting held 5th May 2022 (Pages 5 - 20)

**For Decision**

### **4. APPOINTMENT OF TRUSTEE TO THE CROSSRAIL ARTS FOUNDATION**

To nominate a Director to serve on the Crossrail Art Foundation, a company established jointly by the City Corporation and Crossrail Limited for the purposes of delivering a public art programme on the Elizabeth Line (central stations).

**For Decision**

### **5. BIDS UPDATE, FLEET STREET QUARTER MEMBER OBSERVER**

Report of the Director of Environment.

**For Decision**  
(Pages 21 - 24)

### **6. RESPONSIBLE PROCUREMENT POLICY UPDATE**

Report of the Chief Operating Officer.

**For Decision**  
(Pages 25 - 38)

### **7. PROJECT GOVERNANCE**

Report of the Chief Operating Officer.

**For Decision**  
(Pages 39 - 46)

8. **POLICY AND RESOURCES CONTINGENCY/DISCRETIONARY FUNDS**

Report of the Chamberlain.

**For Decision**  
(Pages 47 - 58)

9. **\* RECOVERY TASKFORCE - UPDATE**

Report of the Director of Communications and Deputy Town Clerk.

**For Information**

10. **\* INTERIM EVALUATION OF SQUARE SMILE CAMPAIGN**

Joint Report of the Director of Innovation and Growth and Director of Communications.

**For Information**

11. **\* DECISIONS TAKEN UNDER DELEGATED AUTHORITY OR URGENCY POWERS**

Report of the Town Clerk.

**For Information**

12. **QUESTIONS ON MATTERS RELATING TO THE WORK OF THE COMMITTEE**

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

14. **EXCLUSION OF THE PUBLIC**

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

## **Part 2 - Non-Public Agenda**

### **15. NON-PUBLIC MINUTES**

To consider non-public minutes of meetings as follows:-

- a) To agree the non-public minutes of the Policy and Resources Committee meeting held on 5th May 2022 (Pages 59 - 64)

**For Decision**

### **16. 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.**

## **Part 3 - Confidential Agenda**

### **18. MINUTES**

- a) To agree the confidential minutes of the Policy and Resources Committee meeting on 17th March 2022

**For Decision**

- b) To agree to confidential minutes of the Policy and Resources Committee meeting held on 5th May 2022

**For Decision**

### **19. MARKETS CO-LOCATION PROGRAMME - UPDATE AND ADDITIONAL BUDGET REQUEST**

Joint report of the City Surveyor, Chief Operating Officer, Markets Director and Chamberlain.

**For Decision**

## POLICY AND RESOURCES COMMITTEE

Thursday, 5 May 2022

Minutes of the meeting of the Policy and Resources Committee held at Committee Rooms, 2nd Floor, West Wing, Guildhall on Thursday, 5 May 2022 at 1.45 pm and livestreamed at [www.youtube.com/watch?v=ViH4Demx5cs](http://www.youtube.com/watch?v=ViH4Demx5cs)

### Present

#### Members:

Deputy Christopher Hayward (Chairman)  
Deputy Keith Bottomley (Deputy Chairman)  
Tijs Broeke (Vice Chair)  
Mary Durcan (Vice Chair)  
Catherine McGuinness  
Tom Sleigh  
Deputy Rehana Ameer  
Deputy Marianne Fredericks  
Alderman Timothy Hailes  
Caroline Haines  
Wendy Hyde (Ex-Officio Member)  
Shravan Joshi  
Deputy Edward Lord  
Alderman & Sheriff Nicholas Lyons  
Wendy Mead  
Deputy Andrien Meyers  
Deputy Brian Mooney  
Ruby Sayed (Ex-Officio Member)  
Deputy Sir Michael Snyder  
Deputy James Thomson (Ex-Officio Member)  
Deputy Philip Woodhouse  
Alderman Sir David Wootton  
Munsur Ali

#### Officers:

John Barradell	- Town Clerk and Chief Executive
Michael Cogher	- Comptroller and City Solicitor
Paul Double	- City Remembrancer
Paul Wilkinson	- City Surveyor
Caroline Al-Beyerty	- The Chamberlain
Gregory Moore	- Assistant Town Clerk
Polly Dunn, Clerk	- Town Clerk's Department
Gemma Stokley	- Town Clerk's Department
Emma Moore	- Chief Operating Officer
Umer Khan	- City of London Police
Juliemma McLoughlin	- Director of Environment
Bob Roberts	- Deputy Town Clerk
Damian Nussbaum	- Director of Innovation and Growth

With Alderman Sir David Wootton in the Chair.

1. **APOLOGIES**

Apologies were received from The Rt Hon The Lord Mayor Vincent Keaveny, Simon Duckworth, Ian Luder, Henry Colthurst, Ben Murphy and James Tumbridge.

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

The Town Clerk confirmed that Shravan Joshi had given notice of a declaration of a pecuniary interest in respect of item 22 on the agenda relating to Support for Integrity Council for the Voluntary Carbon Market. Mr Joshi had indicated that he would not participate or vote on this item.

Catherine McGuinness declared an interest in relation to item 22 as a Member of the UK Voluntary Carbon Market Forum and also on an Advisory Board to Integrity Council for the Voluntary Carbon Market.

3. **ORDER OF THE COURT OF COMMON COUNCIL**

Members received an Order of the Court of Common Council dated 21<sup>st</sup> April 2022 appointing the Committee and agreeing its terms of reference for the ensuing year.

RECEIVED

4. **ELECTION OF CHAIR**

The Committee proceeded to elect a Chair in accordance with Standing Order No. 29.

Chris Hayward, being the only Member expressing their willingness to serve, was duly elected Chairman for the ensuing year.

The Chairman took the opportunity to thank colleagues for their support and also to welcome newly elected and returning Members to the Committee.

5. **ELECTION OF DEPUTY CHAIR**

The Committee proceeded to elect a Deputy Chair in accordance with Standing Order No. 30. Deputy Keith Bottomley and Marianne Fredericks expressed their willingness to serve. A ballot was therefore conducted.

	<b>Votes</b>
Deputy Keith Bottomley	20
Marianne Frederick	4

Deputy Keith Bottomley was duly elected Deputy Chairman for the ensuing year.

6. **ELECTION OF VICE CHAIRS**

The Committee proceeded to elect its two Vice Chairs in accordance with Standing Order No. 30. Deputy Rehana Ameer, Tijs Broeke, Mary Durkan, Deputy Marianne Fredericks and Deputy Philip Woodhouse had all expressed their willingness to serve.

A ballot was therefore conducted, and the results were as follows:

	<b>Votes</b>
Deputy Rehana Ameer	6
Tijs Broeke	19
Mary Durkan	14
Deputy Marianne Fredericks	2
Deputy Philip Woodhouse	4

Tijs Broeke and Mary Durkan were duly elected Vice Chairs for the ensuing year.

**VOTE OF THANKS**

Proposed by Sir Michael Snyder;  
Seconded by Wendy Mead;

**RESOLVED UNANIMOUSLY THAT:**

Members of the Policy and Resources Committee wish to place on record their sincere thanks and appreciation to: -

**Catherine McGuinness**

for her outstanding service as Chair of this Committee from May 2017 to May 2022.

Catherine brought strength of purpose to her Chairmanship and the work of the Committee from the outset at a time when the City, the capital, and the country was experiencing significant political upheaval.

A key priority for the Committee and its Chair has been safeguarding London and the wider United Kingdom's position as the world leading financial and professional services centre as the country navigated its exit from the European Union. In this regard, Catherine has been committed to a smooth transition, acting as the sector's leading voice on a range of measures from equivalence for UK central counterparties to clearing houses.

As part of the range of actions Catherine initiated to minimise disruption to the financial system, the Chair expanded the City of London Corporation's engagement programme with business and government leaders at the local, national, and international level. Of particular note, the UK Partnerships Programme facilitates action and investment with six regional partners, while

overseas, a developed financial dialogue with the United States – including serving as Chair of the British American Finance Alliance – sets a gold standard of professional collaboration.

The emergence of a once-in-a-century global pandemic transformed every aspect of our society and brought significant demands on the Chair. Catherine's response exemplified the leadership qualities required during a crisis.

Following the unprecedented decision to lockdown the country in March 2020, Catherine's, the Committee's and the Court's actions assisted the survival of many businesses in both the Square Mile and wider capital. Trusted to serve on the London Councils Pandemic Steering Committee, London COVID Business Forum, and London Recovery Board, Catherine has collaborated with leaders across London to protect the present and safeguard the future.

Throughout the pandemic, Catherine has emphasised the importance of helping those most affected. During her tenure, the City Corporation has released several tranches of significant financial assistance to City businesses, ensuring that the small and medium-sized firms that constitute the Square Mile's foundations remain strong.

Although Brexit and the pandemic have dominated much of the political and economic agenda of Catherine's tenure, a third hallmark of her leadership has been climate reform. Within the City Corporation, the Chair led the formation of the bold Climate Action Strategy, which places the environment at the core of our working practices. More broadly, Catherine's commitment to climate action – whether in sustainable finance, the formation of the Green Finance Institute, or the Green Horizon Summit at COP26 – will ensure that her legacy endures.

Across a broad portfolio of work – from diversity to the Digital Sandbox, and fintech to green finance – Catherine has worked hard to ensure that others succeed. The consideration that London has endured these great challenges and remains the most competitive city for business is a fitting tribute to her stewardship.

Catherine has been a diligent and dedicated custodian of the Chair and her work is much appreciated by all Members of this Committee. It is for this reason that we truly hope that Catherine will continue to be a friend to the City and that we may continue to rely on her considerable knowledge and skill, even as her thoughts turn towards her next endeavour.

**FURTHER RESOLVED:** That the Town Clerk be authorised to make arrangements for the resolution to be presented in a manner agreeable to the past Chair.

## **7. MINUTES**

- a) The public minutes of the Policy and Resources Committee meeting on 17th March 2022 were agreed as an accurate record.



- b) The public minutes of the Policy and Resources Committee meeting on 28th February 2022 were agreed as an accurate record.

8. **APPOINTMENT OF SUB-COMMITTEES, BOARDS AND REPRESENTATIVES ON OTHER COMMITTEES**

The Committee considered a report of the Town Clerk relating to the appointment, composition and terms of reference of the Policy and Resources Committee's sub-committees and working parties, together with the appointment of representatives on other City Corporation Committees.

**RESOLVED**, that the terms of reference of the Sub Committees and Working Parties set out in the report, and subject proposed amendments endorsed by the Committee, be approved and that the composition of those bodies and the appointments to other committees be as set out below, subject to Deputy Chairman being amended to Vice Chairman where appropriate: -

**Resource Allocation Sub-Committee**

The following Members were duly appointed:

Deputy Shravan Joshi  
Deputy Edward Lord  
Deputy Andrien Meyers  
Ruby Sayed  
Tom Sleigh  
Deputy James Thomson

**Communications and Corporate Affairs Sub-Committee**

The Deputy Chairman proposed, and the Committee endorsed, re-naming the Sub-Committee to Communications and Corporate Affairs Sub Committee to better reflect its terms of reference.

The following Members were duly appointed:

Deputy Rehana Ameer  
Deputy Shravan Joshi  
Deputy Edward Lord  
Ruby Sayed  
Deputy Tom Sleigh

The Chairman nominated Keith Bottomley as Chairman of Communications and Civic Affairs Sub-Committee.

**Civic Affairs Sub-Committee**

The Town Clerk reminded Members of a previous proposal to make, for this year only, an additional ex-officio appointment for Alderman Gregory Jones as the former Chairman of Benefices Sub Committee, which received the agreement of the Committee.

The Town Clerk further highlighted that the 2022 Court Order in which it had been set out that matters concerning the standards regime should fall to Civic Affairs Sub-Committee as stipulated in subsection (r) had been excluded from the terms of reference presented in the appendix today in error, for which apologies were offered. Members noted the error and agreed to matters concerning standards being included in the terms of reference.

The Town Clerk confirmed that there were four places to be filled on Civic Affairs Sub-Committee, with five expressions of interest having been received.

The Chairman proposed expanding the Membership of Civic Affairs Sub Committee by one person and appointing all five nominees, with the proposal receiving the unanimous agreement of the Committee.

The following Members were duly appointed:

Tijs Broeke  
Mary Durcan  
Deputy Edward Lord  
Alderman Ian Luder  
Sir Michael Snyder

The Chairman nominated Deputy Edward Lord as Chair of Civic Affairs Sub-Committee

### **Capital Buildings Board**

Committee agreed to a proposal that Membership of the Capital Buildings Committee be carried over with existing Court-appointed Members Alderman Ian Luder, Alderman and Sheriff Gowman and Deputy Edward Lord being offered continued Membership for this first year only.

The following Members were duly appointed:

Tom Sleigh  
Sir Michael Snyder  
James Tumbridge

The Chairman nominated Sir Michael Snyder as Chairman of Capital Buildings Board.

### **Freedom Applications Sub-Committee**

The Committee agreed that Membership of the Grand Committee be carried over, with existing Court appointed Members being offered first refusal to carry out their one-year term.

The following Member was duly appointed:

Edward Lord

The Chairman nominated Deputy Simon Duckworth, Chief Commoner, as Chairman of Freedom Applications Sub-Committee.

**Operational Property and Projects Sub-Committee**

The Following Members were duly appointed:

Deputy Rehana Ameer  
Alderman Tim Hailes  
Deputy Shravan Joshi  
Deputy Edward Lord

The Chair and Deputy Chair to be appointed from amongst its membership at the first meeting.

**Financial Investment Board**

The following Members were duly appointed:

Deputy Simon Duckworth  
Deputy Andrien Meyers

**Property Investment Board**

The following Members were duly appointed:

Deputy Andrien Meyer  
Deputy James Thomson

The Chair and Deputy Chair to be appointed from amongst its Membership at the first meeting.

**Equality, Diversity and Inclusion Sub-Committee**

The Town Clerk put forward a proposal that Deputy Andrien Meyers and Caroline Addy be appointed for the first year, to ensure continuation of the work of the Tackling Racism Taskforce, with this receiving the support of Members.

The following Members were duly appointed:

Deputy Marianne Fredericks  
Deputy Edward Lord

The Chair and Deputy Chair to be appointed from amongst its membership at the first meeting.

**Competitiveness Advisory Board**

The Town Clerk confirmed there were no changes proposed in the report, but that there were some proposed changes since publication of the report.

The Chairman refereed to events unfolding over the last week such that Deputy Shravan Joshi had indicated a desire to step back from the Competitiveness Advisory Board at this moment, therefore leading to vacancy. The Chairman confirmed that the Town Clerk would be in contact with Members to invite

applications, following which interviews would be held and a recommendation made to this Committee at the next meeting.

Members agreed to the terms of reference, composition as proposed and carry over of the remaining appointments for a further year.

**Representatives for consultation with Court of Aldermen and representatives of the Finance Committee on Mayoralty and Shrievalty Allowances.** The following Member was duly appointed:

Edward Lord

**Audit & Risk Management Committee** - The following Member was duly appointed:

Deputy Rehana Ameer

**Barbican Centre Board** – The following Member was duly appointed:

Deputy Edward Lord

**Education Board** – The following Member was duly appointed:

Deputy Randall Anderson

**Local Plans Sub-Committee** – The following Member was duly appointed.

Chris Hayward

**Economic Cyber Crime (Police) Committee** – The following Member was duly appointed:

James Tumbridge

9. **YEAR 1 QUARTER 4 UPDATE ON CLIMATE ACTION**

The Committee considered a report of the Director of Innovation and Growth reporting results of the planned quarter 4 review of the inaugural year of the Climate Action Strategy.

The Director of Innovation and Growth remarked on it being an ambitious strategy to be delivered up to 2027, with strong progress being seen in the first year and with it currently being on track. The Deputy Chairman referred to this being the first strategy the City Corporation has published that would be reporting annually against its delivery.

RESOLVED: That Members: -

- Note the progress, risks and issues arising between January to March 2022 of year 1 of implementing the Climate Action strategy.

- Note the overall achievement of the targets remain on track with no additional resources required beyond the original budget envelope.
- Approve the draw of funds of up to £17.94m for implementation of the strategy in 22-23 financial year as set out in Table 2 from that original envelope. This represents portions for City Fund (£13.26m) and City's Cash (£4.14m).

**10. APPLICATION FOR DESIGNATION OF THE TIPPERARY PUBLIC HOUSE AS AN ASSET OF COMMUNITY VALUE**

The Committee considered a report of the Executive Director of Environment proposing Tipperary Public House be designated an Asset of Community Value.

RESOLVED: That Members agree to: -

- Designate Tipperary Public House an Asset of Community Value.

**11. LONDON PENSION FUND AUTHORITY (LPFA) PENSION LIABILITY**

The Committee considered a report of the Chamberlain relating to pension arrangements managed by the London Pension Fund Authority for former pan-London organisations the Greater London Authority, Inner London Education Authority and proposing arrangements for future contributions by all London Boroughs and the City Corporation in order to manage these liabilities.

RESOLVED: That Members: -

- Endorse the terms of the agreement.
- Authorise the Chamberlain, in consultation with the Chairman and Deputy Chairman, to finalise and complete the agreement.

**12. GUILDHALL COMPLEX REFURBISHMENT OPTIONS MEMBER CONSULTATION**

The Committee considered a report of the City Surveyor updating them on Guildhall Refurbishment options and seeking approval to consult with relevant Members as detailed to develop the vision of the future Guildhall complex.

The City Surveyor referred to Civic Affairs Sub Committee's remit and suggested the Chair should be added to the list of Members to be consulted.

Concern was raised regarding Guildhall's current offering of suitable meeting facilities for Members, with it being recognised that there was no space in Guildhall to achieve this. A Member suggested there was a need to look at creating a meeting hall for Court of Common Council that was fit for a 21<sup>st</sup> legislative body. Accessibility issues at Guildhall needing reviewing in looking to create a space that could benefit London.

Refurbishment options should offer a masterplan for the whole Guildhall Complex and include the Chartered Insurance Institute, with this location thought to offer a suitable location for Members' facilities and a council chamber and this needing to be considered also.

A Member raised a point of order regarding those joining the meeting virtually being able to participate in discussion on relevant items. The Comptroller responded explaining a set of rules had been established to manage the risk when Government decided not to extend legislation allowing for virtual participation in local authority meetings, with Members having to be in attendance to participate as a result. The Comptroller stressed that it would become very difficult to manage the process if items were to be looked at individually, with there being the potential of the City Corporation finding itself in court and subject to judicial review where items were controversial. There would be a need to agree a set of rules for participation.

The Member stressed that consideration of this issues was not specific to this item and sought an undertaking that further consideration would be given to it. The Chairman asked the Comptroller to consider virtual participation of Members in meetings further and report back with recommendations that can be discussed and agreed.

RESOLVED: That Members: -

- Authorise the City Surveyor to consult with Members as shown in paragraph 10 of the report, with the addition of the Chair of Civic Affairs Sub Committee, for the purpose of developing the vision of the future Guildhall Complex and respective business requirements;
- Note that formal decision making will come back to Committee in September.

13. **MEMBERS' CODE OF CONDUCT - COMPLAINTS PROCEDURE AND ANCILLARY MATTERS FROM THE PANEL OF INDEPENDENT PERSONS.**

The Committee considered a joint report of the Town Clerk and Comptroller and City Solicitor updating on implementation of the Members' Code of Conduct – Complaints Procedure and to consider ancillary matters raised by the Panel and how best Common Councillors might be appointed to assist the Panel at the appeal stage of any complaints.

During the discussion that followed Members raised a concern that there was no informal resolution aspect more explicitly set out within the policy, whilst recognising this would not always be viable with certain complaints e.g., sexual assaults. It was also suggested that where a case had been dismissed that there should be no publication of the details.

The Comptroller responded and suggested informal resolution should be considered first and suggested paragraph 24 could be expanded with options to consider whether a complaint was suitable for informal resolution. It was accepted that informal resolution should be the starting point, but that it must not be made compulsory. There was agreement on a need to expand paragraph 24, with the current proposal being after the complaint and assessment stage and this considered to be too late in the process, with there being no reference to an informal stage before entering the formal process.

A Member suggested it would be appropriate for an annual report on lessons learned and best practice on complaints coming to Civic Affairs Sub-Committee.

The Chairman proposed the item required further consideration and proposed it be taken to the first meeting of Civic Affairs Sub-Committee for consideration. The Chairman accepted that the Members Code of Conduct needed to be owned by the whole Court and accepted the item would need presenting to the whole Court for a final decision.

RESOLVED: That Members: -

- Agreed to the Members Code of Conduct Complaints Procedure being referred to Civic Affairs Sub-Committee for further consideration.

**14. CAPITAL FUNDING UPDATE**

The Committee considered a report of the Chamberlain updating on capital prioritisation and the 2020/21, 2021/22 and 2022/23 round of annual capital bids and seeking agreement to the release of funding (following gateway approvals) to allow schemes to progress.

RESOLVED: That Members: -

- Reviewed the schemes summarised in Table 1 and agreed to their continued essential priority for release of funding at this time; and accordingly
- Agreed to the release of up to £7.612m for the schemes in Table 1 from the reserves of City Fund (£5.770m) and City's Cash (£1.842m) as appropriate, subject to the required gateway approvals.

**15. \*POLICY INITIATIVES FUND AND COMMITTEE CONTINGENCY**

The Committee received a report of the Chamberlain providing a schedule of project and activities which have received funding from Policy Initiatives Fund, Policy and Resources Committee's Contingency Fund, Committee's Project Reserve and COVID19 Contingency Fund for 2022/23 and future years with details of expenditure in 2022/23.

RECEIVED

**16. \*DIGITAL SANDBOX UPDATE**

The Committee received a report of the Director of Innovation and Growth providing an update on Digital Sandbox Pilot scheme that was looking to address practical challenges to developing and integrating technology solutions across financial and professional services (FPS).

RECEIVED

**17. QUESTIONS ON MATTERS RELATING TO THE WORK OF THE COMMITTEE**

The following questions were raised:

- What was the current timescale and scope for the zero-based budgeting review and what were the arrangements for resourcing areas of priority in the interim? The Chairman responded explaining officers were in the process of drafting a suggested scope for a proposed Zero-Based-type review for initial discussion at RA Sub Awayday looking to set parameters and then presented at Policy and Resources Committee in July for agreement.
- A Member referred to previous agreement of a report back on the City wide elections process and questioned the timeline for this. The Chairman acknowledged the promises of a comprehensive review of the City-wide elections and confirmed he would be setting officers a target of reporting back in the next two months.
- It was suggested that as part of the consideration into virtual participation in meetings that consideration could also be given to current ways of working and whether digital improvements could be made through better use of technology; undertaking consultation with Members and also looking at best practice elsewhere. The Chairman agreed there would be a benefit in Members receiving proposals for consideration and debate.
- There was reference to support for SMEs and it was suggested a review be carried out looking at where the City Corporation could be more flexible e.g., businesses currently being limited on use of external outside tables and current rules in this regard not being very flexible. There was a need to review where the City Corporation can be more flexible around licensing and what can be done to support SMEs. The Chair suggested this was an area for officers to report to relevant Committees to consider e.g., Planning and Transportation and Licensing and feedback back to this Committee.
- A Member referred to a number of Aldermanic elections and questioned the promotion of these. The Director of Communications responded confirming the exact same process would be followed for Aldermanic elections as was done for the recent Court of Common Council elections.
- A Member commented on a need to increase engagement with residents. The Chairman referred to his recent attendance at a Residents' Meeting when it was agreed these would be doubled to meet every six months rather than annually.
- A Member raised their concern of a need to expedite the programme of works to housing, specifically works to Golden Lane Estate. An assurance was given that Members of Community and Children's Services Committee would meet and speak to residents. Members were reminded of the limited budget in the Housing Revenue Account, with the City Corporation having 12 housing estate, some of which were outside of the City, and there being a need to work and engage with all residents. The Director of Environment added that a key area of focus for the department was stakeholder engagement with the issue already being addressed.



- A Member referred to the Government's levelling up agenda and questioned the City Corporation's stance on this and how progress was being made. The Director of Communications confirmed the City Corporation was active in this field of work and that it was being progressed through Communications and Corporate Affairs Sub-Committee. It was agreed that a report would come back to this Committee updating Members.
- A Member questioned how much the City contributed to City and Guilds. The Chairman responded explaining he did not have the figure to hand but asked officers to report back to the Member.

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

There were no additional items of business.

**19. 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 the Schedule 12A of the Local Government Act.

**Part 2 – Non-Public Agenda**

**20. NON-PUBLIC MINUTES**

- a) The non-public minutes of the Policy and Resources Committee meeting on 17th March 2022 were agreed as an accurate record of the meeting.

**21. CENTRE FOR FINANCE, INNOVATION AND TECHNOLOGY UPDATE**

The Committee considered a report of the Director of Innovation and Growth providing an update in relation to the Centre for Finance, Innovation and Technology.

----

*At this point in the meeting, in accordance with Standing Order 40, a decision was taken to extend the length of the meeting.*

----

**22. SUPPORT FOR INTEGRITY COUNCIL FOR THE VOLUNTARY CARBON MARKET (IC-VCM) AND UK-VCM FORUM**

The Committee considered a report of the Director of Innovation and Growth relating to support for Integrity Council for the Voluntary Carbon Market and UK Voluntary Carbon Market Forum.

**23. DESTINATION CITY - CITY ENVOY NETWORK AND MAJOR EVENTS 2022 AND 2023**

The Committee considered a report of the Director of Innovation and Growth relating to Destination City – City Envoy Network and Major Events 2022 and 2023.

**24. ENABLING WORKS TO DAGENHAM DOCK DEVELOPMENT**

The Committee considered a report of the City Surveyor relating to enabling works to Dagenham Dock Development.

25. **LONDON WALL WEST - ADDITIONAL FUNDING REQUEST**

The Committee considered a report of the City Surveyor relating to London Wall West – Additional Funding request.

26. **SECURE CITY PROGRAMME (SCP) - YEAR 3**

The Committee considered a joint report of the Director of the Environment and Commissioner of City of London Police relating to the Secure City Programme Year 3.

27. **SECURE CITY PROGRAMME (SCP) - CCTV & TELECOMMUNICATIONS WORKSTREAM - PHASE 2**

The Committee considered a joint report of the Director of Environment and Commissioner of City of London Police relating to Secure City Programme – CCTV & Telecommunications Workstream Phase 2.

28. **\*DECISIONS TAKEN UNDER DELEGATED AUTHORITY OR URGENCY POWERS**

The Committee received a report of the Town Clerk updating Members on action taken by the Town Clerk, in consultation with the Chair and Deputy Chairman, in accordance with Standing Order Nos. 41(a) and 41(b).

29. **QUESTIONS ON MATTERS RELATING TO THE WORK OF THE COMMITTEE**

A Member raised a question regarding offering increased support to staff.

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

**Part 3 - Confidential Agenda**

31. **TO AGREE THE CONFIDENTIAL MINUTES OF THE POLICY AND RESOURCES COMMITTEE MEETING ON 17TH MARCH 2022**

Members noted that the confidential minutes of Policy and Resources Committee meeting held on 17<sup>th</sup> March had been omitted from the papers in error and that these would follow at the next meeting.

32. **OMBUDSMAN OUTCOME REPORT**

The Committee received a confidential report of the Comptroller updating on an ombudsman outcome.

33. **MARKETS CO-LOCATION UPDATE**

The City Surveyor provided Members with a confidential oral update in relation to the Markets Co-Location Programme.

**The meeting ended at 4.29pm.**

-----  
Chairman

**Contact Officer: Chris Rumbles**  
**[christopher.rumbles@cityoflondon.gov.uk](mailto:christopher.rumbles@cityoflondon.gov.uk)**

This page is intentionally left blank

<b>Committee:</b> Policy and Resources Committee	<b>Dated:</b> 09/06/2022
<b>Subject:</b> BIDs update, Fleet Street Quarter Member Observer	<b>Public</b>
<b>Which outcomes in the City Corporation's Corporate Plan does this proposal aim to impact directly?</b>	1,3,4,5,9,10,11,12
<b>Does this proposal require extra revenue and/or capital spending?</b>	No
<b>Report of:</b> Executive Director of Environment	<b>For Decision</b>
<b>Report author:</b> Simon McGinn, Assistant Director Partnership and Engagement	

## Summary

This report provides an update on future engagement with the City BIDs including how the City Corporation will seek where compatible alignment and delivery of key strategies. The report also informs you of the agreement for Martha Grekos of Castle Baynard Ward to be the Member representative on the Fleet Street Quarter Board.

Following the successful outcome of the BID ballots for both EC Partnership (ECP) and Fleet Street Quarter (FSQ) there are now four established BIDs in the City. ECP and FSQ BIDs officially commenced on 1 April 2022. The Culture Mile Partnership is currently undertaking a perception analysis of the business community to establish the desirability of progressing to a formal Ballot in Jan / Feb 2023 which if successful would have a BID 'go live' date in April 2023.

BIDs are a significant vehicle working on behalf of the BID levy payers that help promote ongoing regeneration of their area. The BID Proposals of each of the BIDs align with many of the established and emerging strategies of the City Corporation. The City Corporation supports the BIDs through having a Member representative and officer sitting on the Boards as observers to provide guidance and advice to support delivery of their strategies. It is considered that a more formal strategic relationship should be established chaired by the Deputy Chair of Policy and Resources to provide high level guidance and collaboration to help steer the strategy and vision for the City of London

## Recommendation(s)

Members are asked to:

- Agree to the establishment of a City BIDs strategic partnership to be chaired by the Deputy Chairman of Policy and Resources Committee

## **Main Report**

### **Background**

1. The EC Partnership and Fleet Street Quarter Business Improvement District were approved at ballot in February 2022, following your approval of the BID Proposals in November 2021. This takes the total number of BIDs in the City to four along with Cheapside Business Alliance and Aldgate Connect BID. The City Corporation is the BID Proposer and the contracted delivery agreement requires a Member representative to sit as an Observer on the Board to inform decisions relating to the implementation of the BID Proposal. Day-to-day support and delivery of the BID Proposals is undertaken by the Assistant Director of Partnership and Engagement, reporting to the Executive Director Environment.
2. BIDs are elected for a five-year term directly by businesses with a view to represent the business community in taking forward themes that are set out in the BID Proposal. The Board will meet quarterly and agree spending priorities in accordance with each of the themes.
3. Many of the themes identified as part of the BID Proposals align closely with existing and emerging strategic policies of the City Corporation in areas such as sustainability, destination, and business ecosystems. Going forward in addition to having Member and officer support at BID Board level it is considered that the relationship with BIDs would be further strengthened through establishment of a strategic partnership to bring together senior representatives from City Corporation and the BID levy paying community, representing a range of business sectors that fall within the footprint of the four City BIDs. The respective Chairs of each BID Board have received the idea of strategic partnership favourably.

### **Terms of Reference**

4. Draft terms of reference have been drawn up and it is proposed to hold a first meeting to agree these terms with the four BIDs in June. Key points identified include:
  - The group will help to provide direction for the future of Square Mile, respond to local priorities and engage more effectively with local concerns and the wider stakeholder community. This partnership promotes collaboration and provides opportunities to steer the strategy and vision for the City of London.
  - The group is an influencer, not an operational organisation. It brings together a selected group of business members to work in partnership, identifying strategic city challenges that will benefit from collaboration, and prioritising them based on where the partnership can add most value.
  - The Partnership seeks to facilitate, through effective collaboration between the City Corporation, the BIDs and local agencies a thriving and vibrant district promoting an all-inclusive and accessible offer for business, residents and

visitors to the Square Mile focusing on the themes of the Corporate Strategy together with the themes and pillars set out within the BID Proposals.

- The Partnership will consist of the Deputy Chair of Policy and Resources Committee (Chair of the Partnership), the Member observers on each of the BID Boards, representatives of the City BIDs representing the business community together with the representatives of the BID Executive and City Officers. The City Property Association should also be represented with a property owner from within the BID footprints. The Deputy Chairman of the Policy and Resources Committee will Chair the meeting. These representatives will be individuals operating at a senior level with leadership skills, to contribute to decisions and to influence and guide not just the BID Boards, but our wider stakeholder community.

### **Member observer for Fleet Street Quarter**

5. When considering the ECP BID Proposals it was agreed that Shravan Joshi would remain as the observer on the Board. At the time of considering the BID Proposals for FSQ there was no sitting Member observer, and it was agreed it is necessary to agree a Member representative to sit as an Observer on the FSQ Board. Following consultation with the Wards within the footprint of the FSQ BID (Castle Baynard, Farringdon Within and Farringdon Without) it has been universally agreed that the representative for the term of the BID be Martha Grekos of Castle Baynard. This follows on from her extensive involvement in the FSQ Partnership where she made a significant voluntary contribution chairing the Public Realm and Environmental Steering Group.

### **Proposals**

6. It is proposed that the City Corporation establish a strategic partnership with the City BIDs to be chaired by the Deputy Chairman of Policy and Resources Committee

### **Corporate and strategic implications**

7. Strategic implications

The proposal to develop strategic partnership with the City BIDs aligns with 8 of the 12 Outcomes of the Corporate Plan 2018-2023. In addition, the proposed project areas identified in the BID Proposals will support delivery of key elements of the Climate Action Strategy, Transport Strategy, Culture Strategy and Draft Local Plan 2036. In addition, many of the projects will focus on supporting the business ecosystem, so whilst the levy payers will come from the larger businesses in the area, support will be provided to the SME community to foster future growth and retention.

## **Conclusion**

8. BIDs are a significant vehicle working on behalf of the BID levy payers that help promote the ongoing regeneration of areas. The BID Proposals of each of the BIDs align with many of the established and emerging strategies of the City Corporation. The establishment of a strategic partnership with the BIDs will help to provide direction for the future of Square Mile, respond to local priorities and engage more effectively with local concerns and the wider stakeholder community. This partnership will promote collaboration and provide opportunities to steer the strategy and vision for the City of London.

## **Appendices**

- None

### **Simon McGinn**

Assistant Director Partnership and Engagement

T: 07768526045

E: [simon.mcginn@cityoflondon.gov.uk](mailto:simon.mcginn@cityoflondon.gov.uk)



<b>Committee(s):</b> Operational Property and Projects Sub Committee Policy and Resources Committee Finance Committee	<b>Dated:</b> 26 May 2022 9 June 2022 14 June 2022
<b>Subject:</b> Responsible Procurement Policy Update	<b>Public</b>
<b>Which outcomes in the City Corporation's Corporate Plan does this proposal aim to impact directly?</b>	1, 2, 3, 5, 8, 10, 11, 12
<b>Does this proposal require extra revenue and/or capital spending?</b>	<b>N</b>
<b>If so, how much?</b>	<b>£</b>
<b>What is the source of Funding?</b>	
<b>Has this Funding Source been agreed with the Chamberlain's Department?</b>	<b>N/A</b>
<b>Report of:</b> Chief Operating Officer	<b>For Decision</b>
<b>Report author:</b> Lisa Moore, Responsible Procurement Manager	

## Summary

This paper seeks approval to refocus the commitments in the Responsible Procurement (RP) Policy using the efficiency principles under the Target Operating Model (TOM), better align with the TOM's strategic priorities of Climate Action and Equality, Diversity and Inclusion, and the broader ESG objectives of the Corporation.

The current RP policy has 18 commitments which have been a barrier to self-service for both procurement officers and wider stakeholders. This paper proposes to make RP more accessible and provide greater clarity for implementation while maintaining the integrity of the current RP Policy.

Additionally, Members are asked to consider the recommendation to separate the RP weighting from the quality score so that it forms part of the overall score. This would bring us in line with central government, our peers and future proof against potential changes to procurement legislation.

## Recommendation(s)

Members are asked to:

- Approve changes to the Responsible Procurement Policy, in particular refocusing from 18 commitments to the proposed six.
- Approve amendment to the responsible procurement weighting establishing it as an overall score of 10% from 1 September 2022.
- Approve an uplift in the responsible procurement weighting to 15% of the overall score effective 1 April 2023.

## Main Report

### Background

1. In 2020, 18 separate responsible procurement (RP) commitments were agreed upon as part of the City Procurement Strategy forming the RP Policy 2020 – 2024.

2. The City Corporation has long supported RP as part of the tendering process and assigned 10% of the quality score to RP in 2011. This was ahead of the Public Services (Social Value) Act 2012.
3. In September 2020, Central government issued Procurement Policy Note (PPN) 06/20 'Taking account of social value in the award of central government contracts' which established a 10% weighting of the overall score for social value (equivalent to the City Corporation's RP) for all central government departments, executive agencies and non-departmental bodies.

### **Current Position**

4. A review of the RP Policy was brought forward as part of the Commercial Service redesign. This process considered the broader principles of the TOM and ensured a greater focus on the strategic priorities of Climate Action and Equality, Diversity and Inclusion (EDI).
5. A consultation process was undertaken with the Commercial Service officers and Chairs of the procurement category boards on recommendations to update the RP commitments and the RP weighting in the tender process.
6. Responsible procurement is currently 10% of the overall quality score. A typical procurement might assign 60% quality and 40% to price. This would mean responsible procurement would make up 6% of the overall score.

### **Options**

7. As this paper is recommending two different changes to RP policy the options have been separated to provide clarity.

#### **Options for the RP Policy Changes**

8. **Keep the RP Policy as is and provide supplementary guidance.**

This option is not recommended. The current policy does not support the TOM principles, specifically, to 'increase the pace of decision making'. It is not easy to use and does not help suppliers understand the City Corporation priorities. As a result, there would still be a requirement to publish additional information for officers and suppliers.

9. **Approve the updated Responsible Procurement Policy commitments**

This is the recommended option. The changes support the TOM principles and the new ways of working. The new commitments have been ordered based on the priorities of the City Corporation but are consistent with the social value themes across central government and other local authorities.

#### **Options for changes to the RP Weighting**

10. **Keep RP weighting at 10% of the quality score**

This is not the recommended option. There is reputational risk as we have fallen behind most of our peers in London. Additionally, with the upcoming changes to procurement legislation, we may have to make this change with shorter implementation time. The current benefits include officer familiarity and a greater emphasis on quality and price.

**11. Bring weighting in line with central government – 10% overall**

This is not the recommended option, but it is an acceptable option and would be consistent with our peers. It would also future proof us against further policy changes from central government to include local authorities in PPN 06/20. The aim is to elevate RP and allow it to be a differentiating factor.

**12. Responsible Procurement Leader - Implement 10% weighting overall for 2022/23 to increase 15% in April 2023**

This is the recommended option. This option would bring us in line with current good practice but indicate to our market that we are moving toward being a RP leader. This recommendation proposes a stepped approach to implementation based on the feedback from consultation with category board chairs.

**13. Responsible Procurement Leader - 15% overall weighting**

This is not currently the recommended option based on the consultation with category board chairs.

**Proposals**

14. The RP policy has been updated with the revised set of commitments and guidance as to how they should be considered throughout the commercial process (appendix 1). The new policy is outward facing providing suppliers with more information on what is expected when working with the City Corporation. A full list of changes is provided in Appendix 2.

15. The recommended RP weighting is based on feedback from category board chairs. While the feedback was supportive of an increase to 15%, there was some concern for SMEs. This risk can be mitigated through practices we already employ to facilitate SMEs in our supply chain and the delay will allow us to produce better guidance and RP questions. The RP Policy allows for some flexibility. As 10% is already standard practice, we do not expect this to be used regularly.

16. The September 2022 start date for the 10% would allow the Commercial Service time to communicate changes, update guidance and provide notice for pre-market engagement discussions on upcoming procurements.

**Key Data**

17. At least 20 London boroughs and central government separate RP weighting so that it is part of the overall assessment. The large majority are using 10% as an overall assessment, but there are some with as little as 5% or as high as 20%.

**Corporate & Strategic Implications**

18. Strategic implications – Commitments in this policy are aligned to and seek to advance objectives of the Corporate Plan, Responsible Business Strategy, Climate Action Strategy, Social Mobility Strategy and other corporate priorities.

19. Financial implications – Social value could be delivered at no additional cost, but higher weighing for RP may have cost implications in some instances. Cost will be considered on a case-by-case basis as part of individual contracts or where

systematic change is recommended e.g. procurement standards under the climate action strategy. As part of the delayed implementation, we will monitor impact of the changes and seek to benchmark any identified costs.

20. Resource implications – No significant resource implications. Contract managers and purchasing officers should already be assessing RP.
21. Legal implications – Changes proposed are in line with what we expect from upcoming procurement legislation as outlined in the procurement green paper.
22. Risk implications – While low, there is a risk that the SME market may be negatively impacted. Mitigations including the proposed step change are recommended. We will provide guidance on how to bid and what good looks like, as well as retaining principles that the RP is relevant and proportionate to contract length, value and market. Additionally, one of the RP commitments is to facilitate access for SMEs so the RP policy will actively work towards reducing barriers which includes RP criteria.
23. Equalities implications – The commitments in the RP policy should positively impact or seek to reduce negative impacts on people with protected characteristics through our commitment to Supplier Diversity, Equality Diversity and Inclusion in our supply chain, and meaningful work related opportunities to promote social mobility. Impact assessments for equalities implications will be done at project level.
24. Climate implications – The policy commitments are in line with the Climate Action Strategy and will be supported by the Purchased Goods and Services project plan.
25. Security implications – None

## **Conclusion**

26. The recommendations in this paper seek to align our RP offering to that of our peers and continue the City Corporation's commitment to being a responsible business. They consider the principles outlined in the TOM and the strategic priorities of the business.

## **Appendices**

- Appendix 1 – Updated Responsible Procurement Policy (2022)
- Appendix 2 – Changes to the Responsible Procurement Policy 2020
- Appendix 3 - Responsible Procurement Policy 2020

### **Background Papers**

24 March 2020 - Procurement Sub Committee Paper – Responsible Procurement Policy 2020 – 2024

### **Lisa Moore**

Responsible Procurement Manager

T: 02073323273 E: [lisa.moore@cityoflondon.gov.uk](mailto:lisa.moore@cityoflondon.gov.uk)



# Responsible Procurement Policy

## Contents

Forward.....	2
It's not just the right thing to do.....	2
Scope.....	2
Who is this policy for? .....	2
What is Responsible Procurement?.....	3
Why do we need to consider Responsible Procurement?.....	3
How will we deliver Responsible Procurement? .....	3
Guiding Principles .....	3
Pre-procurement .....	4
Supplier Evaluation and Selection .....	4
Mobilisation and Contract Management .....	5
A note to SME suppliers.....	5
Responsible Procurement Commitments.....	6

## Forward

### It's not just the right thing to do.

Responsible procurement can help us make an impact in the communities we serve and it makes good business sense. Research shows that an organisation with responsible business practices motivates employees, attracts talent, improves brand awareness, gives us a competitive edge and reduces costs. Responsible procurement is a key element to the City Corporation's Responsible Business Strategy. It helps to create a diverse and competitive market, reduces risks and enhances the reputation of the City Corporation.

- Research shows 93% of millennials and Gen Zs make choices over the type of work they are prepared to do or organisations they'd work for based on personal ethics ([Deloitte](#))
- In 2019 more than 5,400 companies reported emissions savings within their supply chains that were equivalent to 663 million tonnes of carbon dioxide. This translated into annual monetary savings in excess of US\$19.3 billion ([Carbon Disclosure Project](#))

The procurement decisions we make are significant and have the potential for positive change; to help combat global issues such as climate change, promote equity, diversity and inclusion throughout our supply chain and to address local priorities such as the social mobility and digital inclusion. A robust approach to responsible procurement is fundamental to fulfil the outcomes of the Corporate Plan: to create a vibrant and thriving City, supporting a diverse and sustainable London within a globally successful UK. This policy has been designed to help us achieve those ambitions, affirm our intention to be leaders in responsible procurement and provide clarity to those using the policy on what is expected.

## Scope

### Who is this policy for?

The policy will apply to all contracts awarded by the City Corporation. It requires action from officers with purchasing responsibilities and suppliers providing goods, services or works contracts.

Officers with purchasing and/or contract management responsibilities, including from our institutions, should be aware of the City Corporation's responsible procurement commitments and actively work with our supply chain to achieve them.

Suppliers should help us advance the priorities of our responsible procurement commitments and report back to the City Corporation how that has been done.

## What is Responsible Procurement?

Responsible procurement is one aspect of being a responsible business. As a responsible business we seek to use our spending power to the benefit of our community and wider stakeholders. The City Corporation defines responsible procurement as having three main pillars: social value, environmental sustainability and ethical sourcing.

- Social Value means protecting and enhancing the health and wellbeing of local people and the local environment, reducing inequalities, providing skills and employment opportunities, promoting the local economy and building resilience through diverse supply chains.
- Environmental sustainability means reducing negative environmental impacts by working towards net zero and supporting environmental protection and improvement including animal welfare.
- Ethical Sourcing means ensuring that human rights and employment rights are protected throughout the City Corporation's UK and global supply chains.

Responsible procurement is also commonly known as Social Value, Corporate Social Responsibility (CSR), Sustainable Procurement and ESG (environmental, social, governance).

## Why do we need to consider Responsible Procurement?

Under the Public Services (Social Value) Act 2012, when acting in its capacity as a local authority, the City Corporation is required to consider how we can deliver additional economic, social and environmental benefits for the community when procuring goods and services, and how we may act to secure that improvement. This policy sets out how the City Corporation seeks to meet those obligations.

Additionally, the City Corporation has adopted measures to help achieve the United Nations Sustainable Development Goals (UN SDGs) by 2030; committing the entire organisation to embed sustainable development into everything it does. Work on the responsible procurement commitments in this policy will contribute towards at least ten SDGs: No Poverty (Goal 1), Good Health and Well-Being (Goal 3), Gender Equality (Goal 5), Decent Work and Economic Growth (Goal 8), Reduced Inequalities (Goal 10), Sustainable Cities and Communities (Goal 11), Responsible Consumption and Production (Goal 12), Climate Action (Goal 13), Life Below Water (Goal 14) and Life on Land (Goal 15).

Advancement of the responsible procurement commitments in this policy will support a wide range of corporate strategies such as climate action including air quality, equity, diversity and inclusion, and social mobility. It will also play a key role in facilitating the delivery of the Responsible Business (RB) Strategy, which is underpinned by the social and environmental aims of the Corporate Plan.

## How will we deliver Responsible Procurement?

### Guiding Principles

- Officers must consider how to maximise social value and ensure risks to environmental sustainability and ethical sourcing are minimised when purchasing on behalf of the

City Corporation.

- Responsible procurement should be tailored on a case-by-case basis considering the commitments in this Responsible Procurement Policy against the contract value and length, market maturity and what is being procured.
- Responsible procurement should be considered at every stage of the contract lifecycle and is the responsibility of all officers working on the contract.
- Social Value is over and above the core deliverables of the tender or contract.

### Pre-procurement

To be effective it is essential that consideration of responsible procurement commitments starts at the pre-procurement stage and is carried through all stages of the procurement lifecycle. Central government's Outsourcing Playbook emphasises the importance of conducting market engagement, considering the nature of the requirement and market dynamics. Responsible procurement should be included in your discussions with suppliers so that you can gauge the maturity of the market and ask for relevant and proportionate outcomes from the contract.

Specifications or briefs must be developed to further the aims of the Responsible Business Strategy and Responsible Procurement Policy commitments. Specifications should incorporate relevant Procurement Code rules (e.g., buying standards and whole life costing) and other relevant City Corporation policies (e.g., Living Wage). Information on specification wording for responsible procurement commitments and other policies is provided to officers in the Responsible Procurement Toolkit.

---

### Key takeaways:

- 
- Put responsible procurement on the agenda at pre-market engagement
  - Check the Responsible Procurement Toolkit for specification wording
- 

### Supplier Evaluation and Selection

Responsible procurement proposals will be required and evaluated at 10% of the overall score as part of the assessment process from all bidders on all contracts at or over £100,000 (including call-off contracts from frameworks where relevant). Officers are able to apply responsible procurement assessments to lower value contracts on a discretionary basis. This means that those bidding for major contracts to deliver goods, services and works for the City Corporation will be partly assessed on their proposals to deliver wider benefits in line with the priorities set out in this policy, in addition to an assessment of the cost and quality of their bid.

The only permissible exception to the 10% minimum of the overall score is where pre-market engagement demonstrates that the approach would significantly reduce competition due to lack of market maturity in delivering social value. In these exceptional cases, officers should consult the Responsible Procurement Manager to agree a recommended way forward

Further guidance on how to include responsible procurement in contracts under £100,000, contracts awarded without competition and contract extensions can be found in the Responsible Procurement Toolkit or obtained from the Responsible Procurement Manager.



Included as part of any assessment, suppliers should provide information on how they will report deliverables back to the City Corporation.

---

#### Key takeaways:

---

- For contracts over £100,000, responsible procurement is evaluated at a minimum of 10% as part of the overall score alongside cost and quality.
  - The Responsible Procurement Manager can help integrate responsible procurement into contracts under £100,000, contract extensions and contracts which are direct awarded.
  - Suppliers should include how they are going to report back progress on their responsible procurement commitment as part of the tender response.
- 

### Mobilisation and Contract Management

Once let the responsible procurement commitments included in the tender response or as included in the specification should be translated into the contract deliverables and monitored according to the nature of the commitment. At mobilisation, the Responsible Procurement Manager can provide guidance on delivery through City Corporation partners or channels if requested.

Delivery of responsible procurement commitments should be considered as part of any contract extension review.

Contract managers should work with the Responsible Procurement Manager to report deliverables centrally for update reports to Members.

Procurement Category Boards can call a contract in at any time to demonstrate effective management of the contract they are responsible for, including on responsible procurement deliverables.

---

#### Key takeaways:

---

- Where responsible procurement is set out as a contractual obligation, this must be measured and monitored as part of contract management.
  - Contract Managers should work with the Responsible Procurement Manager in contract on reporting and signposting.
- 

### A note to SME suppliers

The inclusion of responsible procurement outcomes in the tender process should not exclude SMEs from bidding. The City Corporation's Supplier Diversity strategy includes the commitment to facilitating diverse suppliers into our supply chain and that means breaking down barriers to entry. Where possible, we will ensure that responsible procurement is assessed in a way which allows the largest group of suppliers possible through pre-market

engagement, use of menus and evaluating questions based on qualitative measures rather than quantitative.

Information on [supplying to the City Corporation](#) is included on our website including what good looks like for responsible procurement and top tips from our buying team on submitting a better tender return.

## Responsible Procurement Commitments

Each commitment is a strategic theme based on related policy outcomes that reflect the City Corporations priorities.

The City Corporation commits to working with its supply chain to:

1. Take **Climate Action** and minimise environmental impacts of procurement on our operations and throughout our supply chain
2. Encourage and facilitate **Supplier Diversity** (Diverse Owned Enterprises and SMEs) through direct contracts, partnerships and active monitoring
3. Embed **equity, diversity and inclusion** throughout the contract process and work with suppliers who have proven to take active steps within their own organisations, supply chain and industry
4. Protect human rights in our supply chain by working with suppliers who undertake due diligence to guard against **modern slavery** and other human rights abuses
5. Facilitate **meaningful work-related opportunities**, which are actively targeted to enable social mobility and inclusion
6. Achieve **meaningful social value outcomes** according to organisational and stakeholder priorities through internal collaboration, community input and supplier engagement

Officers and suppliers are encouraged to consider intersectionality when designing responsible procurement questions or proposals. For example, officers might ask how meaningful work-related opportunities might be offered to under-represented groups in a particular industry. A supplier's response might include what pastoral support might be required to recruit and retain from those groups and what active steps will be taken as a result of our contract.

Further information on 'what good looks like' including examples of actions and activities for each commitment will be published on the [Responsible Procurement](#) pages of the City Corporation's website.

## Appendix 1 – Full List of changes to RP Policy

Change	Justification
Added a table of contents	To comply with Accessibility guidelines
Added a forward	To outline the commercial case for responsible procurement.
Added Scope	To provide clarity as to who this policy is for.
Included suppliers in the scope of this policy	To provide clarity for suppliers.
Added definition of Responsible Procurement (RP)	To define what RP means at the City Corporation, a note on what our peers call it, and to ensure the three pillar approach is documented in RP policy.
Added rationale for RP policy e.g. legislation, external commitment to UN SDGs and as RB	To provide clarity on why this policy is necessary.
Added section on how we will deliver RP	Outlines the guiding principles and how RP commitments need to be considered at all stages of the procurement lifecycle.
Added in rules from the Procurement Code regarding specification development, RP weighting and contract extensions.	Added rule from Procurement Code to this policy to help outline RP at stages of procurement lifecycle.
RP weighting increased from 10% of quality to 10% of the overall score.	Recommendation to increase the weighting will bring the City Corporation in line with peers. There is a recommendation in the paper to increase the score to 15% overall from 1 April 2023. The policy will be amended at that time if the recommendation is approved.
Added note to SMEs	As the amendment to the scope now explicitly includes supplier, this was added to provide clarity for SMEs on our processes.
The number of commitments has changed from 18 to six.	This was undertaken to refocus the priorities making them more accessible to officers with buying responsibility and contract managers.
Removed commitment 'F' regarding living wage	There is a separate stand-alone <a href="#">Living Wage Policy</a> .
Removed commitment 'J' regarding road danger	There is a separate policy statement for <a href="#">Road Danger Reduction</a> .
Removed commitment 'K' regarding life cycle costing	Life-cycle costing is included in the Procurement Code and is a key part of the Climate Action Strategy.
Removed commitment 'M' regarding procuring 100% renewable electricity and reducing carbon intensity.	There is a separate policy on Renewable Electricity Policy and Sourcing Strategy. Energy reduction and efficiency is key part of the Climate Action Strategy.
Consolidated commitments 'H, I, L, N, O, P, Q and R' all concerning environmental sustainability.	To reduce the number of RP commitments these were focused under one Climate Action commitment.
Consolidated commitments 'B' and 'C' regarding reducing pay gaps and working with suppliers on equality, diversity and inclusion	To reduce the number of RP commitments these were focused under one commitment for equity, diversity and inclusion.

Enhanced definition of Supplier Diversity under previous commitment 'A' (facilitate SMEs in our supply chain) to include 'diverse owned enterprises'.	Incorporate the work of the Supplier Diversity Action Plan to include diverse owned enterprises.
Reworded Commitment D regarding meaningful work-related opportunities removing reference to 'service and works contracts'.	No material change. This wording was removed to make the commitments more accessible to non-procurement officers and suppliers.
Reworded commitment 'G' on modern slavery	No material change. The wording has been updated to use an active voice and in the style of the updated commitments.
Commitments are numbered instead of 'lettered'.	This will mainly be for ease of reporting, but the new commitments have been put in an order based on the City Corporation's strategic or statutory priorities.

UN SDGs Sustainable Development Goals		Corporate Plan	Responsible Business	Responsible Procurement Policy 2020 – 2024 commitments City Procurement will support the City Corporation to:	City Procurement Strategy Outcomes:
<div>8</div> <div>DECENT WORK AND ECONOMIC GROWTH</div> <div></div>	Promote sustained, inclusive & sustainable economic growth, full & productive employment and decent work for all	We have access to the skills and talent we need.	Diverse organisations	a. Encourage and facilitate <b>integration of VCSEs, SEs and SMEs</b> within our supply chains	<p>Our key people across the organisation are upskilled:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• <b>Raise awareness and accountability</b></li> </ul>
	Achieve gender equality and empower all women and girls	People have equal opportunities to enrich their lives and reach their full potential.	Engaging our employees	b. Seek to <b>reduce gender pay gaps and under-representation</b> of people with protected characteristics that may exist in contractor workforces as part of supplier evaluation and through awareness raising, communication and transparency of our own performance	
<div>5</div> <div>GENDER EQUALITY</div> <div></div>			Equal opportunities	c. Work with suppliers who take active steps to <b>embed equality, diversity and inclusion</b>	<p>Our services provide what is needed and are easy to use:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• <b>Process focus groups</b></li> </ul>
<div>10</div> <div>REDUCED INEQUALITIES</div> <div></div>	Reduce inequality within and among countries	Communities are cohesive with the facilities they need.	Using our convening power	d. Incentivise and <b>facilitate work-related opportunities</b> offered as part of service and works contracts, which are targeted towards those who need them most	<p>Our key people across the organisation are upskilled:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• <b>Performance reporting</b></li> </ul>
<div>1</div> <div>NO POVERTY</div> <div></div>	End poverty in all its forms everywhere		Connecting our communities	e. <b>Achieve meaningful social value outcomes</b> according to organisational and stakeholder priorities through internal collaboration, community input and supplier engagement	<p>Our key people across the organisation are upskilled:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• <b>Stakeholder engagement</b></li> </ul>
<div>3</div> <div>GOOD HEALTH AND WELL-BEING</div> <div></div>	Ensure healthy lives and promote well-being for all at all ages	People enjoy good health & wellbeing.	Promoting human rights	f. Ensure that <b>the Living Wage is paid</b> to staff, apprentices, interns and (sub)contractors	<p>Our key people across the organisation are upskilled:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• <b>Stakeholder engagement</b></li> </ul>
<div>11</div> <div>SUSTAINABLE CITIES AND COMMUNITIES</div> <div></div>	Make cities and human settlements inclusive, safe, resilient and sustainable	People are safe and feel safe.	Prevent bribery, fraud & corruption	g. <b>Guard against modern slavery, human and labour rights abuses</b> and unfair working practices in high risk supply chains	<p>Opportunities to leverage responsible outcomes are maximised:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• <b>Enable Responsible Business outcomes</b></li> </ul>
<div>13</div> <div>CLIMATE ACTION</div> <div></div>	Take urgent action to combat climate change and its impacts	Our spaces are secure, resilient and well-maintained.	People’s wellbeing	h. Ensure that suppliers <b>minimise air and noise pollution</b> associated with our contracts	<p>Sustainable cost assurance is guaranteed for the future:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• <b>Total cost of ownership</b></li> </ul>
<div>15</div> <div>LIFE ON LAND</div> <div></div>	Protect, restore and promote sustainable use of terrestrial ecosystems, sustainably manage forests, combat desertification, halt & reverse land degradation and halt biodiversity loss	We have clean air, land and water and a thriving and sustainable natural environment.	Air quality	i. Procure the vehicles, plant and equipment with <b>the lowest emissions &amp; pollutants possible</b>	<p>Opportunities to leverage responsible outcomes are maximised:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• <b>Facilitate innovation</b></li> </ul>
<div>12</div> <div>RESPONSIBLE CONSUMPTION AND PRODUCTION</div> <div></div>	Ensure sustainable consumption and production patterns	Businesses are trusted and socially and environmentally responsible.	<div>Leading Responsible Procurement</div>	j. <b>Strengthen road danger reduction</b> requirements within goods, services and works contracts	<p>Our key people across the organisation are upskilled:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• <b>Enhance our skills</b></li> </ul>
			Climate change	k. Achieve best value by assessing goods, services and works designs based on <b>life cycle costing</b>	<p>Sustainable cost assurance is guaranteed for the future:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• <b>Increase our spend analytics</b></li> </ul>
			Championing responsible investment	l. Ensure that all procurement related activities are aligned to <b>meet Climate Action targets</b>	
			Biodiversity	m. <b>Procure 100% renewable electricity</b> and continuously <b>reduce carbon intensity of gas &amp; fuel</b>	
			Ensuring transparency	n. Build <b>climate resilience, integrated water management, urban greening and biodiversity</b> requirements into design, construction, public realm & landscape contracts	
			Plastics & packaging	o. <b>Procure low environmental impact goods, services and works;</b> avoiding pollutants, opting for low embodied carbon & water and maximising recycled and sustainable content	
			Waste	p. Opt for practices that <b>minimise supply chain environmental impacts:</b> sustainable farming, fisheries & forestry; preventing land degradation, contamination, habitat & biodiversity loss.	
				q. <b>Eliminate single use plastics</b> and <b>minimise all waste</b> internally & in supply chain operations	
				r. <b>Manage demand, maximise resource efficiency</b> and <b>support the circular economy</b>	

This page is intentionally left blank

<b>Committee(s):</b> Operational Property and Projects Sub Committee – For Decision	<b>Dated:</b> 30/05/22
Policy and Resources Committee – For Decision	09/06/22
<b>Subject:</b> Project Governance	Public
<b>Which outcomes in the City Corporation’s Corporate Plan does this proposal aim to impact directly?</b>	All – cross-cutting
<b>Does this proposal require extra revenue and/or capital spending?</b>	N
<b>If so, how much?</b>	N/A
<b>What is the source of Funding?</b>	N/A
<b>Has this Funding Source been agreed with the Chamberlain’s Department?</b>	N/A
<b>Report of:</b> Chief Operating Officer (COO)	For Decision
<b>Report author:</b> Rohit Paul, Corporate Programme Office, COO	

## Summary

This report outlines interim arrangements for project governance. It includes a temporary request for delegated authority to Tier 1 Chief Officers, to approve all reports for projects with an estimated cost of below £1m (excluding risk). These changes are suggested to support the new Committee in focusing on projects with higher costs and levels of risk. This report also provides an update on the review of the Projects Procedure and project thresholds.

## Recommendation(s)

Members are asked to:

- Delegate authority for all projects with an estimated cost of below £1m (excluding risk) to Tier 1 Chief Officers and officers listed in Appendix 1 for approval.
- Note that Members will be presented with a range of options for revised thresholds in July.
- Note that another report will be submitted in October to amend the Projects Procedure.

## Main Report

### Background

1. The City’s project governance was last reviewed in 2018, whereby various changes were implemented, including the introduction of Costed Risk Provision

(CRP), the creation of the Project Management Academy (PMA) and a revised version of the Projects Procedure. Further changes were scheduled for implementation soon after, however these were deferred, due to the Member Governance Review.

2. Consequently, issues such as very low project thresholds (£50k for capital projects) have remained in place, which has often led to large volumes of paperwork being submitted to Committee for nominal sums.
3. More recently, other changes have been implemented via the TOM and Member Governance Review, which have included:
  - Revised thresholds for Investment Property Group (IPG) projects (£5m) and CoL Schools (temporary pilot at £1m)
  - Strengthening the 'hub and spoke' Programme Management Office (PMO) arrangements
  - Agreement to refresh the Projects Procedure
4. The Projects Procedure is now outdated and no longer reflects the various amendments agreed since 2018. Officers were advised to refrain from submitting revised iterations due to the TOM and Member Governance Review, however with the launch of the new Operational Property and Projects Committee (OPP), it would be prudent to progress this soon.

## **Current Position**

5. Revising the Projects Procedure will have a significant impact on what is submitted to Committee, as this sets out the thresholds for projects. For capital projects, this currently stands at £50k, which is too low and no longer pragmatic. It was not uncommon for Projects Sub Committee (PSC) to have agendas ranging in size from 20-30 items.
6. As three Committees will now merge in to one, it is likely the agenda sizes will become too large and difficult to manage within two hours. Therefore, to enable Members to properly scrutinise high value projects, which tend to carry greater levels of risk, the thresholds must be raised. These changes will bring closer alignment with the TOM principles, as well as the recent revisions made to officer delegations, which were developed to allow officers to have greater authority for approvals.
7. A report will be submitted to Committee in July, which will present a range of potential thresholds for Member approval.
8. Once Members have expressed a preference, officers will develop and implement revised processes around the new thresholds, which will be finalised as part of a refreshed version of the Projects Procedure. This will also include other amendments, such as changing the definition of a project to remove routine procurement activities currently caught in the process, for example vehicle purchases.
9. A revised version of the Projects Procedure will be submitted in October. Please note this will also require approval from Policy and Resources Committee.
10. For the interim period, there is still a pressing need to ensure that the agenda size is kept manageable, therefore this report proposes that all reports for projects under £1m are delegated to Tier 1 Chief Officers and officers listed in Appendix 1 for approval, until the Projects Procedure is formally revised.



11. The £1m threshold has been proposed for consistency with the CoL Schools' Pilot (agreed via the TOM). This was also the initial threshold approved for the IPG expedited Gateway Process.
12. It is estimated that a temporary threshold of £1m would leave just under 150 projects within the Committee remit. If this is not approved, all Gateway reports for projects above the £50k capital threshold will revert to Committee, thus leaving close to 350 projects technically eligible for the Committee cycle.

## **Options**

13. Option 1 – Delegate authority to approve reports for projects under £1m to Tier 1 Chief Officers and their delegates within Tiers 2 and 3 (listed in Appendix 1). This would be on an interim basis until the Projects Procedure is amended in October. This is the recommended option.
14. Option 2 – Maintain the existing arrangements and receive all project reports at Committee. This is not recommended due to the volume of paperwork Committee are likely to receive.
15. A further report will be submitted in July presenting options for thresholds.

## **Proposals**

16. The recommendation in this report to agree a temporary delegation for the interim period carries the following benefits:
  - Ensuring the agenda remains a reasonable size.
  - Allowing Members to focus their attention on more high-risk/strategic items, rather than minor operational issues.
  - Greater consistency with delegations agreed elsewhere within the City (such as the CoL Schools' Pilot).
  - Delivery at pace.
17. For projects under £1m, officers will continue to follow the current process for those within thresholds delegated to Chief Officer, including the standard Gateway Process paperwork and logging of projects on the City's corporate software (Project Vision).
18. The existing performance reporting framework will be maintained. Committee will continue to receive 'red reports' for projects below the £1m threshold. This will ensure Members are aware of the key issues and can maintain oversight of their progression.
19. Officers will also be expected to continue to consult with key stakeholders such as colleagues in Chamberlain's, Commercial Services and the Corporate Programme Office.
20. Both OPP and Service Committees reserve the right to 'call in' any delegated reports for scrutiny.
21. Both Corporate Projects Board (CPB) and Chief Officers can suggest submitting specific reports to Committee, if they feel it would benefit from Member Oversight.
22. OPP will also receive a monthly list of new projects submitted to CPB to proceed under delegation.
23. Projects with an estimated cost of equal to and above £1m will continue to follow the standard process.

24. The changes outlined apply to project approvals but not to funding. Projects will still follow existing steps for funding approvals, such as authority form Resource Allocation Sub Committee.
25. An options appraisal will be presented in July, outlining a range of potential thresholds for projects, including subsequent implications on the volume of papers and any risks to note.
26. A further report will then be submitted in October, finalising all the changes into a refreshed Projects Procedure, once officers have developed new processes around the revised thresholds. It is likely that the following will be proposed within that report (please note this list is not exhaustive):
  - Revised thresholds.
  - Removal of routine procurement exercises.
  - Changes to project tolerances.
  - Greater delegations.
  - Flexible use of CRP.
  - References to the PMA.
  - A more streamlined approval process.
27. It is expected that these changes will deliver the following benefits:
  - Closer alignment to industry standard.
  - Facilitating discussion in Committees for high-risk items where Members can add value.
  - Reducing paperwork and time spent on operational issues or low-cost items.
  - Supporting officers in delivery at pace.
  - Implementing changes in line with a previous steer from Members on their desired amendments.
  - Removing non-project related work from the process for Project Management.
  - Empowering Senior Responsible Owners to take ownership for delivery of their projects.

## **Key Data**

28. There are close to 350 projects within the portfolio, which is why it is essential to agree a temporary delegation, whilst the longer-term amendments are completed.
29. A review of previous PSC agendas has shown that it is not uncommon for agendas to include 20-30 items. Due to the revised Terms of Reference for OPP, including this number of project reports will no longer be viable.
30. Former Committee Members have regularly provided feedback on the large volume of papers, many of which have historically been for minor sums or routine procurement exercises. The need to reduce the agenda sizes to focus on more strategic issues has been a recurrent theme.
31. The next report submitted will include data on how many projects would proceed under delegation if specific thresholds were to be selected. It will also include an approximation of how many will continue to be submitted to Committee.

## **Corporate & Strategic Implications**

There are no strategic implications for this report, other than the benefits agreeing a temporary delegation would bring in allowing Members to focus on strategic issues, because of the reduction in low-cost items. The report presenting revised procedures in October will have significant implications for corporate project governance.

Financial implications – There are no funding requests within this paper. The temporary delegation would mean all projects with an estimated cost of under £1m (excluding risk) are not submitted to OPP.

Resource implications – None.

Legal implications – None.

Risk implications – This approach has been suggested to mitigate risks around unmanageable agenda sizes. Increasing the threshold for the interim period will result in fewer reports submitted to Committee. There are existing procedures for delegations in place within the Projects Procedure, which will continue to apply for all projects, such as utilising the same paperwork and mandating sign-off via senior officers. Audit can also conduct 'deep dives' if requested to monitor compliance.

The next report will outline risk implications for changes to the portfolio. Risks associated with each recommendation will be assessed and will inform the development of a robust assurance framework to support the changes.

Equalities implications – None.

Climate implications – None but the Projects Procedure will include references to Climate Action governance once revised.

Security implications – None.

## **Conclusion**

32. It is necessary to consider a temporary delegation for the interim period until Autumn, due to the current low thresholds and size of the portfolio.

33. A wider review of the Projects Procedure is now required, as agreed in the TOM paper for Project Management, which will refresh the City's project governance and result in closer alignment with industry standards.

## **Appendices**

- Appendix 1 – Officer Delegations

## **Background Papers**

None

### **Rohit Paul**

Corporate Programme Manager (Corporate Programme Office, COO)  
E: rohit.paul@cityoflondon.gov.uk

This page is intentionally left blank

## **Appendix 1 – Officer Delegations**

It is proposed that Members delegate authority to the following officers to approve all project reports, if the total estimated cost of the project (excluding risk) is below £1m:

- Tier 1 Chief Officers
- Property Projects Director (City Surveyor's)
- Investment Property Director (City Surveyor's)
- Corporate Property Director (City Surveyor's)
- Operations Group Director (City Surveyor's)
- Financial Services Director (Chamberlain's)
- Assistant Director – Strategic Finance (Chamberlain's)
- Chief Accountant (Chamberlain's)
- Head of Police Authority Finance (Chamberlain's)
- BHE and Charities Finance Director (Bridge House Estates)
- Planning and Development Director (Environment)
- City Operations Director (Environment)
- Port Health and Public Protection Director (Environment)
- Assistant Director - Business Services (Environment)
- Natural Environment Director (Environment)
- Assistant Director - Barbican and Property Services (Community and Children's Services)

The posts outlined above are within the remit of the three most senior tiers in the organisation. Please note, it is proposed that these delegations also apply in circumstances where officers are acting up to fulfil parts of the posts outlined above.

This page is intentionally left blank

<b>Committee(s):</b> Policy and Resources Committee	<b>Dated:</b> 09/06/2022
<b>Subject:</b> Policy and Resources Contingency/Discretionary Funds	<b>Public</b>
<b>Which outcomes in the City Corporation's Corporate Plan does this proposal aim to impact directly?</b>	All
<b>Does this proposal require extra revenue and/or capital spending?</b>	No
<b>If so, how much?</b>	£0
<b>What is the source of Funding?</b>	N/A
<b>Has this Funding Source been agreed with the Chamberlain's Department?</b>	N/A
<b>Report of:</b> Chamberlain	<b>For Decision</b>
<b>Report Author:</b> Geraldine Francis - Chamberlain	

## Summary

This report provides the schedule of projects and activities which have received funding from the Policy Initiatives Fund (PIF), the Policy and Resources Committee's Contingency Fund, Committee's Project Reserve and COVID19 Contingency Fund for 2022/23 and future years with details of expenditure in 2022/23. The balances remaining for these Funds for 2022/23 and beyond are shown in the Table below.

<b>Fund</b>	<b>2022/23 Balance Remaining after Approved Bids £</b>	<b>2023/24 Balance Remaining after Approved Bids £</b>	<b>2024/25 Balance Remaining after Approved Bids £</b>	<b>2025/26 Balance Remaining after Approved Bids</b>
Policy Initiative Fund	450,843	474,000	900,000	1,200,000
Policy and Resources Contingency	496,492	285,000	285,000	300,000
Policy & Resources Project Reserve	343,000	0	0	0
COVID19 Contingency	462,496	0	0	0

## Recommendation(s)

Members are asked to:

- Note the report and contents of the schedules.
- Agree that the multiyear PIF cap be increased by £130,000 and £126,000 in 2022/23 and 2023/24 respectively to allow the previously agreed bid for the Support for Integrity Council for the Voluntary Carbon Market (IC-VCM) and UK-VCM Forum to run over multiyear.

## **Main Report**

### **Background**

1. The purpose of the Policy Initiatives Fund (PIF) is to allow the Committee to respond swiftly and effectively with funding for projects and initiatives identified during the year which support the City Corporation's overall aims and objectives.
2. The current process for identifying which items should sit within the PIF are if they fall under the below criteria:
  - Items that relate to a specific initiative i.e. research.
  - Sponsorship/funding for bodies which have initiatives that support the City's overall objectives; and
  - Membership of high-profile national think tanks.
3. To restrict the depletion of funds in future years, a two-year time limit is in place on multiyear PIF bids, with three years being an option by exception. To ensure prioritisation within the multiyear bids, the PIF from the financial year 2019/20 and onwards has £600k of its total budget put aside for multiyear bids with the rest set aside (£600k) for one off allocations, with the option to 'top up' the multiyear allocation from the balance if members agree to do so. This will ensure that there should always be enough in the PIF to fund emerging one-off opportunities as they come up.
4. PIF bids need to include a measurable success/benefits criterion in the report so that the successful bids can then be reviewed to see what the outcomes are and if the works/activities meet the objectives of the PIF. These measures will be used to review PIF bids on a six-monthly basis. This review will aide members in evaluating the effectiveness/benefits of PIF bids supported works/activities which can be taken into consideration when approving similar works/activities in the future.
5. When a PIF bid has been approved there should be a reasonable amount of progress/spend on the works/activities within 18 months of approval which allows for slippage and delays. If there has not been enough spend/activity within this timeframe, members will be asked to approve that the remaining allocation be returned to the Fund where it can be utilised for other works/activities. If the Department requires funding for the same works/activities again at a later date, it is suggested that they re-bid for the funding. If there is a legitimate reason, out of the Department's control, which has caused delays, it is recommended that these are reviewed by Committee as needed.
6. The Committee Contingency Fund is used to fund unforeseen items of expenditure when no specific provision exists within the Policy Committee's budget such as hosting one-off events.
7. The Committee's Project Reserve is a limited reserve which has been established from funds moved from the Projects Sub Committee Contingency Fund as approved in May 2019's Policy and Resources Committee. The initial amount



transferred to this reserve totalled £450,000 from the Project Sub Committee, this is not an annual Contingency but a one-off sum. It is suggested that this reserve is used for project type spend.

8. The COVID19 Contingency Fund is a time limited fund established to meet any unforeseen items of expenditure due to the COVID19 virus such as; to enact contingency planning arrangements, support unforeseen expenditure required to support service community which cannot be met from local budgets and to support/implement guidance issued by the government where there is no other compensating source of funding. The Town Clerk and Chamberlain have delegated authority to approve bids to this fund that are under £250,000.

### **Current Position**

9. Appendices 1 to 3 list committed projects and activities approved by this Committee for the current and future financial years with the remaining balances available for the PIF (Appendix 1), your Committee's Contingency (Appendix 2), and the Policy & Resources Project Reserve (Appendix 3). Bids against the COVID19 Contingency Fund (Appendix 4) has either been approved by the Town Clerk and Chamberlain under delegated authority or by this Committee.
10. The balances that are currently available in the Policy Initiatives Fund, Committee Contingency Fund, Committee's Project Reserve and COVID Contingency for 2022/23 are shown in the Table below.

<b>Fund</b>	<b>2022/23 Opening Balance  £</b>	<b>2022/23 Approved Bids  £</b>	<b>2022/23 Balance Remaining after 2022/23 Approved Bids  £</b>	<b>2022/23 Pending Bids  £</b>	<b>2022/23 Balance Remaining after 2022/23 Pending Bids  £</b>
Policy Initiative Fund	2,289,892	(1,839,049)	450,843	0	450,843
Policy and Resources Contingency	604,354	(107,862)	496,492	0	496,492
Policy and Resources Project Reserve	343,000	0	343,000	0	343,000
COVID19 Contingency	727,496	(265,000)	462,496	0	462,496

11. The remaining multiyear allocation is shown in the Table below with details, as shown in Appendix 1, prior to any allowances being made for any other proposals on today's agenda. The multiyear PIF cap needs to be increased for 2022/23 and 2023/24 for the Support for Integrity Council for the Voluntary Carbon Market (IC-VCM) and UK-VCM Forum bid previously agreed. All funds for both years have now been fully allocated.

	2022/23	2023/24	2024/25
Balance remaining of Multiyear PIF allocation	£0	£0	£300,000

### **Corporate & Strategic Implications**

12. Strategic implications – Although each PIF application has to be judged on its merits, it can be assumed that they may be helping towards contributing to a flourishing society, supporting a thriving economy and shaping outstanding environments as per the corporate plan.
13. Financial implications – Each PIF application should be approved on a case by case basis and Departments should look to local budgets first before seeking PIF approval, with PIF requests only being submitted if there is no funding within local budgets available
14. Resource implications – None
15. Legal implications – None
16. Risk implications – None
17. Equalities implications – None
18. Climate implications – None
19. Security implications – None

### **Appendices**

- Appendix 1 – PIF 2022/23 and Future Years
- Appendix 2 – P&R Contingency 2022/23 and Future Years
- Appendix 3 – P&R Project Reserve 2022/23
- Appendix 4 – COVID19 Contingency 2022/23

### **Geraldine Francis**

Accountancy Assistant, Chamberlain

T: 020 7332 1770

E: [Geraldine.francis@cityoflondon.gov.uk](mailto:Geraldine.francis@cityoflondon.gov.uk)

## Appendix 1: Policy and Resources Committee - Policy Initiative Fund 2022/23 to 2025/26

Budget	2022/23	2023/24	2024/25	2025/26
Initial budget	£ 1,200,000	£ 1,200,000	£ 1,200,000	£ 1,200,000
Uncommitted balance brought forward from 2021/22	£ 137,307	£ -	£ -	£ -
Unspent balances deferred from 2021/22	£ 869,049	£ -	£ -	£ -
Unspent balances in 2021/22 returned to Fund	£ 83,536	£ -	£ -	£ -
	£ -	£ -	£ -	£ -
	£ -	£ -	£ -	£ -
<b>Revised Budget</b>	<b>£ 2,289,892</b>	<b>£ 1,200,000</b>	<b>£ 1,200,000</b>	<b>£ 1,200,000</b>

Date	Name	2022/23 Bid	2022/23 Actual	2023/24 Bid	2024/25 Bid	2025/26 Bid
07/07/16	London Councils Summit	£ 16,000	-			
22/02/18	Sponsorship of Wincott Awards	£ 4,000	-			
07/06/18	City of London Corporation - Engagement with Strategy World Economic Forum (WEF)	£ 76,339	3,285			
05/07/18	Events Partnership with The Strand Group, King's College London	£ 35,787	-			
17/10/19	City Week 2020 Event Sponsorship	£ 25,000	-			
20/02/20	Future.Now - Application for Funding	£ 17,000	-			
20/02/20	Sports Engagement Events & Initiatives (Tokyo 2020 Games)	£ 30,236	8,684			
11/06/20	British Foreign Policy Group	£ 17,000	-			
24/09/20	Commitment to UN Sustainable Development Goals	£ 29,450	-			
21/01/21	Support for Innovate Finance	£ 500,000	-	£ 250,000		
Urgency	Investment Support Membership	£ 367,000	-	£ 183,000		
18/02/21	Commonwealth Enterprise and Investment Council: Renewal of Strategic Partnership	£ 20,000	10,000			
08/04/21	Standing International Forum of Commercial Courts	£ 50,000	-	£ 50,000		
06/05/21	Options to Promote Supplier Diversity	£ 17,000	-			
08/07/21	Culture & Commerce Taskforce: Fuelling Creative Renewal - City Corporation Action Plan & Programme Outline	£ 2,431	-			
08/07/21	Voluntary Carbon Markets	£ 4,806	-			
08/07/21	Adoption of Competitiveness Strategy - Development of an 'Asset Under Management' Campaign	£ 70,000	11,289			
16/11/21	Sports Engagement Update	£ 75,000	-	£ -	£ -	
16/12/21	Impact Investment Institute Membership (III)	£ 87,000	-	£ 113,000	£ 100,000	
20/01/22	Summit on Impact Investing	£ 100,000	-			
17/02/22	Franco-British Young Leaders' Programme - Gala Dinner 2022	£ 20,000				
17/02/22	Support for Financial and Literacy Inclusion Campaign	£ 75,000				
17/02/22	Commonwealth Games Baton Relay Celebrations	£ 70,000	3,000			
05/05/22	Support for Integrity Council for the Voluntary Carbon Market (IC-VCM) & UK-VCM	£ 130,000		£ 130,000	£ 200,000	
	<b>Total Allocations</b>	<b>£ 1,839,049</b>	<b>36,258</b>	<b>£ 726,000</b>	<b>£ 300,000</b>	<b>£ -</b>
	<b>Balance Remaining</b>	<b>£ 450,843</b>		<b>£ 474,000</b>	<b>£ 900,000</b>	<b>£ 1,200,000</b>

Bids for Committee's Approval: 09 June 2022

-	-	-	-	-
-	-	-	-	-
<b>Total Balance if pending bids are approved</b>	<b>£ 450,843</b>	<b>£ 474,000</b>	<b>£ 900,000</b>	<b>£ 1,200,000</b>

	Multi Year PIF Bids	2022/23 Bid	2023/24 Bid	2024/25 Bid	2025/26 Bid
	<b>Multi Year PIF Allocation</b>	<b>600,000</b>	<b>£ 600,000</b>	<b>£ 600,000</b>	<b>£ 600,000</b>
24/09/20	Commitment to UN Sustainable Development Goals	10,000			
21/01/21	Support for Innovate Finance	250,000	£ 250,000		
18/02/21	Commonwealth Enterprise and Investment Council - Renewal of Strategic Partnership	20,000			
Urgency	Investment Support Membership	183,000	£ 183,000		
08/04/21	Standing International Forum of Commercial Courts	50,000	£ 50,000		
16/12/21	Impact Investment Institute Membership (III)	87,000	£ 113,000	£ 100,000	
05/05/22	Support for Integrity Council for the Voluntary Carbon Market (IC-VCM) & UK-VCM	130,000	£ 130,000	£ 200,000	
	<b>Total Multi Year Allocations</b>	<b>730,000</b>	<b>£ 726,000</b>	<b>£ 300,000</b>	<b>£ -</b>
	<b>Multi Year PIF Allocation Balance</b>	<b>- 130,000</b>	<b>-£ 126,000</b>	<b>£ 300,000</b>	<b>£ 600,000</b>

Bids for Committee's Approval: 09 June 2022

-	-	-	-	-
-	-	-	-	-
<b>Total Balance if pending bids are approved</b>	<b>- 130,000</b>	<b>-£ 126,000</b>	<b>£ 300,000</b>	<b>£ 600,000</b>

This page is intentionally left blank

## Appendix 2: Policy and Resources Committee - Contingency 2022/23 to 2025/26

Budget	2022/23		2023/24	2024/25	2025/26
Initial Budget	£ 300,000		£ 300,000	£ 300,000	£ 300,000
Uncommitted balance brought forward from 2021/22	£ 210,719		£ -	£ -	£ -
Unspent balances deferred from 2021/22	£ 92,863		£ -	£ -	£ -
Unspent balances in 2021/22 returned to Fund	£ 772		£ -	£ -	£ -
<b>Revised Budget</b>	<b>£ 604,354</b>		<b>£ 300,000</b>	<b>£ 300,000</b>	<b>£ 300,000</b>

Date	Name	2022/23 Bid	2022/23 Actual	2023/24 Bid	2024/25 Bid	2025/26 Bid
08/05/14	City of London Scholarship - Anglo-Irish Literature	£ 19,850	£ -	£ -	£ -	£ -
17/11/16	Police Arboretum Memorial Fundraising Dinner	£ 21,697	£ -	£ -	£ -	£ -
20/02/20	Common Council Elections in March 2021 - funding a high-profile advertising campaign	£ 14,059	£ 1,307	£ -	£ -	£ -
10/12/20	Electoral Registration Campaign Manager	£ 22,219	£ 7,667	£ -	£ -	£ -
Urgency	Lord Mayor's Show Arrangements	£ 15,000	£ -	£ 15,000	£ 15,000	£ -
14/10/21	Election Engagement Campaign	£ 15,037	£ -			
	<b>Total Allocations</b>	<b>£ 107,862</b>	<b>8,973</b>	<b>£ 15,000</b>	<b>£ 15,000</b>	<b>£ -</b>
	<b>Balance Remaining</b>	<b>£ 496,492</b>		<b>£ 285,000</b>	<b>£ 285,000</b>	<b>£ 300,000</b>

Bids for Committee's Approval: **09 June 2022**

-	-	-	-	-
-	-	-	-	-
<b>Total Balance if pending bids are approved</b>	<b>£ 496,492</b>	<b>£ 285,000</b>	<b>£ 285,000</b>	<b>£ 300,000</b>

This page is intentionally left blank

## Appendix 3: Policy and Resources Committee Project Reserve: 2022/23

Budget	2022/23
Initial Budget	£ 450,000
Less: 2019/20 spend	-£ 30,000
Less: 2020/21 spend	-£ 66,422
Less: 2021/22 spend	-£ 10,578
Revised Budget	£ 343,000

Date	Name	2022/23 Bid	2022/23 Actual
		£ -	£ -
	<b>Total Allocations</b>	£ -	£ -
	<b>Balance Remaining</b>	£ 343,000	

Bids for Committee's Approval: **09 June 2022**

-	-
-	-
<b>Total Balance if pending bids are approved</b>	<b>£ 343,000</b>

This page is intentionally left blank



### Appendix 4: Policy & Resources Committee - COVID Contingency 2020/21 - 2021/22

Budget	2020/21	2021/22	2022/23
Initial Budget	£ 1,500,000		
Funding moved from Brexit funding - City Fund	£ 239,270		
Funding moved from Brexit Funding - City's Cash	£ 413,276		
Uncommitted funding carried forward from 2021/22 - City Fund		£ 85,000	
Uncommitted funding carried forward from 2021/22 - City's Cash		£ 394,546	£ 727,496
Additional Funds (Previously ringfenced for GSMD)		£ 600,000	
Funding transferred from PIF & Finance Contingency		£ 500,000	
<b>Revised Budget</b>	<b>£ 2,152,546</b>	<b>£ 1,579,546</b>	<b>£ 727,496</b>

Date	Name	2020/21 Bids	2021/22 Bids	2022/23 Bids
03/04/20	SMTA Rates Bill	£ 67,000		
21/04/20	COLPAI - CCTV	£ 41,000		
17/04/20	Support the Mortality Management Group	£ 27,000		
24/04/20	Direct Access Server Replacement + Additional Server	£ 37,000		
06/05/20	PPE Purchasing	£ 4,000		
11/05/20	CoLP IT Resilience	£ 263,000		
28/05/20	Open Spaces PPE and HSE	£ 65,000		
09/06/20	Using Public Transport and Social Distancing - Face Coverings	£ 25,000		
24/06/20	CoLIT - Remote Working upgrades and expenses	£ 81,000		
09/07/20	City of London Academies Trust Funding Request for Summer Provision 2020/21	£ 70,000		
08/07/20	Everyone In - Rough Sleeping Response	£ 261,000		
27/07/20	Brakespear Mortuary	£ 32,000		
05/10/20	Public Health Communications Officer	£ 50,000		
19/11/20	Communications with Residents	£ 28,000		
10/12/20	Dedicated City Corporation News Hub on City AM	£ 45,000		
21/12/20	Dedicated strategic support on social care to the Chief Executive of Ealing	£ 9,000		
22/01/21	Letter drops to City residents	£ 24,000		
10/02/21	Public Health Communications Officer extended		£ 40,000	
18/03/21	Dedicated City Corporation News Hub on City AM		£ 45,000	
11/03/21	Recovery Promotional Campaign		£ 250,000	
19/03/21	Covering the cost of Hands-Face-Space COVID19 Campaign Materials	£ 13,000		
26/03/21	Contributions towards Pan London Mortality Wace 1 Costs	£ 16,000		
31/03/21	Mental Health & Well Being support to Academies	£ 320,000		
31/03/21	Laptops required for new starters and replacing broken devices	£ 195,000		
13/04/21	Temporary Communication lead		£ 40,000	
13/04/21	Letter drops to Residents: May & June		£ 16,000	
08/06/21	Committee Meeting Live Streaming		£ 68,000	
01/07/21	Return to work costs		£ 14,000	
07/07/21	Mailing to city residents		£ 8,000	
05/08/21	Public Health Comms Officer		£ 40,000	
19/08/21	Phone licences		£ 6,000	
20/09/21	IT costs for home working		£ 38,000	
22/10/21	Culture Communications Officer		£ 40,000	
10/11/21	65a Basinghall use as a Covid Test Centre		£ 90,000	
16/12/21	City Matters Special Edition - COVID Booster Campaign		£ 18,000	
16/12/21	Covid Test Centre and Pop-up Centres		£ 54,050	
20/01/22	City Fund - Leadenhall Market Covid-19		£ 85,000	£ 265,000
	<b>Total Allocations</b>	<b>£ 1,673,000</b>	<b>£ 852,050</b>	<b>£ 265,000</b>
	Non ringfenced balance (City's Cash)		£ 727,496	£ 462,496
	Non ringfenced balance (City Fund)		£ -	£ -
	<b>Total Balance Remaining</b>		<b>£ 727,496</b>	<b>£ 462,496</b>

Bids pending Town Clerks Approval: **09 June 2022**

Total Balance if pending bids are approved

£ 727,496 £ 462,496

This page is intentionally left blank

Document is Restricted

This page is intentionally left blank