



Finance and Risk Committee of the Barbican Centre Board

Date: MONDAY, 1 JULY 2024

Time: 1.45 pm

Venue: CO-LAB SPACE, BARBICAN CENTRE

Members: Tijds Broeke (Chair)
Alderman Sir William Russell (Deputy Chairman)
Tobi Ruth Adebekun, Deputy Chairman (External Member)
Deputy Randall Anderson
Robert Glick, Barbican Trust (External Member)
Alderman Sir Nicholas Lyons
Mark Page (External Member)
Anett Rideg

Enquiries: Kate Doidge
kate.doidge@cityoflondon.gov.uk

Accessing the virtual public meeting

Members of the public can observe all virtual public meetings of the City of London Corporation by following the below link:

<https://www.youtube.com/@CityofLondonCorporation/streams>

A recording of the public meeting will be available via the above link following the end of the public meeting for up to one civic 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.

Whilst we endeavour to livestream all of our public meetings, this is not always possible due to technical difficulties. In these instances, if possible, a recording will be uploaded following the end of the meeting.

Ian Thomas CBE
Town Clerk and Chief Executive

AGENDA

Part 1 - Public Agenda

1. **APOLOGIES**
2. **MEMBERS' DECLARATIONS UNDER THE CODE OF CONDUCT IN RESPECT OF ITEMS ON THE AGENDA**
3. **MINUTES**
 - a) To agree the public minutes and non-public summary of the meeting held on 8 January 2024 (Pages 5 - 8)
 - b) To note the public notes and non-public summary of the inquorate meeting held on 4 March 2024 (Pages 9 - 12)
4. **CAR PARK AND OTHER SIGNAGE PHASE 3**

Report of the CEO, Barbican Centre.

For Decision
(Pages 13 - 22)
5. **INTERNAL AUDIT UPDATE**

Report of the Chamberlain.

For Information
(Pages 23 - 36)
6. **REPORT OF ACTION TAKEN**

Report of the Town Clerk.

For Information
(Pages 37 - 38)
7. **QUESTIONS ON MATTERS RELATING TO THE WORK OF THE COMMITTEE**
8. **ANY OTHER BUSINESS THAT THE CHAIR CONSIDERS URGENT**

9. **EXCLUSION OF THE PUBLIC**

MOTION – That under Section 100A 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 1, in Schedule 12A, of the Local Government Act.

For Decision

Part 2 - Non-Public Agenda

10. **NON-PUBLIC MINUTES**

- a) To agree the non-public minutes of the meeting held on 8 January 2024 (Pages 39 - 42)
- b) To note the non-public notes of the inquorate meeting held on 4 March 2024 (Pages 43 - 48)

11. **BRITISH LIBRARY CYBER ATTACK - SUMMARY OF INCIDENT, THE BARBICAN'S POSTURE AND FUTURE DEVELOPMENTS**

Report of the Interim Deputy CEO, Barbican Centre.

For Information
(Pages 49 - 56)

12. **BARBICAN CYCLICAL WORKS PROGRAMME (CWP) AND CAPITAL PROJECTS - UPDATE REPORT**

Report of the Interim Deputy CEO, Barbican Centre.

For Information
(Pages 57 - 66)

13. **RISK UPDATE**

Report of the Interim Deputy CEO, Barbican Centre.

For Information
(Pages 67 - 82)

14. **ARTS PROGRAMMING & BUSINESS EVENTS RISK & ETHICS REGISTER**

Report of the Interim Deputy CEO, Barbican Centre.

For Information
(Pages 83 - 120)

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

FINANCE AND RISK COMMITTEE OF THE BARBICAN CENTRE BOARD **Monday, 8 January 2024**

Minutes of the meeting of the Finance and Risk Committee of the Barbican Centre Board held at Co-Lab Space, Barbican Centre on Monday, 8 January 2024 at 1.45 pm

Present

Members:

Tom Sleigh (Deputy Chair, in the Chair)
Deputy Randall Anderson
Alderman Sir William Russell

Officers:

Claire Spencer	- CEO, Barbican Centre
Cornell Farrell	- Barbican Centre
Ali Mirza	- Barbican Centre
Jackie Boughton	- Barbican Centre
Udhay Bhakoo	- Barbican Centre
Matthew Lock	- Chamberlain's Department
Sarah Wall	- Chamberlain's Department
Kate Doidge	- Town Clerk's Department

1. APOLOGIES

Apologies were received from Deputy Alpa Raja.

Tijs Broeke (Chair), Robert Glick (External Member), and Tobi Ruth Adebekun (External Member) observed the meeting virtually.

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

There were no declarations for this meeting.

3. MINUTES

RESOLVED – That the public minutes and non-public summary of the meeting held on 1 November 2023 be approved as a correct record.

4. QUESTIONS ON MATTERS RELATING TO THE WORK OF THE COMMITTEE

There were no public questions.

5. ANY OTHER BUSINESS THAT THE CHAIR CONSIDERS URGENT

There were no public items of urgent business.

6. **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 1, of Schedule 12(A), of the Local Government Act.
7. **NON-PUBLIC MINUTES**
RESOLVED – That the non-public minutes of the meeting held on 1 November 2023 were approved as a correct record.
8. **INTERNAL AUDIT UPDATE**
The Committee received a joint report of the Chamberlain and Head of Internal Audit concerning an internal audit update.
9. **BAD DEBTS ANNUAL UPDATE**
The Committee received a joint report of the Chamberlain and Chief Executive Officer, Barbican Centre, concerning the annual update for bad debts.
10. **MARKETING FINANCES DEEP DIVE**
The Committee received a joint report of the Chamberlain and Chief Executive Officer, Barbican Centre, providing a deep dive into the marketing finances.
11. **RISK UPDATE**
The Committee received a report of the Chief Executive Officer, concerning a risk update.
12. **ANNUAL PLAN FOR CAPITAL WORKS PROGRAMME (CWP) AND MAINTENANCE**
The Committee received a report of the Chief Executive Officer, Barbican Centre, concerning the Annual Plan for the Capital Works Programme (CWP) and maintenance.
13. **BARBICAN CAPITAL WORKS PROGRAMME (CWP) AND CAPITAL PROJECTS - UPDATE REPORT**
The Committee received a report of the Chief Executive Officer, Barbican Centre, concerning an update on the Cyclical Work Programming (CWP) and Capital Projects.
14. **BARBICAN BUSINESS REVIEW: NOVEMBER 2023 (PERIOD 8)**
The Committee received a joint report of the Chamberlain and Chief Executive Officer, Barbican Centre, concerning the Barbican Business Review for Period 8.
15. **ARTS PROGRAMMING & BUSINESS EVENTS RISK REGISTER**
The Committee received a report of the Chief Executive Officer, Barbican Centre, concerning the Arts Programming and Business Events Risk Register.
16. **NON-PUBLIC QUESTIONS ON MATTERS RELATING TO THE WORK OF THE COMMITTEE**
There were no non-public questions.

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

There were no non-public items of urgent business.

The meeting ended at 2.51 pm

Chairman

Contact Officer: Kate Doidge
kate.doidge@cityoflondon.gov.uk

This page is intentionally left blank

FINANCE AND RISK COMMITTEE OF THE BARBICAN CENTRE BOARD **Monday, 4 March 2024**

Notes of the inquorate meeting of the Finance and Risk Committee of the Barbican Centre Board held at Co-Lab Space, Barbican Centre on Monday, 4 March 2024 at 1.45 pm

Present

Members:

Tijs Broeke (Chair)
Deputy Randall Anderson
Robert Glick (External Member)
Tobi Ruth Adebekun (External Member)
Mark Page (External Member)

Officers:

Claire Spencer	- CEO, Barbican Centre
Cornell Farrell	- Barbican Centre
Ali Mirza	- Barbican Centre
Udhay Bhakoo	- Barbican Centre
Sarah Wall	- Barbican Centre
Ola Obadara	- City Surveyor's Department
Kate Doidge	- Town Clerk's Department

1. APOLOGIES

Apologies were received from Alderman Sir William Russell and Tom Sleight (Deputy Chairman).

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

There were no declarations.

MATTERS ARISING

During this item, the quorum ceased to exist. The meeting adjourned, and it was determined that there was no reasonable likelihood that the quorum would be re-established. In accordance with Standing Order 36(3) of the Court of Common Council, the formal meeting was dissolved and consideration of business was discussed as an informal session. Business requiring approval prior to the next regular meeting would be considered by the Town Clerk under urgency procedures, in consultation with the Chair and Deputy Chair.

3. MINUTES

The public minutes and non-public summary of the previous meeting held on 8 January 2024 were informally noted and agreed, subject to formal approval at the next formal meeting of the Finance & Risk Committee of the Barbican Centre Board.

4. **CURVE GALLERY REFURBISHMENT**

The Committee received a report of the City Surveyor, concerning Curve Gallery refurbishment project.

The Committee agreed that the report be approved under urgency procedures (Standing Order 41a).

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

There were no public questions.

6. **ANY OTHER BUSINESS THAT THE CHAIR CONSIDERS URGENT**

There were no public items of urgent business.

7. **EXCLUSION OF THE PUBLIC**

RESOLVED - That under Section 100A of the Local Government Act 1972, the public be excluded from the informal meeting for the following items, on the grounds that they involve the likely disclosure of Exempt Information, as defined in Part 1, in Schedule 12A, of the Local Government Act.

8. **NON-PUBLIC MINUTES**

The non-public minutes of the previous meeting held on 8 January 2024 were informally noted and agreed, subject to formal approval at the next formal meeting of the Finance & Risk Committee of the Barbican Centre Board.

9. **RISK UPDATE**

The Committee received a report of the CEO, Barbican Centre, concerning the Risk Update. Members noted the report.

10. **THEATRE FINANCES DEEP DIVE**

The Committee received a joint report of the Chamberlain and CEO, Barbican Centre, concerning a deep dive into the financial detailing and modelling within the Theatre area. Members noted the report.

11. **BARBICAN CENTRE - BUILDING DISRUPTION REPORT**

The Committee received a report of the CEO, Barbican Centre, concerning the building disruption report. Members noted the report.

12. **BARBICAN CYCLICAL WORKS PROGRAMME (CWP) AND CAPITAL PROJECTS - UPDATE REPORT**

The Committee received a report of the CEO, Barbican Centre, concerning an update on the Barbican Cyclical Works Programme (CWP) and Capital Projects. Members noted the report.

13. **BARBICAN BUSINESS REVIEW: DECEMBER 2023 (PERIOD 9)**

The Committee received a joint report of the Chamberlain and CEO, Barbican Centre, concerning the Business Review for December 2023 (Period 9). Members noted the report.

14. **ARTS PROGRAMMING & BUSINESS EVENTS RISK & ETHICS REGISTER**
The Committee received a report of the CEO, Barbican Centre, concerning the Arts Programming & Business Events Risk and Ethics Register. Members noted the report.

15. **NON-PUBLIC QUESTIONS ON MATTERS RELATING TO THE WORK OF THE COMMITTEE**
There were no non-public questions.

16. **ANY OTHER BUSINESS THE CHAIR CONSIDERS URGENT AND WHICH THE COMMITTEE AGREE SHOULD BE CONSIDERED WHILST THE PUBLIC ARE EXCLUDED**
The Committee received one item of non-public urgent business, detailed in Item 16a.

16.1 **Barbican Fire Safety Projects**

The Committee received a late supplementary report of the City Surveyor, concerning the Barbican Fire Safety Project.

The meeting ended at 3.21 pm

Chairman

Contact Officer: Kate Doidge
kate.doidge@cityoflondon.gov.uk

This page is intentionally left blank

Agenda Item 4

Committees: Finance and Risk Committee of the Barbican Board <i>for decision</i> Barbican Centre Board <i>for information</i> Projects and Procurement Sub Committee <i>for information</i>	Dates: 01 July 2024 17 July 2024 15 July 2024
Subject: Car Park & Other Signage Phase 3 (02800100) Unique Project Identifier: 11518	Gateway 6: Outcome Report Light
Report of: Barbican Centre Report Author: Alice Lassey	For Decision
PUBLIC	

Summary

1. Status update	<p>Project Description: <i>Phase 3 of the signage project aimed to align the external signage at the Centre's entrances with its new visual identity, introduced in 2012. This was an important part of the centre's brand management strategy, ensuring all audience touchpoints were in keeping with the new look and removing old branding that now looked dated.</i></p> <p>RAG Status: Green (Green at last report to committee)</p> <p>Risk Status: Low (Low at last report to committee)</p> <p>Costed Risk Provision Utilised: CRP had not been introduced to the project when this project entered the gateway process.</p> <p>Final Outturn Cost: £96,979.00</p>
2. Next steps and requested decisions	<p>Requested Decisions:</p> <p>To note the lessons learned section of this report and approve formal closure of this project.</p>
3. Key conclusions	<p>The project was completed on time and to budget.</p> <p>The success criteria stated in the Gateway 1/2 Report was the 'replacement or modification of specific external signage to align with the Barbican's new visual identity, giving an up-to-date, consistent image across the Barbican Centre and its</p>

communication materials. [There is a] clear image of the Barbican brand to patrons across all platforms.’ On assessment of the project outcomes, it is fair to say that this criteria has been met, if to a somewhat limited degree.

Of the eight signs identified for replacement in this project, only six were in fact replaced, due to significant objection to the replacement of the historical 4Bs signage outside Silk Street entrance and in the Sculpture Court. As a result, there is significant brand consistency across signage in major public use areas – such as lakeside, the main Silk Street entrance, and the entrance to Beech Street cinemas. However, the heritage branding still remains in prominent areas, and consequently key opportunities to further reinforce the Barbican brand in the minds of visitors are missed.

In addition, it is worth noting that the aim to provide a ‘clear image of the Barbican brand to patrons across all platforms’ was from the start a goal that was not fully achievable in a project with as limited a scope as this one. Though arguably the most important signage has been replaced, as of 2024, the previous ‘orange circle’ branding still remains on signage such as the freestanding sign outside Beech Street cinemas and the donation point beside the entrance to the Curve Gallery. The even older ‘4Bs’ branding is visible not only in the signs intended to be replaced, but also on glass doors in Frobisher Crescent, and the brass sign by the Sculpture Court Conservatory entrance.

The six signs that were successfully installed were installed later than the planned dates stated on the Gateway 5 report, which stated works would be completed by June 2017. In fact, the works did not *begin* until approximately 2nd November that year, based on the date the Authority to Start on Site form was signed. This is a notable delay, but not one that appears to have had particular negative impact on the project.

For future projects, it is recommended that, where applicable, residents’ views are taken into consideration from the very beginning of the project to avoid the setbacks this project encountered. At the least, this would avoid wasting resources on projects or elements of projects that could not gain planning approval, and at best could potentially allow for the creation of a plan that would be agreed upon by all parties. In addition, the repetition in the resident’s objection letters of the fact that they do not trust the Centre to stick to the proposed times for the illumination of the Silk Street sign speaks to a serious lack of

	trust that it would be in the Centre’s interest to fix. This is a long-term issue that requires a long-term solution, but the aforementioned early consultation could tie into any strategy regarding building trust with the Barbican residents.
--	---

Main Report

Design & Delivery Review

<p>4. Design into delivery</p>	<p>The design for signs 1-5 and 8 were adequately prepared for the delivery of this project. The designs for signs 6 and 7 were not, as they were considered unacceptable to a significant number of residents, whose complaints eventually led to the withdrawal of the application for listed building consent (LBC). Complaints largely had two themes: a feeling that the original ‘4Bs’ signs were ‘iconic’ and ‘fit the character of the estate,’ and replacing them would take away part of the centre’s heritage; and that the signs being illuminated would contribute to light pollution and shine unwanted light into the flats of Defoe House.</p> <p>It is possible that earlier consultation with residents could have led to the creation of a design more acceptable to them, and that less complaints being received would have allowed LBC to be granted. However, this is far from certain, as the Centre’s attempts to find a compromise – such as keeping the original ‘4Bs’ sign intact and displayed in a different location – were considered unacceptable to the residents; keeping the original sign as the residents wished was diametrically opposed to the project’s aim of unifying the Centre’s branding.</p>
<p>5. Options appraisal</p>	<p>The Gateway 1/2 report outlined possible options for this project. The recommended and accepted option (Option 2) was to replace only key external signage with the new Barbican branding. Another option was to replace all external signage, which naturally would have fulfilled the project aims more fully. That said, once the key external signage identified in Option 2 were replaced, it is likely the replacement of further signs would have resulted in diminishing returns, due to their lesser prominence throughout the centre. Therefore, the chosen option is considered an efficient compromise to balance fulfilment of the project aims with value for money for the Centre.</p> <p>The effectiveness of this option was decreased by scope change when the LBC application was withdrawn as a result of resident complaints. This outcome would be unchanged had the more comprehensive Option 3 been chosen instead.</p>

6. Procurement route	<p>Services were procured through a tendering process. Four tenders were received and were assessed on a quality/price matrix of 60:40. Of the four suppliers, John Anthony Signs ranked third of four on price, but were first by a significant lead on quality. Therefore, John Anthony Signs were awarded the contract.</p> <p>No procurement reference number could be found for this project.</p>
7. Skills base	<p>The City of London project team had the required skills and experience to deliver this project. The consultants and contractors similarly had the required skills and expertise to carry out these works satisfactorily.</p>
8. Stakeholders	<p>Stakeholders noted in the Gateway 1/2 report were managed well and pleased with the results of the project.</p> <p>Residents of the Barbican Estate were not noted as a stakeholder in the Gateway 1/2 report, but it was the complaints of this group that eventually lead to the project being closed prematurely. It is possible, though far from assured, that a more proactive approach to involving residents may have identified these issues earlier, potentially allowing for mitigation efforts to be undertaken.</p>

Variation Review

9. Assessment of project against key milestones	<p>The expected completion date at Gateway 5 was November 2017; in actuality, no works were completed <i>after</i> this date, but a significant portion of the planned programme did not go ahead, with two of the eight signs being abandoned after a lengthy planning process. This was a result of the unexpectedly large volume of objections received in response to the application for listed building consent for signs 6 and 7. This application was eventually withdrawn in 2020.</p> <p>This outcome report has been further delayed by approximately four years as a result of staff turnaround, with a number of projects having their final account and outcome reports outstanding at the time of their project manger's departure. This created a backlog of work that was low priority during a time of reduced staff numbers, as well as complicating matters as new project managers have been required to complete these without pre-existing knowledge of the project. This has required extra time to read through reports and correspondence to gain an accurate picture of the project and its outcomes.</p>
10. Assessment of project against Scope	<p>The project was completed to scope with the sizable exception of the eventual exclusion of signs 6 and 7, abandoned after a large volume of complaints from residents made LBC approval unlikely.</p>

	The result is that the external branding remains inconsistent, though to a lesser extent than before the project.
11. Risks and issues	<p>When applying for listed building consent, the City of London Planning department raised the likelihood of residents objecting to the new signs, especially in regard to the illumination on some of them. However, though this risk was identified, it was likely underestimated; it was not foreseen that the objections would be of a number to make the application untenable. These complaints led to the application for signs 6 and 7 being withdrawn.</p> <p>The effect was that only six of the originally planned eight signs were installed as part of the project, meaning the original aim of unifying the Centre's branding across the main external signage has not been as fully realised as if these signs were able to be part of the works.</p>
12. Transition to BAU	<p>The project had a clear plan for transfer to business as usual. The areas in which works were carried out were available for use immediately after the contractors' departure.</p> <p>The powered lights are to be maintained by the Barbican centre engineering department.</p>

Value Review

13. Budget	<table border="1"> <thead> <tr> <th></th> <th><i>At Authority to Start work (G5)</i></th> <th><i>Final Outturn Cost</i></th> </tr> </thead> <tbody> <tr> <td><i>Fees</i></td> <td><i>£56,415</i></td> <td><i>£44,439</i></td> </tr> <tr> <td><i>Works</i></td> <td><i>£68,088</i></td> <td><i>£52,540</i></td> </tr> <tr> <td>Total</td> <td>£124,503</td> <td>£96,979</td> </tr> <tr> <td><i>Staff Costs</i></td> <td><i>£12,000</i></td> <td><i>£0</i></td> </tr> </tbody> </table>				<i>At Authority to Start work (G5)</i>	<i>Final Outturn Cost</i>	<i>Fees</i>	<i>£56,415</i>	<i>£44,439</i>	<i>Works</i>	<i>£68,088</i>	<i>£52,540</i>	Total	£124,503	£96,979	<i>Staff Costs</i>	<i>£12,000</i>	<i>£0</i>
		<i>At Authority to Start work (G5)</i>	<i>Final Outturn Cost</i>															
	<i>Fees</i>	<i>£56,415</i>	<i>£44,439</i>															
	<i>Works</i>	<i>£68,088</i>	<i>£52,540</i>															
	Total	£124,503	£96,979															
	<i>Staff Costs</i>	<i>£12,000</i>	<i>£0</i>															
<p>This projects was funded from City Fund as part of the Capital Cap Programme. Staff costs were not recorded for this project.</p> <p>Please confirm whether or not the Final Account for this project has been verified.*</p> <p>The Final Account for this project has been verified.</p>																		
14. Investment	N/A																	
15. Assessment of project against	No SMART objectives were identified in the Gateway 2 report.																	

SMART objectives	
16. Key benefits realised	Much of the key external signage now aligns with the Barbican's new visual identity, meaning there is a more consistent image across the Barbican Centre and its communication materials. However, this is not to the extent expected at the beginning of the project due to the cancellation of signs 6 & 7.

Lessons Learned and Recommendations

17. Positive reflections	<p>The procurement route allowed for numerous suppliers to submit a tender, increasing the chances of being able to find a supplier capable of delivering the project.</p> <p>The overall performance of the specialist contractor chosen was good.</p>
18. Improvement reflections	Having a better general understanding of residents' priorities, views, and issues before the project started could have at the least saved the time and work put into the design and planning application for two signs that ultimately the project could not go ahead with. At best, being able to anticipate residents' concerns could have allowed for those efforts to be directed into creating a proposal able to achieve planning approval.
19. Sharing best practice	Considering residents' perspectives earlier on in the project process would help create a better understanding of the ways residents are invested in the outcomes of projects and have some level of power over those outcomes in certain situations. In addition, to make this level of conflict with residents less likely, thought should be put in to how we can build trust between them and the Centre – many objections to the planning application spoke of not trusting the Centre to stick to the given times for illumination of the signs. Them believing we mean what we say would go some way to preventing unwarranted complaints and perhaps a greater willingness to accept compromises.
20. AOB	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • The staff costs noted in this report are estimates as there is currently no way to record these with accuracy. • Due to staff turnover, the writer of this report was not involved in the project until the final account stage.

Appendices

Appendix 1	Project Coversheet
-------------------	--------------------

Contact

Report Author	Alice Lassey
Email Address	alice.lassey@barbican.org.uk
Telephone Number	02038341266

This page is intentionally left blank

Project Coversheet

[1] Ownership & Status

UPI: 11518

Core Project Name: Car Park & Other Signage - Phase 3

Programme Affiliation:

Project Manager: Richard O'Callaghan/Harry Gravett/Alice Lassey

Definition of need: Following the development of a new visual identity for the Barbican brand in 2012, the signage across the site became out-of-date and out of step with the new branding used across the Centre's website and print marketing. To ensure the Centre adheres to basic brand management principles, it was essential that all touchpoints for audiences were aligned, correctly reflecting the new brand identity. This required the replacement of many external signs that displayed older logos and branding, which was the aim of this project.

Key measures of success:

1. A consistent brand image is displayed across the Barbican Centre site.
2. Branding seen across the buildings matches that on the Centre's website and hard copy literature.
3. Project completed to specification, on time, and in budget, without disrupting the use of the Centre.

Expected timeframe for the project delivery: November 2017 – February 2018

Key Milestones:

Gateway 1-2: 31 October 2014

Issue Report 1 approved: 7 June 2016

Issue Report 2 approved: 1 November 2016

Issue Report 3 approved: 15 February 2017

Gateway 5: 30 March 2017

Issue Report 4 approved: October 2017

Works: October - November 2017

Planning application for signs 6 and 7 submitted: 8 May 2018

Planning application for signs 6 and 7 withdrawn: 7 February 2020

Gateway 6: March 2024

Are we on track for completing the project against the expected timeframe for project delivery?

This project was completed in November 2017.

Has this project generated public or media impact and response which the City of London has needed to manage or is managing?

No.

[2] Finance and Costed Risk

Headline Financial, Scope and Design Changes:

‘Project Briefing’ G1 and 2 combined report (as approved by Chief Officer)

- Total Estimated Cost: £49k - £100k
- Costed Risk Against the Project: N/A
- Estimated Programme Dates: October 2014 – April 2015

Scope/Design Change and Impact:
N/A

Issue Report 1 (as approved by Chief Officer)

- Approval for a £6,294 uplift of the fee to North Associates to cover Listed Building, Planning, and Advertising consent applications.

Issue Report 2 (as approved by Chief Officer)

- Approval for a single tender action to appoint North Associates as consultants, allowing them to produce the project tender documentation.

Issue Report 3 (as approved by Chief Officer)

- Approval for a £2,440 uplift of the fee for North Associates to cover preparation of an additional planning application to submit signs 6 and 7 separately.

‘Authority to start Work’ G5 report (as approved by PSC):

- Total Estimated Cost (excluding risk): £136,503
- Spend to date: £41,317
- Costed Risk Against the Project: N/A
- CRP Requested: N/A
- CRP Drawn Down: N/A
- Estimated Programme Dates: October 2014 – December 2017

Scope/Design Change and Impact:

Works to begin on installation of 6 of the 8 signs while Listed Building Consent for the final two was still being sought.
Proposed that space be found within the Centre to display the old ‘4Bs’ signs after they had been removed (*did not go ahead*).

Issue Report 4 (as approved by Chief Officer)

- Approval for a £3,784 uplift of the fee for John Anthony Signs for additional works to the light source for the illuminated sign.

Total anticipated on-going commitment post-delivery [£]: nil
Programme Affiliation [£]: N/A

Committee(s) Finance & Risk Committee of the Barbican Centre Board	Dated: 01 July 2024
Subject: Internal Audit Update	Public
Which outcomes in the City Corporation’s Corporate Plan does this proposal aim to impact directly?	N/A
Does this proposal require extra revenue and/or capital spending?	N
If so, how much?	N/A
What is the source of Funding?	
Has this Funding Source been agreed with the Chamberlain’s Department?	N/A
Report of: The Chamberlain	For Information
Report author: Cirila Peall, Audit Manager	

Summary

This report provides Members with an update in respect of Internal Audit activity related to the Barbican Centre since the January 2024 meeting of this Committee.

Delivery of relevant assurance work has progressed significantly, comprising five key Barbican Centre risk reviews, completion of fieldwork in respect of two Barbican Centre audits, finalisation of a relevant corporate audit, and a follow-up (fourth round) in respect of Facilities Management and Maintenance.

As at mid-June 2024 there are no live high (red) or medium (amber) priority recommendations.

Recommendation(s)

- Members are asked to note the report.

Main Report

Background

1. Internal Audit provides assurance on the effectiveness of internal controls through delivery of its risk-focused audit programme, developed in consultation with Barbican Centre Management, and incorporating timely follow-up activity to confirm the resolution of issues identified during audit testing.
2. The Internal Audit Section operates in accordance with the Public Sector Internal Audit Standards and its Charter reflects that the remit of audit work covers the entire control environment of the City of London Corporation (the Corporation), of which the Barbican Centre is an institutional department.
3. This Committee receives updates in respect of the delivery of relevant Internal Audit work i.e. Barbican Centre audits and corporate audits incorporating testing of Barbican Centre controls, and the implementation of high (red) and medium (amber) priority audit recommendations.

Delivery of Internal Audit Work

4. A breakdown of assurance work delivery between the last Internal Audit update and mid-June 2024 is set out in Appendix 1. Detailed progress is set out under relevant headings below but key developments since the last update to this Committee can be summarised as:
 - Five risk register reviews have been completed and the management reports issued: these focused on
 - Health and Safety (Emergency, Major Incident, Risk of Terrorism)
 - Health and Safety (Failure to Comply with Legislation)
 - Fire Safety (Non-Compliance with Fire Regulations)
 - Fire Safety (Fire Leading to Major Incident)
 - Safeguarding
 - The draft report in respect of the audit of Business Continuity has been circulated. The outcome will be reported to this Committee once finalised.
 - Audit fieldwork in respect of Financial Management has been completed and the report drafted. As above, the outcome will be reported once finalised.
 - A corporate audit has been finalised which incorporated testing related to the Barbican Centre (Accounts Payable: Prompt Payment Performance).
 - A fourth round of follow-up has been completed in respect of Facilities Management and Maintenance.
5. Internal Audit work has identified areas for improvement across all areas examined. It is key that Barbican Management take appropriate action to ensure sustained improvement and ongoing compliance with requirements.
6. Formal follow-up activity has identified that target timescales for resolving issues have been over-optimistic in some cases, resulting in recommendations implementation slippage, and delaying closure; progress in making the necessary improvements has also been affected by staff turnover and reorganisation. Barbican Management should implement proactive monitoring of control improvements to ensure that they are being progressed satisfactorily and having the required impact.

Risk Reviews

7. Internal Audit introduced a programme of risk register reviews within 2023-24 to replace 'deep dives' undertaken by the Audit & Risk Management Committee, with a focus on streamlining the process, and improving efficiency and effectiveness. These Internal Audit-led reviews incorporate a quantitative assessment of the systematic application of the corporate Risk Management Framework and a qualitative assessment as to the overall quality and completeness of sampled risk register content.
8. Internal Audit has undertaken five Barbican Centre risk reviews and identified shortcomings in the systematic application of risk management, as indicated by

content within the corporate risk management system (Ideagen) and the risk registers examined. Summary outcomes are set out below and detailed findings are shown in Appendix 2.

Risk Ref and Title	Date	Assurance
BBC H&S 002: Failure to deal with Emergency/ Major Incident/ Risk of Terrorism	Feb 24	Moderate
H&S 006 – Failure to Comply with Current Legislation	Feb 24	Limited
H&S 005 – Non-Compliance with Fire Regulations	Feb 24	Limited
H&S 008 - Fire Leading to Major Incident	Feb 24	Moderate
BBC CL 002 Safeguarding	May 24	Limited

9. It should be noted that improvement principles have been highlighted as opposed to formal audit recommendations being made. The expectation is that Barbican Centre management will use the outcome of these exercises to support strengthening of risk management practices, particularly as recorded within Ideagen. It is intended that a full audit of Safeguarding will be carried out within 2024-25.

Corporate Audit: Prompt Payment of Invoices

10. This audit was carried out because overall compliance with the Prompt Payment Code was consistently below these corporate targets for undisputed invoices:

- 88% of Small and Medium Enterprises (SMEs) paid within 10 days
- 97% of all suppliers paid within 30 days

11. The review determined the factors contributing to poor invoice payment performance via data analysis and sample testing of non-compliant transactions, including those relating to the Barbican Centre. Audit testing identified several recurring themes which hamper prompt payment of invoices, such as:

- No or retrospective Purchase Orders (POs) or insufficient funds against POs
- Matching difficulties, including where inaccurate POs have been raised
- Delays in invoice input or input errors

12. Internal Audit was unable to provide assurance that the controls in place to help ensure compliance with the Prompt Payment Code were operating effectively, or that the range of activities in progress to drive improvement in this area was having the desired effect. It was noted that processes were generally fit for purpose but were undermined by patchy application in practice. Several corporate-focused recommendations were made to supplement ongoing departmental action to improve performance. Barbican Centre management should ensure that the recurring themes identified are monitored and addressed.

Recommendations Implementation

13. Internal Audit follow-up since the last update has focused on live issues from the 2020-21 joint audit of Facilities Management and Maintenance (Barbican Centre and Guildhall School of Music and Drama). All recommendations from this audit have now been closed. Future audit coverage (2025-26) will examine whether internal control improvements in this area have been sustained.

14. As at mid-June 2024, there are no live high (red) or medium (amber) priority recommendations.
15. Barbican Centre management have been reminded of the importance of providing realistic rather than optimistic target timescales for resolution of issues. Internal Audit has also highlighted scope to strengthen internal management processes for tracking recommendations implementation and ensuring that evidence is provided for follow-up in line with target dates unless exceptional circumstances apply.

Forward Programme

16. Confirmed assurance work for the remainder of 2024-25 comprises the following:
- P Cards Compliance: annual exercise to evaluate the effectiveness of established controls.
 - Contract Management (Locally Managed): part of a rolling programme examining arrangements to monitor and manage contractual performance.
 - Safeguarding: expanding on the findings of the risk review.
 - Health and Safety: focus to be agreed with Barbican Centre management but likely to be expanding on the findings of one or more of the risk reviews.
17. Formal follow-up exercises will be undertaken in line with the timescales agreed during audit finalisation e.g. Business Continuity and Financial Management.
18. A corporate audit of Accounts Payable Approval Controls is in planning stage and will incorporate examination of the Barbican Centre's arrangements.

Corporate & Strategic Implications

19. The overall programme of Internal Audit work is designed to provide assurance as to the adequacy of the City of London Corporation's systems of internal control and governance. This programme of activity is aligned with the Corporate Plan, Corporate Risk Register and Departmental Top Risks. The Barbican, as an institutional department of the Corporation, has a sub-programme of Internal Audit work that includes audit assignments specific to the activity of the Barbican and regular follow-up activity in respect of recommendations implementation.

Conclusion

20. Members are asked to note the delivery position in respect of the ongoing programme of assurance (corporate and Barbican-focused), the outcome of finalised work, planned future coverage and the feedback in respect of recommendations implementation.

Appendices

- **Appendix 1: Internal Audit Assurance Work**
- **Appendix 2: Findings of Barbican Centre Risk Reviews**

Cirla Peall - Audit Manager, Chamberlain's Department,
cirla.peall@cityoflondon.gov.uk

Barbican Internal Audit Delivery Update: June 2024

Project & Scope	Current Stage	Assurance Rating	Recommendations Raised			
			Total Red	Total Amber	Total Green	Total
<p><u>Risk Register Reviews</u></p> <p>The focus of these reviews was examination of key risk register entries to inform:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • A quantitative assessment of the application of the corporate Risk Management Framework • A qualitative assessment of the quality and completeness of information provided within the register <p>The assurance ratings relate to these specific assessments and the extent to which the risk register represents a useful assurance tool for management and other key readers e.g. those charged with governance.</p>						
<p><u>Risk BBC H&S 002: Failure to deal with Emergency/ Major Incident/ Risk of Terrorism (February 2024)</u></p> <p><i>Context: risk score of 16, target score of 8, target date of 31/03/2024 and a 'reduce' approach recorded on Ideagen.</i></p> <p>Assurance could not be provided that the stated mitigation actions would be effective in reducing the target risk score in line with the target due date. Several opportunities were identified to improve the content of the register and better facilitate effective risk management.</p>	Complete	Moderate	Improvement opportunities highlighted			
<p><u>Risk H&S 006: Failure to Comply with Current Legislation (February 2024)</u></p> <p><i>Context: risk score of 4, target score of 4, an 'accept' approach recorded on Ideagen and no target date.</i></p> <p>This risk was recorded on Ideagen as being below appetite but the limited information contained within the register did not facilitate independent review or the provision of assurance.</p>	Complete	Limited	Improvement opportunities highlighted			

Project & Scope	Current Stage	Assurance Rating	Recommendations Raised			
			Total Red	Total Amber	Total Green	Total
<p><u>Risk H&S 005: Non-Compliance with Fire Regulations (February 2024)</u></p> <p><i>Context: risk score of 16, target score of 2, target date of 31/12/2025 and a 'reduce' approach recorded on Ideagen.</i></p> <p>Whilst the overall target date is not until 31st December 2025, assurance could not be provided (on the basis of the limited information within the risk register) that the planned mitigations would be effective in bringing the risk score within appetite by this point.</p>	Complete	Limited	Improvement opportunities highlighted			
<p><u>Risk H&S 008: Fire Leading to Major Incident (February 2024)</u></p> <p><i>Context: risk score of 8, target score of 4, target date of 31/08/2024 and a 'reduce' approach recorded on Ideagen.</i></p> <p>Assurance could not be provided that the stated mitigation actions would be effective in reducing the target risk score in line with the target due date. Several opportunities were identified to improve the content of the register and better facilitate effective risk management.</p>	Complete	Moderate	Improvement opportunities highlighted			
<p><u>Risk BBC CL 002: Safeguarding (May 2024)</u></p> <p><i>Context: risk score of 12, target score of 4, a 'reduce' approach recorded on Ideagen and no target date.</i></p> <p>Assurance could not be provided that:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • incremental progress was being made in reducing this score to the target level, and • mitigation actions were being delivered on a sufficiently timely basis. 	Complete	Limited	Improvement opportunities highlighted			

Project & Scope	Current Stage	Assurance Rating	Recommendations Raised			
			Total Red	Total Amber	Total Green	Total
The content of the risk register did not demonstrate that the corporate risk management approach had been applied consistently and did not facilitate effective oversight of the management of this risk.						
<p><u>Corporate Review: Prompt Payment Performance</u></p> <p>The focus of this corporate review was determining the factors contributing to poor performance via data analysis and sample testing of non-compliant transactions. Three high-level recommendations were made for action by the Chamberlain's Department to help improve compliance performance. Assurance in respect of the Barbican Centre's prompt payment performance was moderate, in part due to the impact on timescales of retrospective requisitioning.</p>	Complete	Moderate	-	-	-	-
<p><u>Business Continuity</u></p> <p>An evaluation of the control framework for devising, maintaining, implementing and testing the effectiveness of the Barbican Centre's Business Continuity arrangements.</p>	Draft Report	N/A	-	-	-	-
<p><u>Financial Management</u></p> <p>An evaluation of the range of key controls underpinning effective financial management – including financial procedures, processes for ensuring the integrity of financial data, demonstration of continuous alignment between finances and the strategic objectives and priorities of the Barbican Centre, and financial reporting arrangements.</p>	Fieldwork Complete	N/A	-	-	-	-

Project & Scope	Current Stage	Assurance Rating	Recommendations Raised			
			Total Red	Total Amber	Total Green	Total
<u>Purchase Cards Compliance</u> An annual compliance check comprising: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Examination of reported compliance with the P Cards Policy. • Determination of reasons for ongoing non-compliance. • Evaluation of local action taken since the 2023 audit to improve performance in this area. 	Not Initiated	N/A	-	-	-	-
<u>Contract Management (Locally Managed)</u> Part of a rolling programme examining arrangements for local contract management and monitoring, specific Barbican Centre contract to be selected from the corporate register.	Not Initiated	N/A	-	-	-	-
<u>Safeguarding</u> Scope TBC but expected to build upon the findings of the 2024 safeguarding risk review, which resulted in a limited assurance opinion.	Not Initiated	N/A	-	-	-	-
<u>Health & Safety</u> Scope TBC but expected to build upon the findings of one or more of the Health & Safety / Fire Safety risk reviews, which resulted in moderate to limited assurance opinions.	Not Initiated	N/A	-	-	-	-
TOTAL RECOMMENDATIONS RAISED			0	0	0	0

Follow-Ups	Revised Assurance Rating	Issues / Recommendations Outstanding			
		Total High	Total Medium	Total Low	Total
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <u>Facilities Management and Maintenance 2020-21: Fourth Round Follow-Up – April 2024</u> <p>The third follow-up exercise in September 2022 confirmed implementation slippage, with 5 issues outstanding. The recent follow-up exercise evidenced that the remaining control improvements had been implemented. No revised assurance rating has been provided due to the time elapsed since the original audit testing i.e. controls previously confirmed as being in operation may have lapsed. A future audit in this area (anticipated to be 2025-26) will evaluate whether improvement actions have been sustained and are effective in practice.</p>	Not Provided	0	0	0	0
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <u>P cards 2023: Follow-up Enquiries – March 2024</u> <p>Evidence was provided of steps taken to address the findings of the previous audit and improve the rate of compliance with the requirements of the corporate P Card Scheme. The 2024 annual audit will examine the impact of corrective action on overall compliance performance.</p>	Not Provided	0	0	0	0
ISSUES / RECOMMENDATIONS OUTSTANDING AT LATEST FOLLOW-UP		0	0	0	0

This page is intentionally left blank

Internal Audit Risk Reviews – June 2024 Update: Barbican Centre Outcomes

Risk Reference, Date of Review and Assurance Rating	Key Findings
<p>Risk BBC H&S 002: Failure to deal with Emergency/ Major Incident/ Risk of Terrorism (February 2024)</p> <p><i>Context: risk score of 16, target score of 8, target date of 31/03/2024 and a 'reduce' approach recorded on Ideagen.</i></p>	<p>Assurance could not be provided that the stated mitigation actions would be effective in reducing the target risk score in line with the target due date.</p> <p>Effective oversight in respect of the management of this risk would be better facilitated by ensuring that updates to the risk register include an overall statement setting out whether the risk rating and score are likely to be reduced in line with target, within the planned timeframe. Where delivery is at risk, the revised delivery timescales should be stated.</p> <p>The following exceptions were also noted during audit testing and reported to Barbican Centre management:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Risk and mitigation action updates have not been provided since October 2023. • It is unclear from mitigation action update notes what further activity is planned by the individual due dates; this makes it hard to evaluate progress and assess the impact of any slippage. • If the due dates are being used as the next significant review date, the commentary in the risk register should reflect this. <p>It was evident from discussion with the risk owners that the risk was well understood, there was a range of activity in progress linked to the mitigation actions and consideration of the risk was ongoing as part of business as usual operations.</p>
<p>Assurance: Moderate</p>	
<p>Risk H&S 006: Failure to Comply with Current Legislation (February 2024)</p> <p><i>Context: risk score of 4, target score of 4, an 'accept' approach recorded on Ideagen and no target date.</i></p>	<p>This risk was recorded on Ideagen as being below appetite but the limited information contained within the register did not facilitate independent review or the provision of assurance.</p> <p>Effective oversight in respect of the management of this risk would be better facilitated by ensuring that more detail is included within the action descriptions and their respective updates.</p>
<p>Assurance: Limited</p>	

Risk Reference, Date of Review and Assurance Rating	Key Findings
	<p>The overall risk description set out a range of causes that could result in the risk event, but the mitigation actions did not reference – even at a high level - the range of planned activities to address these.</p> <p>Overall risk and individual mitigation action updates had not been provided since October 2023.</p> <p>The risk owner acknowledged that the level of information captured within Ideagen was lacking and it was agreed that the next iteration of the register would seek to address this.</p>
<p>Risk H&S 005: Non-Compliance with Fire Regulations (February 2024)</p> <p><i>Context: risk score of 16, target score of 2, target date of 31/12/2025 and a 'reduce' approach recorded on Ideagen.</i></p>	<p>Whilst the overall target date is not until 31st December 2025, assurance could not be provided (on the basis of the limited information within the risk register) that the planned mitigations would be effective in bringing the risk score within appetite by this point.</p>
<p>Assurance: Limited</p>	<p>Internal Audit evaluation of BBC H&S 008 (Fire Leading to Major Incident) identified that one of the mitigation actions linked to that risk references “scope and deliver the capital investment projects as described BBC H&S 005”. This action was reported as being behind on progress: “Scope and cost of works have increased significantly beyond budget hence reduction in progress score and increased due date. Funding to be sought to complete project.” This update, coupled with insufficient information within the H&S 005 risk register, hampers assessment of whether the target risk score will be achieved by the specified date.</p> <p>The following exceptions were also noted during audit testing and reported to Barbican Centre management:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • In some instances, it is unclear from action update notes the plans for further activity to mitigate the risk; this makes it hard to evaluate progress and assess the impact of any slippage. The notes section should capture progress in delivery of the mitigation actions against the relevant due dates, making it clear whether milestones have been met and the mitigation is on track.

Risk Reference, Date of Review and Assurance Rating	Key Findings
	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • There is a completed mitigation action on Ideagen (005b Monitoring and complying with legislation) – marked as complete in April 2020, with a later update of “City Surveyor leading the project, but capital projects currently put on hold pending a City decision” in September 2022. The basis for closure of this action is not reflected in Ideagen. • If the due dates are being used as the next significant review date, the commentary in the risk register should reflect this.
<p>Risk H&S 008: Fire Leading to Major Incident (February 2024)</p> <p><i>Context: risk score of 8, target score of 4, target date of 31/08/2024 and a ‘reduce’ approach recorded on Ideagen.</i></p> <p>Assurance: Moderate</p>	<p>Assurance could not be provided that the stated mitigation actions would be effective in reducing the target risk score in line with the target due date.</p> <p>Effective oversight in respect of the management of this risk would be better facilitated by ensuring that updates to the risk register include an overall statement setting out whether the risk rating and score are likely to be reduced in line with target, within the planned timeframe. Where delivery is at risk, the revised delivery timescales should be stated.</p> <p>The following exceptions were also noted during audit testing and reported to Barbican Centre management:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • In some instances, it is unclear from action update notes the plans for further activity to mitigate the risk; this makes it hard to evaluate progress and assess the impact of any slippage. The notes section should capture progress in delivery of the mitigation actions against the relevant due dates, making it clear whether milestones have been met and the mitigation is on track. • One of the mitigation action due dates is later than the overall risk target date. • The progress score and latest note in respect of one of the mitigation actions suggest that the associated due date (30/04/2024) should be extended. • If the due dates are being used as the next significant review date, the commentary in the risk register should reflect this.

Risk Reference, Date of Review and Assurance Rating	Key Findings
	<p>The Internal Audit review was carried out in mid-February 2024, soon after the most recent updates on Ideagen, and it was noted that the risk was then deactivated mid audit fieldwork. The Corporate Strategy Officer sought to liaise with the Barbican Centre to understand the reason for this and to confirm the intended arrangements for ongoing management of this particular risk area.</p>
<p><u>Risk BBC CL 002: Safeguarding (May 2024)</u> <i>Context: risk score of 12, target score of 4, a 'reduce' approach recorded on Ideagen and no target date.</i></p>	<p>Assurance could not be provided that:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • incremental progress was being made in reducing this score to the target level • mitigation actions were being delivered on a sufficiently timely basis <p>The content of the risk register did not demonstrate that the corporate risk management approach had been applied consistently and did not facilitate effective oversight of the management of this risk. The following exceptions were also noted during audit testing and reported to Barbican Centre management:</p>
<p>Assurance: Limited</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Review and update of the register is not frequent and timely. • The frequency of risk review did not meet the corporate quarterly expectation in 2023 and has not met it in 2024 to date. • There has been no overall risk update since September 2023. • There is no target date for achieving the target risk score of 4 and the overall risk updates do not make clear the likely timescale. • The reported progress on Ideagen is 0% for all stated mitigations with a due date of 31/03/2024, indicating that delivery is well behind target. • Mitigation action updates have been unchanged between April 2023 and the last recorded update in September 2023. • Revised due dates are required for the live mitigation actions. • Mitigation action updates lack sufficient detail to inform progress monitoring – for example simply repeating the description or commenting “ongoing”.

Agenda Item 6

Committee: Finance & Risk Committee of the Barbican Centre Board	Date: 1 July 2024
Subject: Report of Action Taken	Public
Which outcomes in the City Corporation's Corporate Plan does this proposal aim to impact directly?	See background papers
Does this proposal require extra revenue and/or capital spending?	No
If so, how much?	N/A
What is the source of Funding?	N/A
Has this Funding Source been agreed with the Chamberlain's Department?	N/A
Report of: Town Clerk	For Information
Report author: Kate Doidge, Governance Officer	

Summary:

This report provides details of delegated decisions taken under urgency between Committee meetings.

Recommendation

Members are asked to note the report.

Delegated Decisions Under Standing Order 41A

Approval for decisions due to inquorate meeting – Curve Gallery Refurbishment

1. The meeting of the Finance & Risk Committee of the Barbican Centre Board held on 4 March was inquorate. The meeting was formally dissolved, and an informal session was held.
2. Item 4 of the agenda, Curve Gallery Refurbishment, was an Outcome Report seeking a decision from the Committee at this inquorate meeting to note the lessons learned and approve formal closure. The project was to replace the timber flooring with concrete and replace the wall cladding with treated flame checked timber cladding at the Curve Gallery at the Barbican Centre. It was reported that the project was completed within budget and programme, with the Final Account for the project having been verified. Lessons learned to noted included positive reflections of clear and effective communication between the project and stakeholder, and a detailed planning and programming process. Improvement reflections include consideration of the environmental impact equipment used for the project to the nearby foyer/reception.
3. Members in attendance at the informal session indicated that they were supportive of progressing the requested decisions.
4. Approval was sought under urgency procedures as it was not recommended to adjourn the approval of this report to the Finance & Risk Committee of the Barbican Centre Board's next meeting would cause delays to progress the requested decisions, and there is a current backlog of Outcome Reports due to lack of resource and turnover of staff. The current project team have an agreed timetable with the Corporate Programme Officer for when these reports will go to committee, and to delay would have further added to this backlog.
5. Approval was therefore sought for the Town Clerk to approve, in consultation with the Chair and Deputy Chair of the Finance & Risk Committee of the Barbican Centre Board, the decisions sought in the paper. This was approved on 9th April 2024.

Background Papers

- Public Report – Curve Gallery Refurbishment
- Draft Inquorate Minute Extract – Finance & Risk Committee of the Barbican Centre Board, 4 March 2024

Kate Doidge

Governance Officer

Deputy Town Clerk's Department

E: kate.doidge@cityoflondon.gov.uk

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

Document is Restricted

This page is intentionally left blank

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

Document is Restricted

This page is intentionally left blank

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

Document is Restricted

This page is intentionally left blank

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

Document is Restricted

This page is intentionally left blank

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

Document is Restricted

This page is intentionally left blank

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

Document is Restricted

This page is intentionally left blank

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

Document is Restricted

This page is intentionally left blank

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

Document is Restricted

This page is intentionally left blank

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

Document is Restricted

This page is intentionally left blank