

Appendix 1

Project Briefing

Project identifier			
[1a] Unique Project Identifier	TBC	[1b] Departmental Reference Number	36100006
[2] Core Project Name	Billingsgate Action Plan-CCTV		
[3] Programme Affiliation <i>(if applicable)</i>	Yes, affiliated to the wider Markets Colocation Programme.		

Ownership	
[4] Chief Officer has signed off on this document	The Director of Markets & Consumer Protection has read and agreed the content of this document.
[5] Senior Responsible Officer	Jon Averbs/ Ben Milligan
[6] Project Manager	Nicholas Sommerville

Description and purpose					
[7] Project Description					
New CCTV system required to provide greater security and control over day to day operations. Will support an improvement in site operating standards, general hygiene and health and safety.					
[8] Definition of Need: What is the problem we are trying to solve or opportunity we are trying to realise (i.e. the reasons why we should make a change)?					
Management of the site is labour intensive, made more difficult by its layout and configuration. Tenants report a variety of malpractices by users of the site (fly tipping, secondary and unlicensed trading etc) who take advantage of the situation and impact the Billingsgate brand. A modern CCTV system would extend scrutiny to all areas, improve enforcement of site standards. A corresponding reduction in the current staffing would contribute to pay back					
[9] What is the link to the City of London Corporate plan outcomes?					
<p>[1] People are safe and feel safe.</p> <p>[4] Communities are cohesive and have suitable housing and facilities.</p> <p>[5] Businesses are trusted and socially and environmentally responsible.</p> <p>[6] We have the world's best regulatory framework and access to global markets.</p> <p>[9] Our spaces are secure, resilient and well-maintained.</p>					
[10] What is the link to the departmental business plan objectives?					
<p>In consultation with the Tenants' Association, identify and progress improvements to the market's facilities</p> <p>Pursue opportunities to increase income from commercial car parking- by more efficient resourcing</p>					
[11] Note all which apply:					
Officer:	Y	Member:	N	Corporate:	Y

Project developed from Officer initiation		Project developed from Member initiation		Project developed as a large scale Corporate initiative	
Mandatory: Compliance with legislation, policy and audit	Y	Sustainability: Essential for business continuity	N	Improvement: New opportunity/idea that leads to improvement	Y

Project Benchmarking:

[12] What are the top 3 measures of success which will indicate that the project has achieved its aims?

<These should be impacts of the activity to complete the aim/objective, rather than 'finishes on time and on budget'>>

1) No written complaints regarding contractor performance

2) project delivered within parameters and risk provision

3) Staff welfare area reinstated

[13] Will this project have any measurable legacy benefits/outcome that we will need to track after the end of the 'delivery' phase? If so, what are they and how will you track them? (E.g. cost savings, quality etc.)

- Zero terrorist related incidents
- 10% reduction in the level of criminal incidents per month (currently averaging 15 incidents per month)
- 100% of users trained and competent in all aspects of the CCTV system

[14] What is the expected delivery cost of this project (range values)[£]?

Lower Range estimate: £90k

Upper Range estimate: £440k

(potentially could be under lease agreement)

[15] Total anticipated on-going revenue commitment post-delivery (lifecycle costs)[£]:

£500 per annum – maintenace contract

[16] What are the expected sources of funding for this project?

Tenants contributions.

[17] What is the expected delivery timeframe for this project (range values)? Are there any deadlines which must be met (e.g. statutory obligations)?

Lower Range estimate: Dec 2021

Upper Range estimate: May 2022

<Critical deadline(s):> Billingsgate scheduled to Move Q1 2027

Project Impact:

[18] Will this project generate public or media impact and response which the City of London will need to manage? Will this be a high-profile activity with public and media momentum?

None anticipated

[19] Who has been actively consulted to develop this project to this stage?

<(Add additional internal or external stakeholders where required) >

Chamberlains:

Officer Name: Clem Harcourt

Finance	
Chamberlains: Procurement	Officer Name: James Carter
IT	Officer Name:
HR	Officer Name:
Communications	Officer Name:
Corporate Property	Officer Name:
External	Officer Name: Dan Ritchie
<p>[20] Is this project being delivered internally on behalf of another department? If not ignore this question. If so: Please note the Client supplier departments. Who will be the Officer responsible for the designing of the project? If the supplier department will take over the day-to-day responsibility for the project, when will this occur in its design and delivery?</p>	
Client	Department: Markets & Consumer Protection
Supplier	Department:
Supplier	Department:
Project Design Manager	Department: City Surveyors
Design/Delivery handover to Supplier	Gateway stage: 2

City of London: Projects Procedure Corporate Risks RegisterProject name: *BAP: CCTV*

Unique project identifier:

Total est cost (exc risk) *£250000*

PM's overall risk rating

Medium

Avg risk pre-mitigation

8.8

Avg risk post-mitigation

5.8

Red risks (open)

0

Amber risks (open)

5

Green risks (open)

0

Corporate Risk Matrix score table

	Minor impact	Serious impact	Major impact	Extreme impact
Likely	4	8	16	32
Possible	3	6	12	24
Unlikely	2	4	8	16
Rare	1	2	4	8

Costed risks identified (All)

£345,000.00

138%

Costed risk as % of total estimated cost of project

Costed risk pre-mitigation (open)

£345,000.00

138%

" "

Costed risk post-mitigation (open)

£95,000.00

38%

" "

Costed Risk Provision requested

£0.00

0%

CRP as % of total estimated cost of project

- (1) Compliance/Regulatory
- (2) Financial
- (3) Reputation
- (4) Contractual/Partnership
- (5) H&S/Wellbeing
- (6) Safeguarding
- (7) Innovation
- (8) Technology
- (9) Environmental
- (10) Physical

Number of Open Risks	Avg Score	Costed impact	Red	Amber	Green
0	0.0	£0.00	0	0	0
1	8.0	£5,000.00	0	1	0
0	0.0	£0.00	0	0	0
0	0.0	£0.00	0	0	0
2	8.0	£125,000.00	0	2	0
0	0.0	£0.00	0	0	0
0	0.0	£0.00	0	0	0
0	0.0	£0.00	0	0	0
1	12.0	£25,000.00	0	1	0
1	8.0	£50,000.00	0	1	0

Issues (open)

0

Open Issues

Extreme	Major	Serious	Minor
0	0	0	0
0	0	0	0

All Issues

0

All Issues

Cost to resolve all issues
(on completion)

£0.00

Total CRP used to date

£0.00

City of London: Projects Procedure Corporate Risks Register

Project Name:	BAP: CCTV		PM's overall risk rating:	Medium	CRP requested this gateway	£ -	Average unmitigated risk	8.8	Open Risks	5
Unique project identifier:			Total estimated cost (exc risk):	£ 250,000	Total CRP used to date	£ -	Average mitigated risk score	5.8	Closed Risks	0

General risk classification										Mitigation actions					Ownership & Action						
Risk ID	Gateway	Category	Description of the Risk	Risk Impact Description	Likelihood Classification pre-mitigation	Impact Classification pre-mitigation	Risk score	Costed impact pre-mitigation (£)	Costed Risk Provision requested Y/N	Confidence in the estimation	Mitigating actions	Mitigation cost (£)	Likelihood Classification on post-mitigation	Impact Classification post-mitigation	Costed impact post-mitigation (£)	Post-Mitigation risk score	CRP used to date	Date raised	Named Departmental Risk Manager/Coordinator	Risk owner (Named Officer or External Party)	Date Closed OR/Realised & moved to issue
R1	5	(9) Environmental	existing electrical capacity insufficient to meet proposed demand	Additional scope/ time/ cost	Possible	Major	12	£60,000.00	N	C - Uncomfortable	Appoint M&E consultant to investigate, advise and design accordingly	£0.00	Unlikely	Serious	£25,000.00	4	£0.00	16-Aug-21	N Sommerville	N Sommerville	
R2	4	(10) Physical	Works budget estimate insufficient	Reduced scope or additional time/ cost	Likely	Serious	8	£150,000.00	N	C - Uncomfortable	Precedent examples / costs used as well as market testing advice	£0.00	Possible	Minor	£50,000.00	3	£0.00	16-Aug-21	N Sommerville	N Sommerville	
R3	5	(5) H&S/Wellbeing	Working adjacent to live site	Restricted areas of working, limitation or altered contract working hours	Likely	Serious	8	£25,000.00	N	C - Uncomfortable	Set out the requirement and agree contractors compound	£0.00	Possible	Serious	£10,000.00	6	£0.00	16-Aug-21	N Sommerville	N Sommerville	
R4	5	(5) H&S/Wellbeing	Working at Height	Falls from height when installing / maintaining equipment	Unlikely	Major	8	£100,000.00	N	C - Uncomfortable	To be controlled by installing specialist	£0.00	Rare	Major	£5,000.00	4	£0.00	16-Aug-21	N Sommerville	N Sommerville	
R5	4	(2) Financial	Inflation between estimate and mid point of works	additional costs	Likely	Serious	8	£10,000.00	N	C - Uncomfortable	subject to advice from appointed QS	£0.00	Possible	Major	£5,000.00	12	£0.00	16-Aug-21	N Sommerville	N Sommerville	

Appendix 4

CITY OF LONDON CORPORATION
 CITY SURVEYORS DEPARTMENT
 PROPERTY PROJECTS GROUP - COST BOOK

Project No.	TBC
Project name	Billingsgate Action Plan -CCTV
Project Type	Capex
Period	01 August 2021

PM	Nicholas Sommerville
Site	Billingsgate

Financial Summary													
Element	GATEWAY CASHFLOW								Total CapEX	CRP Alloc - GW2	CRP Alloc - GW3	CRP Alloc - GW4	Total Add
	Gateway 1 Budget	Gateway 2 Budget	Gateway 3 Budget	Gateway 4 Budget	Gateway 4C Budget	Gateway 5 Budget	Gateway 6 Budget						
Construction	0	0	0	0	0	215,000	0	215,000				0.00	
1.1 Enabling Works		0	0	0	0	0	0	0				0.00	
1.2 Main Contractor		0	0	0	0	210,000	0	210,000				0.00	
1.3 Direct Package		0	0	0	0	0	0	0				0.00	
1.4 Surveys		0	0	0	0	5,000	0	5,000				0.00	
1.5 Landscape		0	0	0	0	0	0	0				0.00	
1.6 Fittings and Equipment		0	0	0	0	0	0	0				0.00	
Professional Fees	0	6,000	0	0	0	12,000	0	18,000				0.00	
2.1 Architect		0	0	0	0	0	0	0				0.00	
2.2 Interior Designer		0	0	0	0	0	0	0				0.00	
2.3 Cost Consultant		0	0	0	0	5,000	0	5,000				0.00	
2.4 Mechanical and Electrical & PD		6,000	0	0	0	1,000	0	7,000				0.00	
2.5 Structural Engineer		0	0	0	0	0	0	0				0.00	
2.6 Planning Consultant		0	0	0	0	0	0	0				0.00	
2.7 Heritage Consultatant		0	0	0	0	0	0	0				0.00	
2.8 Building Control		0	0	0	0	0	0	0				0.00	
2.9 Project Management		0	0	0	0	6,000	0	6,000				0.00	
3 Fire Risk Assessment		0	0	0	0	0	0	0				0.00	
3.1 Acoustics Consultant		0	0	0	0	0	0	0				0.00	
3.2 AV Consultant		0	0	0	0	0	0	0				0.00	
3.3 CDMA		0	0	0	0	0	0	0				0.00	
3.4 Sustainability		0	0	0	0	0	0	0				0.00	
3.5 CGI		0	0	0	0	0	0	0				0.00	
3.6 RoL		0	0	0	0	0	0	0				0.00	
3.7		0	0	0	0	0	0	0				0.00	
Consequential Fees	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0				0.00	
4.1 Construction Legal Fees		0	0	0	0	0	0	0				0.00	
4.2 Consents - RoL		0	0	0	0	0	0	0				0.00	
4.3 Agents		0	0	0	0	0	0	0				0.00	
4.4 Marketing		0	0	0	0	0	0	0				0.00	
4.5 Stamp Duty		0	0	0	0	0	0	0				0.00	
4.6 Relocation		0	0	0	0	0	0	0				0.00	
4.7 Planning Fees		0	0	0	0	0	0	0				0.00	
4.8 FF&E (furniture, AV, FM)		0	0	0	0	0	0	0				0.00	
4.9		0	0	0	0	0	0	0				0.00	
City of London Internal Recharge	0	5,000	0	0	0	7,000	0	12,000				0.00	
5.1 IT Costs		0	0	0	0	0	0	0				0.00	
5.2 DBE		0	0	0	0	0	0	0				0.00	
5.3 Legal Costs		0	0	0	0	2,000	0	2,000				0.00	
5.4 Other		0	0	0	0	0	0	0				0.00	
5.5 Staff Costs		5,000	0	0	0	5,000	0	10,000				0.00	
SUB TOTAL	0	11,000	0	0	0	234,000	0	245,000				0.00	
Risk Register	0	0	0	0	0	95,000	0	95,000	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	
6.1 Compliance/Regulatory (i.e Planning)		0	0	0	0	0	0	0					
6.2 Financial (i.e inflation)		0	0	0	0	5,000	0	5,000					
6.3 Reputation (Client Changes)		0	0	0	0	0	0	0					
6.4 Contractual/Partnership (Contracts)		0	0	0	0	0	0	0					
6.5 H&S/Wellbeing (i.e Design Compliance)		0	0	0	0	15,000	0	15,000					
6.6 Safeguarding (i.e Site Attendance)		0	0	0	0	0	0	0					
6.7 Innovation (i.e Design Development)		0	0	0	0	0	0	0					
6.8 Technology (BIM/ Sustainability)		0	0	0	0	0	0	0					
6.9 Environmental (Site Constraints)		0	0	0	0	25,000	0	25,000					
6.10 Physical (building Constraints)		0	0	0	0	50,000	0	50,000					
6.11 Blank													
6.12 Blank													
6.13 Blank													
6.14 Blank													
7 GRAND TOTAL	0	11,000	0	0	0	329,000	0	340,000					
CapEx- Actuals& Committed													
CapEx-Variance	0	11,000	0	0	0	329,000	0	340,000					

NOTES	
EXCLUSIONS	
Costs prepared by:	
Costs verified by:	
Date:	

Appendix 3

PT3 - Procurement Options Report: Services and Goods

This document is used to identify the Procurement Strategy and Purchasing Routes associated with a project and only considers the option recommended on the associated Gateway report.

City Procurement Project Reference:	21/28/PS		
Project / Contract Title:	Replacement CCTV system at Billingsgate Market		
Category Board:	N/A		
Category Board date:	N/A		
Project Lead & Contract Manager:	Nicholas Sommerville	Lead Department:	City Surveyors
Category Manager:	James Carter	Other Contact:	Dan Ritchie
Total Contract Value (excluding VAT and inc. extension options):	£100-250k	Contract Duration (inc. extension options):	5 months
Revenue Budget Value:	250,000	Approved:	Y/N
Capital Budget Value:		Approved:	Y/N
Capital Project/project vision reference (if applicable):			
Agreed Savings Baseline (£):	£250,000 maximum expected value		
Gateway Approval Process			
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Is this project subject to the Gateway process? Yes (Light) - If so, what was the last Gateway report, and date of approval, and what is the next Gateway report and scheduled date for recommendation for approval? 1 Sep 21 Corp Proj 15 Sep 21Markets/ Projects Sub 			
Opportunity for Inter-City Collaboration (is there another site/department that could benefit from this project)?			
N/A – this is a one-off procurement project to provide a CCTV upgrade specific to Billingsgate Market			

Procurement Strategy Recommendation

City Procurement team recommended option
--

Option 1 – Procure supplier as one-off contract via open competition

Route to Market Recommendation

City Procurement team recommended option

Option 1 – 1-stage open tender via FTS

Specification and Evaluation Overview

Summary of the main requirements:

Replacement CCTV system at Billingsgate Market

- 45 Cameras/ cabling and head end equipment to be replaced

- new PVR and VDU equipment to be moved from Constabulary rest room

Technical and Pricing evaluation ratio

40% (Technical) / 60% (Price)

Overview of the key Evaluation areas (if known at this stage):

- **Methodology**
- Stakeholder engagement
- **Previous experience**
- Responsible procurement

Does contract delivery involve a higher than usual level of Health & Safety, Insurance, or Business risk to be allowed in the procurement strategy?

Yes – working in an occupied environment and working at height

Is there a requirement for a Performance Bond on this Project and if so, on what grounds?

No

Is the contract likely to require financial uplifts? (Please describe what method will be used to calculate the uplift and whether this will be capped)

No

Will the procurement process require a financial assessment? Yes No

If yes, please indicate recommended assessment: Finance Check Financial Appraisal

Please indicate reasons for this recommendation (please include in this section information on project being rated low/not low): TBC

Are there any accompanying documents with this report? e.g. PTO/outlined project plan identifying roles and responsibilities as appropriate

Yes No

If yes, please include information in the appendices section below.

Will this project require the winning supplier(s) to process personal data on our behalf?	Yes <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> No <input type="checkbox"/>
If yes, please make sure you've defined roles and responsibilities within your project specification. For more information visit Designing Specifications under GDPR . You may include your Privacy Impact Assessment or other relevant report as an appendix to this PT form when submitting to category board (for information).	
Evaluation Panel – Please enter Names of evaluators and Departments below (if known)	
Nicholas Sommerville	TBC

Procurement Timeframes

Target tender live date (to market)	16/10/2021	Notification of outcome / intention to award date	20/08/2021
Target contract start date	20/09/2021		
Are there any time, quality, or cost constraints which need to be taken into consideration? - no works in the lead up to Christmas - working in a live/ occupied site			

Policy and Compliance Considerations

How will the Procurement meet the City's: Responsible Procurement Strategy: To be addressed though tender evaluation with minimum 10% weighting to be applied to RP criteria
TUPE/Pension liabilities that need to be considered (including future exit provisions where applicable)? N/A
Will this procurement be split into Lots? No
Other:

Baseline Savings Calculation: *This section should include how the baseline figure for savings has been calculated against the [Efficiency and Savings Process Manual](#) in accordance with paragraph 3.1, including any suggested savings or efficiencies e.g. reduced service.*

Agreed Baseline (£):	£250,000
Summary of Baseline Calculations / Savings Proposal Note: Typically, the baseline is an existing price but may also be a budget value, estimate, forecast, standard cost or planned expense.	
Please confirm the Baseline Calculation that has been applied below to establish the Agreed Baseline: - Previously Contracted Costs (where there is an existing contract): <input type="checkbox"/>	

<ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Previously Contracted Costs (where there are multiple contracts): <input type="checkbox"/> - Attributed Costs: <input type="checkbox"/> - Target Cost: <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> - Other methodology** (agreed with Finance Representative) and explained below: <input type="checkbox"/> <p>** e.g. BAFO for under OJEU contracts</p>

Procurement Strategy Options: *This could include inter-departmental usage, external collaborative opportunities, existing contracts integrated once expired or adding it to an existing contract. Options for Make (In-house delivery) versus Buy (Outsource) decision to be considered; also indicate any discarded or radical options.*

Option 1: Procure supplier as one-off contract via open competition
Advantages to this Option: (include savings opportunity of the option) <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Tests the market • Demonstrates competitive sourcing to market tenants – shows that we have been transparent and offered the work to the wider market • Allows for assessment and comparison of costs through competitive tendering
Disadvantages to this Option: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Time and resource needed to undertake a tender exercise may delay planned start date
Please highlight and possible risks associated with this option: Very little risk in open tendering other than tie and resource required.
Option 2: Direct award to existing CoL CCTV provider
Advantages to this Option: (include savings opportunity of the option) <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Quick route to contract – no competition required • Known and trusted provider to the City
Disadvantages to this Option: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Does not test the market therefore difficult to evidence VfM to market tenants • Can limit future use of the contract for its core purpose (CoLP) as available contract value may be reduced
Please highlight and possible risks associated with this option: Push back from tenants that VfM cannot be demonstrated – they may not accept a direct award approach unless we can evidence competitive rates.

N.B. Additional advantages/disadvantages may apply if a waiver is the recommended route. If recommending an extension, please make sure that CCM has been consulted (where appropriate) and that we include information on contract terms.

Route to Market Options: *Route to market is the way in which the City will invite suppliers to bid for the procurement.*

Option 1: 1-stage open tender via FTS

Advantages to this Option:

- Maximises market exposure through open advertising
- Open competition should drive competitive commercial bids
- Can demonstrate open competition to market tenants and evidence VfM
- Does not restrict who can bid – can encourage new or unknown suppliers to bid

Disadvantages to this Option:

- Potential for large number of responses
- Procurement processes and rules not well understood by the market
- Increased resource and time to evaluate

Please highlight and possible risks associated with this option:

There are prescribed timescales for above threshold procurement exercises, which may cause the planned start date to be delayed. Bidders may be put off by bureaucratic process which they may not be familiar with.

Option 2: Further competition via framework

Advantages to this Option:

- Timescales can be adjusted to suit needs
- Bidders have been pre-approved so reduced due diligence required
- Likely to include known and trusted suppliers
- Maximum number of bids will be known in advance so resource can be planned accordingly.

Disadvantages to this Option:

- Limits supply base to only those suppliers on the framework
- Limited scope to amend call-off terms
- Due diligence on frameworks may be required if not previously used, adding to time to go out to market

Please highlight and possible risks associated with this option:

May not realise benefits of competition as strongly as an openly advertised tender, leading to increased commercial bids.

Outline of appendices

- Please list appendices here or mark 'Not applicable' if there is none.

- **Items to consider appending:**
 - **PTO (Project Plan with Roles and Responsibilities)**
 - **Data Protection Impact Assessment**
 - **Financial Risk Assessment (if applicable)**
 - **Risk matrix if applicable**

Report Sign-offs (prior to Category Board approval)

Senior Category Manager	James Carter	Date	Click here to enter a date.
Finance Representative	Simon Owen	Date	Click here to enter a date.
Departmental Stakeholder	Dan Ritchie	Date	Click here to enter a date.

Appendix 5 - High Level Programme

