

Item No. 20.	Classification: Open	Date: 13 March 2018	Meeting Name: Cabinet
Report title:		Gateway 0 - facilities management contract for the council's operational estate	
Ward(s) or groups affected:		All	
Cabinet Member:		Councillor Fiona Colley, Finance, Modernisation and Performance	

FOREWORD – COUNCILLOR FIONA COLLEY, CABINET MEMBER FOR FINANCE, MODERNISATION AND PERFORMANCE

With our two large facilities management contracts expiring in 2020 we have an opportunity now to consider how we will deliver these services in the future. With the collapse of Carillion and profit warnings from other large firms in the outsourcing sector, we have particularly considered the risks associated with large single provider outsourced contracts, and in accordance with the Fairer Future Procurement Strategy, considered the opportunity and our capacity to bring services in house.

At this stage we are recommending that we bring a number of FM services back in house, such as pest control, reception services, fixed security and cleaning in our main offices. The remaining FM services will be divided into two contracts, one for soft FM services (such as one off security and cleaning of outlying offices and facilities) and one for hard FM services (such as repairs and maintenance). There may well be opportunities to insource more services when these contracts expire.

We will also be using the tender process to encourage the contractors to employ local people and use local SME businesses as sub-contractors. As ever we will require them to pay the London Living Wage and offer apprenticeships. This will be set out in more detail at the Gateway 1 stage.

RECOMMENDATION

1. That Cabinet approves the recommended strategic delivery option to divide the corporate facilities management services into three areas; in-house services, and soft and hard services (which will be subject to a tender process). For further details see paragraphs 37-39.

BACKGROUND INFORMATION

2. The vision statement for the Corporate Facilities Management (CFM) team is, 'CFM aim to provide a reliable, consistent and proactive FM service to ensure our employees and the public have clean, safe and welcoming operational buildings provided by the council. We strive to provide our customers with services that are value for money'.
3. The service provides hard FM (planned preventative maintenance, reactive maintenance and statutory compliance such as fire and water risk assessments) and soft FM (help desk, cleaning, pest control, security services (fixed and ad-

hoc), confidential waste, vending service and inter-site mail) to core operational non-residential buildings within the borough.

4. There are currently two suppliers providing FM services to Southwark Council, Interserve (Facilities Management) Limited (Interserve) and Kier Facilities Services Ltd (Kier).
5. Following a competitive procurement process and subsequent approval of the Gateway 2 on 23 October 2012, Interserve was appointed to provide a Total Facilities Management (TFM) solution (hard and soft FM services) on behalf of Tooley Street, Queens Road and other principal buildings within the estate. The contract was awarded for a period of five years, with an option to extend for a further two years and has a current total estimated value of £45,900,000. The soft FM services were split into 'bundles' which provided the council with the opportunity to retain some of the services in-house (post room, reception and event management services).
6. Interserve's contract went live in February 2013 and following approval of a Gateway 3 on 19 September 2017, was extended and is due to expire in January 2020. Throughout the contract's duration Interserve's services have been extended (within the parameters of the contract) to include up to 54 core operational buildings within the borough, making a total spend of £6,500,000 for the 2016-17 financial year.
7. Following approval of the Gateway 2 on 12 February 2016, Kier was appointed to provide consolidated repairs and maintenance services for the council's operational estate. This contract followed a separate competitive procurement process to rationalise the council's supplier base from 30 suppliers for hard FM services to a single supplier. This increased efficiencies and economies of scale across the estate and formalised the contractual agreements for required services. Kier's contract went live in June 2016, was awarded for a period of four years and is due to expire in June 2020. There is an option to extend the contract for a further two years and has current total estimated value of £7,400,000; however, the council is intending to allow both contracts to co-terminate in 2020.
8. Kier's contract provides technical services support (hard FM) to 53 core operational buildings, along with a compliance risk assessment service to a further 94 buildings. In addition, Kier operate the single 24/7 helpdesk where all job requests are raised and managed from their office based in Basingstoke.
9. The remaining 339 non residential buildings (schools and tenants halls etc.) and 840 commercial buildings, which do not require a fully managed service, can access the Kier agreement on a call-off basis as and when they require services offered as part of the contract.
10. The council's contracts with Interserve and Kier have multiple maintenance strategies and key performance indicators (KPI's). The CFM team have undertaken a review of the current service and are developing a new and refined operating model that will deliver streamlined and efficient FM support to the operational estate in line with the procurement strategy post 2020.

KEY ISSUES FOR CONSIDERATION

Future service requirements and outcomes

11. CFM's future requirements will remain largely the same as they are currently provided where the buildings continue to operate in the same capacity. This means that future contracts for FM services are likely to have an increased annual value due to changes in suppliers operating models.
12. The key objectives for future contracts will be to further centralise the services provided to the core operational buildings, whilst also providing a comprehensive compliance risk assessment programme to the remaining non-residential buildings. The reasons and benefits for this are as follows:
 - a) **Simplified operating model**
Streamlining and improving the operating model, will negate the need to duplicate effort by the CFM contracts team and will provide end users within the council with clarity of service.
 - b) **Ownership and responsibility of compliance is clear**
A centralised service will enable CFM to manage the risk assessment programme for all core and non-core operational buildings effectively.
 - c) **Commercial viability for the market**
The contracts have to be of a sufficient size to be attractive to the market. This will increase economies of scale, avoid duplication of services (by having one help desk as the point of contact) and simplify the delivery model. The anticipated cost of planned and reactive maintenance and the corporate compliance programme is expected to increase the annual value on previous years due to changes in the market place. In addition there will also be an anticipated spend of £5,000,000 per year through a capital investment programme.
 - d) **Value for money through economies of scale**
Combining services should enable a reduction of spend per service through a competitive tender, and the resultant reduced management requirements and centralised budgets will allow CFM review its operating model. More information on the scope of cross division departmental working will be provided in the Gateway 1.
 - e) **In-house services**
Further review will enable the council to identify any services which would benefit from being brought back in-house. This would require closer partnership working between CFM, Southwark Building Services (SBS), property and asset management teams to share best practice and utilise mutually beneficial agreements/contracts where possible.
 - f) **Enables digitisation of contact centre**
Through the provision of improved web enabled technology, the CFM team could benefit from a high-tech digital online reporting system (similar to Hornbill for IT).
 - g) **Improved customer experience**

The service would be simplified for the customer, with very clear service level agreements and CFM having end to end responsibility for core operational buildings, supported by a single contact centre.

Strategic service delivery options and assessment

13. Due to the value of the new FM contract being over the EU Services threshold of £181,302 it is subject to the EU procurement regulations and therefore an OJEU compliant procurement procedure is required to be followed. The council could therefore undertake a competitive procurement process via either an OJEU restricted procurement or through a competitively tendered framework to appoint suppliers to provide the Facilities Management support service to the council's core operational buildings.
14. Detailed below are the main options available to the council when looking to provide CFM services.
15. **Option 1 – Create a FM SIAM (Service Integration and Management) Model**
Create multiple FM contracts split by lots for hard FM services (e.g. reactive maintenance, planned preventative maintenance and compliance), with a bundled soft FM contract supported by an in-house CFM management layer. This would be similar to a SIAM model adopted by the IT sector (see Appendix 1 for diagram).
16. Advantages
 - a) This may create opportunities for local Small Medium Enterprise's (SME's) due to the market share being widened
 - b) Would allow more specialist providers to apply to individual services which could improve overall quality of service
 - c) It would reduce the risk to the council of these services not being delivered in the event of a single supplier not performing.
17. Disadvantages
 - a) This moves away from the CFM strategy to provide a lean, streamlined service. It would create multiple contracts for CFM to manage, which would require additional resources to be employed to manage this model
 - b) Model goes against the strategy CFM have been pursuing over the last five years of consolidating contracts and suppliers to gain better value for the council in a low-margin industry where economies of scale are key
 - c) This model is likely to significantly increase FM cost, due to increased management overhead, current pricing and indexation
 - d) This would cause confusion to end users due to moving from two suppliers to multiple suppliers.
18. **Option 2 – Total Facilities Management Contract**
Procure a single supplier to deliver a five year total facilities management contract, covering both hard (reactive, planned preventative maintenance, capital investment projects and compliance) and soft FM (help-desk, cleaning, security (fixed and ad-hoc), inter site mail, pest control, etc.)
19. Advantages
 - a) Provides a more robust and streamlined service to council employees
 - b) Eliminates duplication and promotes economies of scale within the contract

- c) Supports the work CFM have done over the last five years and strengthens the CFM target operating model by facilitating targeted investment and statutory compliance
- d) Will improve the quality of the service provision and allow CFM to improve its internal operational model, therefore providing a value for money service to the council, allowing greater efficiencies
- e) This option is likely to be more attractive to suppliers due to the combined value of the contract.

20. Disadvantages

- a) Savings may not be delivered early in the contract as the suppliers are likely to front load costs
- b) Only having one supplier could impact on the service delivery if the supplier failed to perform
- c) A mutually beneficial relationship and robust KPIs are required to be established to enable innovation and cost reductions, failure to achieve this could have an adverse effect on the contract
- d) The confidence in the ability of a single FM supplier successfully delivering a Total Facilities Management solution has been significantly reduced, following some of the larger FM providers being unable to fulfil their contractual commitments.

21. **Option 3 – In-source all FM Services (excluding ad-hoc security)**

Bring all FM services in house, and run a separate procurement for security services (ad-hoc) (due to the uncertain nature of the requirements).

22. Following careful analysis and consideration, the following services were identified as viable for in-sourcing these are covered in more detail in option 4:

- | | |
|-----------------------------|--|
| • Building Management | Queens Road |
| • Mail porters | Queens Road |
| • Reception | Queens Road |
| • Cleaning services | Tooley Street and Queens Road |
| • Security services (fixed) | Tooley Street, Queens Road and the Wider |
| | Council Estate |
| • Pest control | All sites |
| • Help desk | To be based at Tooley Street |

23. Advantages

- a) There would be a direct relationship with the team providing the services and therefore greater influence on performance
- b) There would be improved communication and a standardised approach to delivering the contract
- c) Following the successful delivery of in house services within Tooley Street, there is an opportunity to align Queens Road with the same in-house model earlier than 2020.

24. Disadvantages

- a) Low margin commodity service that is not the council's core business. A lot of effort would be required to deliver services to the required standard, and could result in very little return. The cost to deliver could potentially be higher than an outsourced model

- b) The additional risk assessment programme is considered too onerous for the asset management team and with the increase in volume would require additional resource and specialist training
 - c) Although SBS specialise in reactive repairs to a large number of residential properties, these are fundamentally different to the repairs and maintenance regime that is required across the non-housing and commercial estate
 - d) CFM would be required to recruit additional staff to ensure that this model could be delivered successfully. However, the skillset required would be difficult to source and retain in-house
 - e) The internal (and other associated) costs of bringing staff in-house would be significant for a contract of this size. Some of the services (e.g. compliance) would require the council to increase their insurance contribution
 - f) There would be a large increase in full time equivalent (FTE) with 233 Interserve employees and 11 Kier employees likely to be subject to a TUPE transfer to the council.
25. Due to the logistics (and size) of the estate, the cost and associated risks with bringing both the hard and remaining soft services in house is too high to consider at this stage, although there are synergies with the current soft FM Interserve model (reception, building management, mail porters, (fixed) security services) which are further explored in option 4.
26. There are many specialist requirements (such as planned maintenance and statutory compliance) that are required to be undertaken periodically and therefore would not warrant bringing in-house.
27. **Option 4 – Bundled FM Services (Preferred option)**
This option ultimately divides the CFM services into the following three areas (see Appendix 2):
- a) **In-house services:**
 - **Tooley Street and Queens Road** – all soft FM services to be retained or brought in-house (post room, reception, event management, cleaning, (fixed) security services, help-desk, building management, mail porters, and inter-site mail)
 - **Wider council estate** – additional soft FM services to be brought in-house for all other council buildings (pest control and (fixed) security services).
28. The remaining services would be subject to a tender process for a new and revised facilities management contracts offered in two lots:
- b) **Soft Services** – to be procured as ‘Lot 1’ and to bundle the soft services to outlying sites within the estate (cleaning, (ad-hoc) security services, vending services, confidential waste and inter-site mail)
 - c) **Hard Services** – to be procured as ‘Lot 2’ and will consist of mechanical, engineering and plumbing (MEP), building fabric, lifts and equipment falling within the lifting operations lifting equipment regulations 1998 (LOLER) and statutory compliance (fire safety, water hygiene and asbestos etc.).
29. Lot 2 (Hard FM) would be a managed contract solution, and the successful supplier will be encouraged to use local SME’s and suppliers for third party support.

30. Advantages
- a) Bundling soft services under one supplier will provide clarity for both the CFM contracts team and council employees that use these services
 - b) Bringing cleaning and (fixed) security services in house provides greater flexibility at key sites
 - c) Employing a supplier to provide a managed contracts solution for hard services will provide the CFM contracts team and council employees with clarity of service
 - d) Consolidates the work CFM have done over the last five years and strengthens the CFM target operating model by facilitating targeted investment and robust statutory compliance monitoring
 - e) Outsourcing the service will reduce risk as the service delivery responsibility is transferred to the supplier
 - f) There will be greater ability to incentivise suppliers through detailed estate management information.
31. Disadvantages
- a) Reducing contract scope likely to impact on the financial economies available
 - b) Two main suppliers with multiple support suppliers may lead to end user confusion
 - c) There could be loss of control, influence and inflexibility over the FM service delivery
 - d) It may reduce the ability to develop a true partnering approach across the FM services.
32. **Option 5 – Shared Service Delivery**
Work collaboratively with neighbouring councils to enter into a shared service arrangement to procure a TFM contract.
33. Advantages
- a) Promote shared best practice, standardising processes and procedures
 - b) Drive economies of scale due to the value of the contract
34. Disadvantages
- a) This is not considered viable due to the market not being mature enough to successfully deliver a combined TFM contract. Recent experience shows London councils shared service arrangement being overly complex and challenging for all parties
 - b) The services incorporated within a TFM contract are not the typical transactional / back office services that are often included within a shared service contract and therefore would not be a suitable model for the council to adopt
 - c) Currently, there isn't a suitable shared service contract for the council to join
 - d) Undertaking a collaborative procurement with neighbouring councils would increase the timelines significantly and would therefore require the current contracts to be extended.

Market considerations

35. The market has moved away from the 'one size fits all' TFM model over the past year due to suppliers incorrectly bidding for work (submitting really low bids) to guarantee winning business, which has had an adverse effect on service delivery, resulting in suppliers withdrawing their services and in one case, going into liquidation. Many public sector bodies are moving to hybrid or bundled

services (as per option 4) to reduce the risk of this happening and to ensure continued service delivery within their perspective organisation.

36. There are a number of frameworks available for the council to use, one of which is CCS framework for FM. CCS have learnt from recently events within the market place and adapted their new framework (available from September 2018) to include up to 50 suppliers, which is divided between large FM suppliers and SME's. The use of this framework will be explored further in the Gateway 1 report.

Policy Implications

37. The theme of "Valuing the environment" and "Value for money" will be increasingly supported through the provision of the new FM service delivery platform and effective strategic management of FM. Supported policies include "Southwark Cleaner Safer" and the "Sustainable Community Strategy".

Recommended strategic delivery option

38. Based upon the information and details outlined above, the recommended option is option 4, to divide the CFM services into the following three areas (see Appendix 2);
- a) **In-house services:**
- **Tooley Street and Queens Road** – all soft FM services to be retained or brought in-house (post room, reception, event management, cleaning, (fixed) security services, help-desk, building management, mail porters, and inter-site mail)
 - **Wider council estate** – additional soft FM services to be brought in-house for all other council buildings (pest control and (fixed) security services).
39. The remaining services would be subject to a tender process for a new and revised facilities management contracts offered in two lots:
- b) **Soft Services** – to be procured as 'Lot 1' and to bundle the soft services to outlying sites within the estate (cleaning, (ad-hoc) security services, vending services, confidential waste and inter-site mail)
- c) **Hard Services** – to be procured as 'Lot 2' and will consist of mechanical, engineering and plumbing (MEP), building fabric, lifts and equipment falling within the lifting operations lifting equipment regulations 1998 (LOLER) and statutory compliance (fire safety, water hygiene and asbestos etc.).
40. Lot 2 (Hard FM) would be a managed contract solution, and the successful supplier will be encouraged to use local SME's and suppliers for third party support.
41. This option is recommended as it incorporates the council's vision to bring services in-house where possible and cost efficient, along with dividing the services between two suppliers which reduces the risk of interrupted service delivery.

Identified risks for the service and recommended strategic option

42. Risks and included assumptions made in the strategic options assessment

No	Risk	Risk Rating	Description and Mitigation
1	<p>Delays to procurement programme Procurement programme is delayed resulting in a period where the council will be out of contract which may have an impact on service delivery as the supplier may stop providing their services.</p>	Low	<p>The programme will be planned to ensure that appropriate resources are deployed to meet target dates to obtain timely decisions so that the tender is not delayed.</p> <p>Robust tender documents will be developed to reduce the likelihood of subsequent revisions and clarifications that cause delays.</p> <p>The evaluation of tenders will be appropriately resourced and executed, and completed on time.</p>
2	<p>Insufficient resource Not having the appropriate resource to deliver this project could result in long delays or even stop this project. This in turn would leave the council vulnerable to not providing a FM service provision in 2020.</p>	Low	<p>Appropriate resource/s needs to be identified prior to the commencement of this project.</p>
3	<p>Insufficiently robust specification Poor specification results in contracted services not being fit for purpose to meet the council's requirements.</p>	Low	<p>Effective stakeholder engagement to identify needs and the analysis of services and their value to define the scope and specification of services.</p> <p>The project manager will hold workshops with internal stakeholders to ensure that all requirements are identified.</p>
4	<p>Abnormally low bids There would also be a risk of suppliers providing an unsustainable pricing model which could lead to particularly high or low cost models being submitted.</p>	Low	<p>Robust evaluation of the pricing proposals will be conducted to ensure that the successful supplier can deliver services to the desired quality for the submitted cost.</p>
5	<p>Poor response A poor response resulting in few suppliers presenting submissions undermines the procurement and limits the council's choice of suppliers.</p>	Low	<p>Open days for bidders will be held to inform potential suppliers and promote the procurement to the market.</p>
6	<p>Failure of Suppliers Working in low margin areas such as facilities management, results in strain on suppliers when things go</p>	Low	<p>Tender evaluation methodology will provide reassurance of bidders financial security. Reducing risk to the council</p>

No	Risk	Risk Rating	Description and Mitigation
	wrong (financially)		

Key/non-key decisions

43. This is a key decision.

Next Steps

44. Programme board to be assembled and detailed programme plan to be agreed.

45. Internal workshops to be held with stakeholders to ensure that the scope and specifications are fully captured ready for the future procurement.

46. Once requirements fully agreed, Gateway 1 will be drafted for approval of the procurement strategy.

Service delivery project plan (key decisions)

Activity	Complete by:
Enter Gateway 0 decision on the Forward Plan	22/02/2018
DCRB Review Gateway 0	19/02/2018
CCRB Review Gateway 0	22/02/2018
Approval of Gateway 0: Strategic Options Assessment	13/03/2018
Scrutiny Call-in period and notification of implementation of Gateway 0 decision	21/03/2018
Current contract end date (Interserve)	31/01/2020
Current contract end date (Kier)	15/06/2020

Community impact statement

47. This contract will have a direct impact on those local residents who visit council premises which are subject to these contracts, and it would be expected that the appointed supplier complies with all relevant council policies and procedures. This information will be ascertained as part of the tender process (to be covered in greater detail in Gateway 1 and Gateway 2).

Social value considerations

48. The Public Services (Social Value) Act 2012 requires that the council considers, before commencing any procurement process, how wider social, economic and environmental benefits that may improve the well being of the local area can be secured. Social value considerations and how the delivery of these services can benefit the local area are detailed below:

Economic considerations

49. Economic considerations are to be built into the options appraisal process for the market engagement exercise and will be reported in the Gateway 1 report.

Social considerations

50. Social considerations are to be built into the options appraisal process for the market engagement exercise and will be reported in the Gateway 1 report. However, any supplier appointed would need to:
- a) guarantee the London Living wage for both its own staff and any subcontractors used
 - b) follow all relevant standard provisions on blacklisting
 - c) engage with Southwark Council's apprenticeship model
 - d) follow the standards for financial transactions and payment windows for their entire supply chain
 - e) make every effort to reflect the council's fairer future principle by 'looking after every penny as if it was our own'.

Environmental/sustainability considerations

51. The supplier will be required to provide services that support, and do not compromise, Southwark's green building targets, sustainability policy and Fairtrade status. These will be reported in the Gateway 1 report.

Plans for the monitoring and management of project

52. The council will create a steering board, which will be chaired independently from CFM. Representatives from both Legal and Procurement will be invited to ensure that all relevant council policies and procedures are adhered to.

Resource implications

TUPE/pensions implications

53. Whichever of the various service delivery options set out in this report is chosen, will have a bearing on the application of the Transfer of Undertakings (Protection of Employment) Regulations 2006 (TUPE). A change in the supplier of the existing services is likely to amount to a service provision change under the TUPE. Further TUPE considerations will be reported in Gateway 1 and Gateway 2.

Financial implications

54. The financial implications arising from the recommendation to adopt the strategic delivery options for the future provision of corporate facilities management services, as set out in option 4, paragraph 27 and to retain and bring a number of services in-house cannot be determined at this point in time. However the council has the experience and capacity to provide them at the required level of quality and will be seeking to achieve value for money within the prevailing market conditions.

Investment implications

55. There will also be an anticipated spend of £5,000,000 per year through a capital investment programme.

Legal implications

56. Please see concurrent from the director of law and democracy.

Consultation

57. The head of corporate facilities management held an internal 'Heads of Service' workshop on 19 July 2017 to ascertain the level of service and support required from the new CFM contract. This workshop was highly attended and good feedback was received to help shape the CFM division moving into the future. Some of the feedback included wanting a more streamlined service and for CFM to provide greater clarity of service.
58. An external review was conducted on the current CFM service provision. 46 interviews were conducted with senior stakeholders, customer departments (i.e. Children's and Adults' services, Environmental and Social Regeneration etc.), CFM staff and external suppliers. This provided the team with evidence and clear insight into the workings, relationships and processes of CFM and the challenges faced by individuals in the day to day work of CFM. The overall findings recommended changing to a less complex operating model with consolidated budgets.

Other implications or issues

SUPPLEMENTARY ADVICE FROM OTHER OFFICERS

Strategic Director of Finance and Governance

59. The strategic director of finance and governance notes the recommendation in this report for future delivery of facilities management services to the council's operational estate. As described above, there are no specific financial implications at this stage from this decision. These will be identified at future stages in the procurement process.

Head of Procurement

60. This report seeks the approval of the Cabinet for the recommended strategic delivery option proposed in paragraph 37 for the delivery of a facilities management (FM) contract for the council's operational estate and to note the next steps as further detailed in the body of the report.
61. At this stage the estimated annual spend is likely to increase due to suppliers operating models and following a review of the strategic options available the report recommends dividing the delivery of CFM services across three areas: in-house services, soft and hard services. The procurement strategy and value will be confirmed in the Gateway 1 which will be brought for decision in due course.

Director of Law and Democracy

62. This report seeks the approval of the cabinet to the strategic options assessment for the delivery of a facilities management contract for the council's operational estate.

63. Under contract standing orders, a pre-procurement / Gateway 0 is required for any service contract with an estimated contract value of £10,000,000 or more. The contract value of the possible procurement is not yet known but is likely to be well in excess of £10,000,000 and will be confirmed in the Gateway 1 report together with the proposed procurement strategy.

BACKGROUND DOCUMENTS

Background Documents	Held At	Contact
Gateway 2 – Contract Award Approval Consolidated Facilities Management contract	Corporate Facilities Management Hub 4, 2nd Floor 160 Tooley Street London SE1 2QH	Paul Symington 0207 525 0225
Link (copy and paste into your browser): http://moderngov.southwark.gov.uk/documents/s32565/Report%20Gateway%202%20Contract%20Award%20Approval%20Consolidated%20Facilities%20Management%20Contract%20for%20160%20Toole.pdf		
Gateway 2 – Consolidated repairs and maintenance services contract for the Councils Operational Estate	Corporate Facilities Management Hub 4, 2nd Floor 160 Tooley Street London SE1 2QH	Paul Symington 0207 525 0225
Link (copy and paste into your browser): http://moderngov.southwark.gov.uk/documents/s60205/Report%20Gateway%202%20Contract%20Award%20Approval%20-%20Consolidated%20Repairs%20and%20Maintenance%20Services%20Contract%20Of.pdf0		

APPENDICES

No	Title
Appendix 1	Option 1 – diagram of an FM SIAM Model
Appendix 2	Option 4 – diagram of the Bundled FM Services (Preferred option)

AUDIT TRAIL

Cabinet Member	Councillor Fiona Colley, Finance, Modernisation and Performance	
Lead Officer	Paul Symington, Head of Corporate Facilities Management	
Report Author	Kelly Sanders, Head of Contracts (Corporate FM)	
Version	Final	
Dated	1 March 2018	
Key Decision?	Yes	
CONSULTATION WITH OTHER OFFICERS / DIRECTORATES / CABINET MEMBER		
Officer Title	Comments sought	Comments included
Strategic Director of Finance and Governance	Yes	Yes
Head of Procurement	Yes	Yes
Director of Law and Democracy	Yes	Yes
Contract Review Boards		
Departmental Contract Review Board	Yes	Yes
Corporate Contract Review Board	Yes	Yes
Cabinet Member	Yes	Yes
Date final report sent to Constitutional Team	1 March 2018	