



DERBY CITY COUNCIL

## **Appendix 2**

# **Public Buildings Cleaning & Caretaking Review**

## **Draft Business Case**

**Version – Draft 0.6**

**Date – 2 December 2011**

**Author – Christine Durrant/Neil Sheard**

## TABLE OF CONTENTS

<b>DOCUMENT CONTROL AND APPROVAL</b> .....	<b>3</b>
<b>DOCUMENT PURPOSE</b> .....	<b>3</b>
<b>PROJECT BACKGROUND</b> .....	<b>3</b>
Project Scope .....	3
<b>BENEFIT REALISATION</b> .....	<b>3</b>
Benefit Description.....	3
Benefit Detail .....	3
Benefit Assumptions .....	3
Benefit Dependencies.....	3
Benefit Critical Success Factor .....	3
Benefit Measurement.....	3
<b>OPTIONS</b> .....	<b>3</b>
Options Available .....	3
Recommended Option .....	3
<b>COSTS AND TIMESCALE</b> .....	<b>3</b>
Costs .....	16
Timescales.....	3
<b>RISKS AND ISSUES</b> .....	<b>3</b>
Initial Risks.....	3
Initial Issues .....	3
<b>APPENDICES</b> .....	<b>3</b>
A List of premises where cleaning and caretaking is carried out .....	3
B Project Programme and Timetable	
C Pre- Project Risk Assessment Checklist	

# 1 DOCUMENT CONTROL AND APPROVAL

Version Number / Date	Author	Distribution	Purpose	Changes
0.1 29/10/11	CD/NS			Update with further general information
0.2 22/11/11	CD/NS	C.Durrant, R.Sexton	Review Financials and text	
03				
04	CD/NS			Further amendments and layout changes
05	CD/NS			Further amendments and layout changes
06	CD/NS			Inclusion of appendices and amendments

The following table identifies the current approval status of this document.

Version Number / Date	Project Role	Name and Position	Date Approved

# 2 DOCUMENT PURPOSE

The purpose of this document is to describe the justification for the undertaking of a project based on the business benefits to be gained. The Business Case is used to say why the forecast effort and time will be worth the expenditure. The on-going viability of the project will be monitored against the Business Case.

# 3 PROJECT BACKGROUND

## 3.1 Introduction

A £444,000 annual saving out of an original budget of £1.3m was identified as part of the ODOC procurement savings, where some benchmarking analysis had been carried out by an external consultancy firm who suggested that the cleaning provided by the in-house service appeared to cost significantly more than could be delivered by the private sector.

There were some inaccurate assumptions made as part of this work, but nevertheless there is a saving expectation within the budget proposals that every effort must be made to achieve. To this end a Cabinet report (19 July 2011) approved a number of recommendations to progress the review of the cleaning and caretaking services across the Council.

Cabinet approved the recommendation that schools and governing bodies should make their own arrangements for cleaning and caretaking from the 1 April 2012 and therefore this element of work is not within this project's scope.

### **3.2 Initial assessment**

Work carried out to look in more detail at the benchmarking analysis has identified some issues and has concluded that in order to achieve the £444,000 saving, as well as working towards an outsourced contract, the specification needs to be reviewed and the way in which we deliver the service transformed. This was noted by Cabinet.

As well as issues with the benchmarking, it is apparent that some of the £1.3m spend is actually on caretaking/ site management functions and not just cleaning. This adds further pressures to the savings target, as many functions carried out by site management staff are related to health and safety around water hygiene, asbestos management and fire evacuation.

However it is also worth noting that there are a number of services that provide their own cleaning and caretaking, rather than using the in-house service; and there are also some services that mix and match. There are therefore likely to be ODOC efficiencies in identifying these disparities and bringing the functions, where appropriate into one area for service delivery.

Due to the varying nature of building management responsibilities across the Council's buildings there are likely to be advantages in retaining many of the caretaking/ site management services in direct control of the council, rather than incorporating them within an outsourced cleaning contract. Not only would this allow a cleaning specification to be clearly defined, and therefore attract the most competitive prices, but this would also allow the Council to put in place a consistent corporate approach to operational management, including statutory duties and responsibilities.

If we were to look to outsource caretaking/ site management in the future it would make more sense to do this as an overall outsource of facilities management, rather than include them within a cleaning procurement exercise.

One of the key issues for this business case to consider is what are the advantages and disadvantages of delivering the service through directly employed staff in comparison to procuring an external provider to deliver the service.

Also if the preferred option is one that recommends outsourcing then a further important consideration would be the nature of such a procurement process, as it should be designed in such a way as to provide maximum opportunity to local firms to submit competitive tenders.

Initial views on this are that we could package the work in to either geographical areas, or into building or service types and tender a number of 'lots', rather than tender for one overall contract for cleaning services.

### 3.3 Current Operation

The service provides cleaning and/or caretaking at 70 sites (with 83 specific key areas), excluding schools. The list of sites, linked to directorates is shown in Appendix A.

The Cleaning and Caretaking service currently employ the equivalent of 90 full time equivalents (FTE) work a collective 667.5 hours per day across schools and public buildings. Of this number 5% are on fixed term or temporary contracts.

A full breakdown of the hours by role and

<b>Schools</b>							
				<b>Snapshot April 2010</b>		<b>Snapshot Nov 2011</b>	
<b>A</b>	<b>B</b>	<b>C</b>	<b>D</b>	<b>B</b>	<b>C</b>	<b>D</b>	
<b>Contracted Grade</b>	<b>No Of Employees</b>	<b>Total Daily Contracted hours</b>	<b>FTE</b>	<b>No Of Employees</b>	<b>Total Daily Contracted hours</b>	<b>FTE</b>	
School facilities							
Manager	2		15 2.00	1	7.5	1.00	
Site Manager	4		30 4.00	3	22.5	3.00	
Caretaker	29		190 25.33	14	85	11.33	
Mobile Caretaker **	9		65 8.67	2	15	2.00	
Mobile Cleaner **	2		3.25 0.43	3	4.3	0.57	
Cleaner in Charge	6		27 3.60	3	14.5	1.93	
Cleaner Key Holder	2		4 0.53	1	2	0.27	
Cleaner (Equated)	77		191 25.47	57	146	19.47	
<b>Totals</b>	<b>131</b>		<b>525.25 70.03</b>	<b>84</b>	<b>296.75</b>	<b>39.57</b>	

#### Public Buildings

				<b>Snapshot April 2010</b>		<b>Snapshot Nov 2011</b>	
<b>A</b>	<b>B</b>	<b>C</b>	<b>D</b>	<b>B</b>	<b>C</b>	<b>D</b>	
<b>Contracted Grade</b>	<b>No Of Employees</b>	<b>Total Daily Contracted hours</b>	<b>FTE</b>	<b>No Of Employees</b>	<b>Total Daily Contracted hours</b>	<b>FTE</b>	
Site Manager	1		7 0.93	1	7.5	1.00	
Caretaker	13		82 10.93	19	91	12.13	
Mobile Caretaker **	8		57 7.60	2	15	2.00	
Mobile Cleaner **	2		3.25 0.43	2	2.2	0.29	
Cleaner in Charge	14		48 6.40	11	36.5	4.87	

Cleaner Key Holder	46	110	14.67	38	87	11.60
Cleaner	88	226	30.13	55	132	17.60
<b>Totals</b>	<b>172</b>	<b>533.25</b>	<b>71.10</b>	<b>128</b>	<b>371.2</b>	<b>49.49</b>

\*\* Mobile workers cover both schools and public buildings, these figures have been split to avoid double counting

The roles and responsibilities of the team are split into 6 key job titles...

*School Facilities Manager* - A person responsible for instructing and managing contractors on site, responsible for ordering, receiving and receipting deliveries, responsible for fire alarm tests, legionella checks, site security, managing cleaning staff and completing cleaning themselves, ensuring outdoor cleaning was also completed. Carrying out any DIY repairs and portering tasks.

*Site Manager* - A person responsible for managing contractors on site, responsible for receiving deliveries, responsible for fire alarm tests, legionella checks, site security, managing cleaning staff and completing cleaning themselves, ensuring outdoor cleaning was also completed. Carrying out any DIY repairs and portering tasks.

*Caretaker*- A person responsible for receiving deliveries, responsible for fire alarm tests, legionella checks, site security, managing cleaning staff and completing cleaning themselves, ensuring outdoor cleaning was also completed. Carrying out any DIY repairs and portering tasks.

*Cleaner In Charge* - Responsible for site security, managing the cleaning staff and ensuring that all cleaning is completed to the required standard by staff and themselves (internal cleaning only).

*Cleaner key Holder*- Responsible for site security, ensuring that all cleaning is completed to the required standard by themselves (internal cleaning only).

*Cleaner* - Responsible for completed the required cleaning of the areas allocated to them (internal only).

### 3.4 Current Finances

The current cleaning charge for cleaning and caretaking is split by the respective directorate as below (in Neighbourhoods these figures take into account the saving of £173,000 for 2011/12).

Section	Cleaning £	Caretaking £	Total £
Adults, Health & Housing	142,458	19,962	162,420
Chief Executives	7,202	0	7,202
Children & Young People	419,753	104,883	524,636

Economic Regeneration	3,118	0	3,118
Neighbourhoods	445,501	14,957	460,458
Resources	57,865	7,001	64,866
	<b>1,075,897</b>	<b>146,803</b>	<b>1,222,700</b>

### 3. 5 Project Scope

The Cabinet approvals from July 2011 have led to the following points providing the project scope.

- To develop a business case that considers a range of options for delivering the cleaning service requirements for the Council’s public buildings. Cabinet approved the principle of putting in place outsourcing arrangements for the cleaning of the Councils public buildings, subject to the recommendations set out in a sound business case.
- As part of the implementation of the approved option, to ensure that the revised cleaning service takes into account the new requirements of the Council as a whole entity in light of recent staffing changes and in accordance with the Derby Workstyle location strategy.
- Centralise the cleaning and caretaking budgets to ensure a standardised approach to the service strategy in line with the ODOC principles of simplify, standardise and share.
- To review the caretaking/ site management and building management arrangements in public buildings across the Council, and in line with a Facilities Management approach, design the most efficient and effective way to deliver these service requirements.
- Cabinet approved the recommendation to allow existing contracts with external suppliers to run their full term. This project should consider what approach should be taken beyond that, based on the approved recommendations from this business case.

## 4 BENEFIT REALISATION

### 4.1 Benefit Description

- A budget saving of £444,000 from the current costs associated with the in-house cleaning and caretaking service provision.

- A more consistent and visible cleaning service to all building users, internal and external.
- A shift in the current workspace practices to encourage recycling and reduce the amount of waste that is disposed of in landfill.
- A simplified budgetary process to reduce the financial transactions going through the Councils accounts.
- An improved consistent and corporate approach to operational building management, with leadership and support being provided through the Facilities Management Division, as appropriate to the services.

## 4.2 Benefit Detail

Type of Benefit:	Measurable	Non - measurable	Duration: One Off / Continuous	Benefit:
<b>Financial</b>	Y		Continuous	Saving of £444,000 on costs associated with in-house cleaning and caretaking provision
<b>Non Financial</b>	Y	N	Continuous	Reduced number of financial transactions/ transfers across budgets
	Y		Continuous	Reduction of waste sent to landfill (possible financial benefits).
	Y		Continuous	Improved consistency in the level of service provision for cleaning and building management
			Continuous	Possible increased capacity in front line services, by improved processes and procedures

One Derby one Council Savings (High Confidence)	2010/11	2011/12	2012/13	2013/14	2014/15

<b>Benefit £</b>		173,000			
<b>Cost of implementation</b>		0			

<b>One Derby one Council Savings (Low Confidence)</b>	<b>2010/11</b>	<b>2011/12</b>	<b>2012/13</b>	<b>2013/14</b>	<b>2014/15</b>
<b>Benefit £</b>			271,000		
<b>Cost of implementation</b>			0		

There will be small costs of implementation depending on the option that is selected; for example TUPE costs, staff time in carrying out restructure or procurement process. It is not anticipated that significant cash values will be required for implementation.

#### **4.3 Benefit Assumptions**

From the DECATS analysis It has been assumed that either the service redesign, or a procurement process will enable the overall delivery of the budgeted £444,000 saving.

#### **4.4 Benefit Dependencies**

- That this change to cleaning is done in parallel with the review of the caretaking/ site management and overall building management responsibilities across the Council, which will lead to a redesign of the Facilities Management approach within the Council.
- The role of cleaners, and what constitutes cleaning for Derby City Council, should be clearly defined across all building types.
- The centralisation of current cleaning and caretaking budgets.
- Other ongoing savings will rely upon the consolidation of all public buildings cleaning and caretaking into one cohesive Council-wide strategy. This does not mean that all services must have the same provision, but across the Council we must understand and deliver the most efficient and effective cleaning, caretaking and site management services in a managed way.
- Contractual agreement between the outsourced company and Derby City Council to share any savings gained through site/building consolidation (Workstyle programme) or efficiencies from changes to staff working patterns/processes.

## **4.5 Benefit Critical Success Factor**

Staff resources from across the Council services must be made available to engage with the project to deliver the changes in a planned manner.

The project must deliver a new way of working within Council buildings so that cleaning efficiencies (through the reduction of staff/hours required) can be realised.

## **4.6 Benefit Measurement**

There are cashable savings associated with this proposal that are required in order to realise the original figures proposed within the *One Derby, One Council Mandate*. In addition any contracted work procured would be managed using standard Government Service Level Agreements.

# **5 OPTIONS**

## **5.1 Options Available**

Consistent with all of the options must be the centralisation of cleaning and caretaking budgets into one cost centre, the redesign of current workspace processes, to engender ownership of workspace cleanliness, and the redefining of the cleaning specifications for different types of buildings to reflect the levels of cleanliness required.

Current specifications for cleaning vary wildly between directorates and this is causing a disparity in spend across the Council. By centralising the budgets and creating an output specification for the cleaning and caretaking we can ensure that quality is measurable, standardised and can be communicated to an external contractor.

Simple processes put in place with Council employees could realise further savings by reducing the amount of work required to be completed any cleaning service.

An option that has not seriously been considered is to leave the cleaning and caretaking budgets within each directorate, move the employees to be directly managed by those services and reduce their available budget by 34% to achieve the savings. The reason for not pursuing this option is that this approach is directly opposite to the ODOC design mandate and the principles of standardise, simplify and share.

The do nothing option is also not considered viable, as there is no way that the level of savings could be achieved if no changes are made to the way in which the service is delivered.

Three main options have been considered in relation to the delivery model for the in-house cleaning and caretaking services that are currently provided through the Facilities Management Division.

- Option 1) To continue to deliver the service through directly employed cleaners and caretakers, and achieving the savings target through implementing new and innovative approaches, including new equipment where appropriate
- Option 2) To outsource both the cleaning and caretaking services, either to a number of contractors or one main contractor depending on the procurement approach
- Option 3) To outsource the cleaning services only and to retain the caretaking/ site management service within the Facilities Management Division

## 5.2 Advantage and disadvantages of each option

**Option 1)** To continue to deliver the service through directly employed cleaners and caretakers, and achieving the savings target through implementing new and innovative approaches, including new equipment where appropriate

Advantages	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Employees would remain employed by the Council on their current terms and conditions, with no risk of changes from an external provider</li> <li>• The Council would have more direct control over the employees carrying out this work. This is considered more advantageous for caretaking/ site management staff than cleaning staff, due to the nature of the work</li> <li>• If staff are directly employed by the Council there may be less concerns over those staff working in buildings where the users are vulnerable adults and children, and less concern over key holding responsibilities</li> <li>• The Council are currently reducing permanent staff within the establishment through accepting voluntary redundancy applications; this will reduce the need for compulsory redundancies in any redesigned structure</li> </ul>
Disadvantages	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Even with specifications in place there is a tendency for directly employed staff to have their priorities changed by individuals, sometimes at an additional cost that has not been budgeted for by the service; this leads to tensions between employees and overspends within services</li> <li>• Time would need to be invested into investigating new and innovative processes and implementing new staffing structures to achieve the required savings.</li> <li>• Investment would be required to purchase new cleaning equipment.</li> <li>• It is inherently difficult for the Council to cost-effectively run an in-house cleaning service, as the large numbers of staff involved incur significant overhead costs in relation to areas such as finance, legal, procurement and personnel requirements.</li> </ul>
Other issues	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Cleaning of public buildings is not considered to be a core service of the Council and in the current financial pressures upon all Local Authorities it would be more prudent to concentrate upon those services that more directly benefit the citizens of Derby.</li> </ul>

**Option 2)** To outsource both the cleaning and caretaking services, either to a number of contractors or one main contractor depending on the procurement approach.

Advantages	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• External cleaning specialists are more likely to be in a position where they can deliver the service in a more flexible and innovative way than the in-house service, which is not a core service and therefore can not be considered a priority for investment to deliver new ways of working</li> <li>• Professional Cleaning services can apply techniques and efficiencies from lessons learned with other customers '...outsourced service providers can deliver savings of 10% – 15% through better management, transfer of knowledge from other sites and economies of scale' (CSSA Report 2010)</li> <li>• Recent outsourcing of the Connexions service has demonstrated a potential saving of 52% against using the in-house service.</li> <li>• National and larger dedicated cleaning companies will be able to benefit from</li> </ul>
------------	---

	<p>economies of scale when ordering cleaning equipment and consumables. (Reference: <i>MTW Research 2011 Contract Cleaning Report</i>)</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Changes requested outside of the specification could be managed appropriately so that actual spend is managed within available budgets</li> <li>• The specification could readily allow for the addition of new sites which could be implemented quickly following any further service reviews carried out across the Council</li> <li>• The Council are currently reducing permanent staff within the establishment through accepting voluntary redundancy applications; this will reduce the need for compulsory redundancies in any redesigned service, and in the case of an outsourced contract would reduce the priced costs within any tender associated with TUPE</li> <li>• It is inherently difficult for the Council to cost-effectively run an in-house cleaning and caretaking service, as the large numbers of staff involved incur significant overhead costs in relation to areas such as finance, legal, procurement and personnel requirements.</li> </ul>
Disadvantages	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Employees may consider it a disadvantage that they would not remain employed by the Council, though their current terms and conditions would be protected under TUPE legislation</li> <li>• If staff are employed through a contractor there may be more concerns over them working in buildings where the users are vulnerable adults and children, and more concern over key holding responsibilities</li> <li>• Changes to service provision outside of the specification may be more difficult to deliver and cost more</li> <li>• A contract management structure would have to be introduced to manage the contract(s), so savings in management time would be limited.</li> <li>• As caretaking/ site management incorporates building management responsibilities including specific Health and Safety and other legislation it is felt that to outsource both cleaning and caretaking could potentially discourage the most cost-effective cleaning supplier from bidding for the service contract.</li> </ul>
Other issues	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Management of the contract(s) would be by the Facilities Management Division, on behalf of the other services of the Council.</li> <li>• Due to the varying nature of building management responsibilities across the Council's buildings there are likely to be advantages in retaining many of the caretaking/ site management services in direct control of the council, rather than incorporating them within an outsourced cleaning contract. It is proposed that a review of these services is carried out to put in place a consistent corporate approach to operational management, including statutory duties and responsibilities.</li> </ul>

**Option 3)** To outsource the cleaning services only and to retain the caretaking/ site management service within the Facilities Management Division.

Advantages	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• External cleaning specialists are more likely to be in a position where they can deliver the service in a more flexible and innovative way than the in-house service, which is not a core service and therefore can not be considered a priority for investment to deliver new ways of working</li> <li>• Professional Cleaning services can apply techniques and efficiencies from lessons</li> </ul>
------------	---

	<p>learned with other customers ‘...outsourced service providers can deliver savings of 10% – 15% through better management, transfer of knowledge from other sites and economies of scale’ (CSSA Report 2010).</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Recent outsourcing of the Connexions service has demonstrated a potential saving of 52% against using the in-house service.</li> <li>• National and larger dedicated cleaning companies will be able to benefit from economies of scale when ordering cleaning equipment and consumables. (Reference: <i>MTW Research 2011 Contract Cleaning Report</i>)</li> <li>• Changes requested outside of the specification could be managed appropriately so that actual spend is managed within available budgets</li> <li>• The specification could readily allow for the addition of new sites which could be implemented quickly following any further service reviews carried out across the Council</li> <li>• The Council are currently reducing permanent staff within the establishment through voluntary redundancy applications; this will reduce the need for compulsory redundancies in any redesigned service, and in the case of an outsourced contract would reduce the priced costs within any tender associated with TUPE</li> <li>• It is inherently difficult for the Council to cost-effectively run an in-house cleaning service, as the large numbers of staff involved incur significant overhead costs in relation to areas such as finance, legal, procurement and personnel requirements. There are much lower numbers of staff involved in the caretaking/ site management functions, which could be incorporated more appropriately into the teams within the Facilities Management Division</li> <li>• Keeping the caretaking service in-house and carrying out a review of these and other building management responsibilities across the Council to develop a consistent corporate approach to incorporate within the Good Stewardship Guide.</li> <li>• By removing the further development of cleaning by outsourcing the service, we can concentrate our resources on developing a comprehensive in-house facilities team - that could potentially be outsourced at a later date.</li> </ul>
Disadvantages	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Employees may consider it a disadvantage that they would not remain employed by the Council, though their current terms and conditions would be protected under TUPE legislation</li> <li>• If staff are employed through a contractor there may be more concerns over them working in buildings where the users are vulnerable adults and children, and more concern over key holding responsibilities</li> <li>• Changes to service provision outside of the specification may be more difficult to deliver and cost more</li> <li>• A contract management regime would have to be introduced to manage the contract(s), so savings in management time would be limited.</li> </ul>
Other issues	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• The contract and specifications need to be considered in particular detail to manage any concerns around the work in buildings where the users are vulnerable adults and children, and where there may be key holding responsibilities</li> <li>• Management of the cleaning contract(s) would be by the Facilities Management Division, on behalf of the other services of the Council.</li> <li>• A review would be carried out of the caretaking/ site management and other building management responsibilities across the Council to develop a consistent</li> </ul>

	corporate approach.
--	---------------------

## 5.2 Recommendations

Having looked carefully at the advantages and disadvantages of each of the three main options, it is considered that Option 3 will provide the most benefits to the Council.

The recommendations from this business case document are therefore;

- to centralise the cleaning and caretaking budgets into one cost centre managed by the Facilities Management Division,
- to redesign of current workspace processes and to engender ownership of workspace cleanliness, especially with regard to the future use of the Council House
- to work with services to redefine the cleaning specifications for different types of buildings to reflect the minimum appropriate levels of cleanliness required for the service and its users
- to outsource the delivery of the cleaning services that are currently provided by the in-house Cleaning and Caretaking team.
- To ensure there is scope in the outsourced contract to add other premises if required in the future.
- To use an open tender procurement process, designed appropriately to support local businesses in being able to submit competitive tenders
- To retain a redesigned caretaking/ site management function through directly employed staff within the Facilities Management Division
- To develop and implement a consistent corporate approach to the operational management of the Councils buildings, including statutory duties and responsibilities.

## 6 COSTS AND TIMESCALE

### 6.1 Costs

Non Chargeable Resources		
Role	Name	Time Commitment

Transformation Project Mgr	N. Sheard	
Procurement Management	S. Kahlon	
Legal	E. Feenan	
HR Advice	S. Farmery	
Facilities Management	S. Cole	
Facilities Management	I. Shepherd	
Facilities Management	M. Basherat	

Expenditure	Expected Costs (£'000)
One-off Capital Revenue	
On-going Revenue Costs	Those linked to pensions work around TUPE
Supplier/3 <sup>rd</sup> party	
Hardware / technical / other capital	Recently purchased Asset Management Software should be able to support FM responsibilities
Staff Costs	
Recurring / ongoing	Should deliver ongoing saving

## 6.2 Timescales

Please see Appendix B

## 7 RISKS AND ISSUES

### 7.1 Initial Risks

Detailed analysis of risks will be held in a separate Risk Register document.

Ref	Risk	likelihood	impact	Rating
1.	Timescales too restrictive to achieve required savings			

Ref	Risk	likelihood	impact	Rating
2.	Political appetite to follow the recommended option of outsourcing to achieve the savings required by the CSR/ODOC			
3.	TUPE costs increased due to the numbers of staff in cleaning service over 55 years old			
4.	Acceptability of the varied output specification in the Tender documents			

## 7.2 Initial Issues

*Describe any known issues and consider how you can avoid or work around them. Include appropriate activities for dealing with these issues in your project schedule.*

Detailed analysis of issues will be held in a separate Issue Log document.

Ref	Issue	Author's Priority	Date to be Resolved	Issue Owner
1.	Savings have already been achieved by some services through building closure etc. with some already recorded as savings for the Directorate rather than as a saving for cleaning.			
2.	Current overspends within the directorates for cleaning and caretaking			

## APPENDICES

### A List of premises where cleaning and caretaking is carried out

Directorate	Address/Building	Building use	Comments
AH&H	11 Arthur Court	Living/assisted	
AH&H	41 & 43 Brentford Drive	AH&H	
AH&H	64 Birdcage Walk	AH&H	64 Birdcage Walk
AH&H	Alternative Living Scheme - Newdigate	Alternative Living Scheme	Newdigate Street
AH&H	Bio House	Housing Services	Bio House
AH&H	Chesapeake Administration	Family Centre	
AH&H	Humbleton Drive, Mackworth	AH&H	Humbleton Drive Mackworth
AH&H	Morleston Street Day Centre	Day centre	
AH&H	Rycote Centre Buildings	Adult Learning	
AH&H	Rycote Centre Buildings	Adult Learning	
AH&H	St Pauls	Mental Health	
AH&H	St Peters House	Private Sector Housing	Housing Options - Peartree & St Peters - 7th floor
AH&H	Wetherby	Adult Day Centre	
AH&H	Whitaker Road Day Centre	Day centre	
Chief Execs	Strategy Development	City Centre Management	St Peters - 7th floor
CYP	218 Osmaston Road	PRU	
CYP	Ashtree FSC	Office & Social Care	
CYP	42 Leopold Street	CSA Unit	42 Leopold Street
CYP	63 Duffield Road	People Referral Unit (PRU)	63 Duffield Road
CYP	Allen Park, Multicultural Centre & Village	Operational	Allen Park, Multicultural Centre & Village Learning
CYP	Aspire - Peartree Road	Rental	In Rental Costs
CYP	Babbington Children Centre Family Vis	Childrens Centre	Babington Children's Centre
CYP	Big Building	Rosehill SS Premises	Big Building
CYP	Boulton Children's Centre	Childrens Centre	
CYP	Bromley House	Access Service, etc.	Bromley House
CYP	Chellaston Childrens Centre	Childrens Centre	
CYP	Cockayne Street	Premises Costs	Cockayne Street
CYP	Cross Phase Pru	Cross Phase PRU	Kingsmead, Southgate PRU & Breadsall YC
CYP	Darley Barn	Outdoor Education	
CYP	Eastmead Childprotectn Office	Child Protection Office	
CYP	Firs Youth Centre	Youth Centre	
CYP	Mackworth Youth Centre	Youth Centre	Mackworth Youth Centre
CYP	Mandela Ctr,179-181Peartreerd	Youth Centre & PRU	
CYP	Newtons Walk	People Referral Unit (PRU)	Newtons Walk
CYP	Normanton Childrens Centre	Childrens Centre	Peartree Infant / Junior Childrens Centre
CYP	North Chadd Children's Centre	Childrens Centre	
CYP	Oaklands Ave / Homelands	Premises Running Costs	Oaklands Ave / Homelands
CYP	Oakwood Childrens Centre	Childrens Centre	
CYP	Perth Street Office	Fostering & Adoption	
CYP	Redwood Bungalow - 2 months only	rea Neighbourhood Workin	Redwood Bungalow - 2 months only
CYP	Reigate Children's Centre	Childrens Centre	Reigate Childrens Centre
CYP	Roosevelt Avenue	Administration	Roosevelt Avenue
CYP	S.P.A.C.E (Curzon Street)	SPACE	Space
CYP	Sinfin Children's Centre	Childrens Centre	
CYP	South Chaddesden Childrens Centre	Childrens Centre	
CYP	Southgate Youth Centre	Youth Centre	Southgate Youth Centre
CYP	St Peters - 7th floor	Offices/Admin	9 services
CYP	St Peters House (2nd Floor)	YOS Core Activity	CSP
CYP	St Peters House (2nd Floor)	YJB General Funding	
CYP	Upper Space	CYP	Space
CYP	Youth House Mill Street	Youth Centre	
CYP	Youth House, Mandela & Madeley	Derby Youth General	Youth House, Mandela & Madeley

Directorate	Address/Building	Building use	Comments
Eco Regen	Tourist Information Centre	Eco Regen	
External	Eaton Court	External	Eaton Court
NGH	Albion Street and Heritage Gate	Offices/Admin	
NGH	Allestree Branch Library	Libraries	
NGH	Blagreaves Lane Group Library	Libraries	
NGH	Business Centre - Beaufort Street	Chief Execs	
NGH	Celtic House	Offices/Admin	
NGH	Cemeteries (All sites)	NGH	
NGH	Chaddesden Branch Library	Libraries	
NGH	Derby Central Library	Libraries	
NGH	Estates - Kings Chambers	Chief Execs	
NGH	Highways and Transport Accommodati	NGH	Saxon House & Parking Asst
NGH	Libraries Development & Delivery	Libraries	
NGH	London Road Depot Holding Account	Offices/Admin	London Road - 2 months. Transferred to Derby Hc
NGH	Mickleover Branch Library	Libraries	
NGH	Mobile Library	Libraries	
NGH	Museum & Art Gallery	NGH	
NGH	Norman House	Occupational Health	
NGH	Norman House 2nd Floor	Offices/Admin	
NGH	Pearlree Group Library	Libraries	
NGH	Roman House	Offices/Admin	
NGH	Sinfin Library	Libraries	
NGH	St Mary's Gate Complex	Offices/Admin	
NGH	Stores Road Depot	Depot	
RES	Kedleston Road	Training Facility	Shared with County
RES	Royal Oak House	Registrar Office	
RES	Stanley Road Social Services	Administration Team	



## B Project Programme and Timetable

Task Name	Duration	Start	Finish	November	December	January	February	March	April	May	June	July	August	September
				B	M	E	B	M	E	B	M	E	B	M
1 Preliminaries	49 days?	Mon 21/11/11	Thu 26/01/12	█										
6 Approvals	21 days?	Mon 21/11/11	Mon 19/12/11	█										
14 Prepare tender and contract documentation	80 days?	Tue 06/12/11	Mon 26/03/12		█									
28 Tender period	48 days	Fri 24/02/12	Tue 01/05/12				█							
33 Evaluation and clarification of tenders	31 days	Wed 02/05/12	Wed 13/06/12						█					
40 Stakeholder Engagement	70 days?	Mon 21/11/11	Fri 24/02/12	█										
46 Staff and Union Consultation	141 days	Wed 14/12/11	Wed 27/06/12		█									
50 Mobilisation	60 days	Mon 11/06/12	Fri 31/08/12								█			
52 Project Board Meetings	1 day?	Mon 21/11/11	Mon 21/11/11	█										

## c Pre-Project Risk Assessment Checklist

The Pre- Project Risk Assessment Checklist has been completed, as shown in spreadsheet below.

Criteria	Comments	Value or Limits - Value given as examples only	Score	Project Score
Estimated Total Business Costs	Total estimated cost to the business including all resource and staff costs.	< £25K	1	1
		£25K - £150K	2	
		> £150K	4	
Estimated Total Duration in weeks	Estimate the time required to deliver the Project: Alternatively, the business requirement may dictate the completion date. This estimate precedes the detailed Project Plan and may be refined subsequently.	< 8 Weeks	1	4
		8 – 18 weeks	2	
		> 18 Weeks	4	
Estimated Human Resource Effort in whole time equivalent days	Estimate the staff requirements for the project by grade and whole time equivalent. This estimate preceded the detailed Project Plan and may be subsequently refined.	< 30 days wte	1	2
		30 – 60 days wte	2	
		> 60 days wte	4	
Degree of innovation	Has this type of project been done before or is the technology involved familiar in this organisation or another similar organisation?	Yes	1	1
		No	6	
Sensitivity	Will the conduct or outcome of this project be contentious within the organisation, with other stakeholders, or politically?	No	1	6
		Yes	6	
Dependencies	Will the project depend on any resources from outside the Organisation?	No	1	4
		Yes	4	
External Impact	Will the product of the project have significant effects outside the Organisation, for example on the public or other organisations?	No	1	1
		Yes	6	
Business Impact	Is the project dependent on other projects and changes, both internal and external to the project?	Stand Alone Project	1	2
		Supports departmental change	2	
		Supports cross cutting change initiative	4	
		Supports national or EU initiative	6	
IT Dependency	To what extent is the success of the project likely to depend on an external IT supplier?	No new IT required	1	1
		Commercial off-the-shelf product to be	2	
		Bespoke applications required	4	
		New business processes required	6	
<b>Total Score for Risk Assessment</b>				<b>22</b>

**Risk Classification MEDIUM**