

# AGENDA

**Meeting**    **GLA Oversight Committee**

**Date**        **Thursday 17 December 2015**

**Time**        **2.00 pm**

**Place**        **Chamber, City Hall, The Queen's  
Walk, London, SE1 2AA**

Copies of the reports and any attachments may be found at  
<https://www.london.gov.uk/what-we-do/gla-oversight-committee>

Most meetings of the London Assembly and its Committees are webcast live at  
[www.london.gov.uk/mayor-assembly/london-assembly/webcasts](http://www.london.gov.uk/mayor-assembly/london-assembly/webcasts) where you can also view past meetings.

## Members of the Committee

Len Duvall AM (Chair)

Tony Arbour AM (Deputy Chairman)

Jennette Arnold OBE AM

Gareth Bacon AM

Roger Evans AM

Darren Johnson AM

Joanne McCartney AM

Caroline Pidgeon MBE AM

Navin Shah AM

A meeting of the Committee has been called by the Chair of the Committee to deal with the business listed below.

Mark Roberts, Executive Director of Secretariat  
Wednesday 9 December 2015

## Further Information

If you have questions, would like further information about the meeting or require special facilities please contact: John Barry, Principal Committee Manager; Telephone: 020 7983 4425; Email: [john.barry@london.gov.uk](mailto:john.barry@london.gov.uk); Minicom: 020 7983 4458

For media enquiries please contact Alison Bell; Telephone: 020 7983 5769; Email: [alison.bell@london.gov.uk](mailto:alison.bell@london.gov.uk). If you have any questions about individual items please contact the author whose details are at the end of the report.

This meeting will be open to the public, except for where exempt information is being discussed as noted on the agenda. A guide for the press and public on attending and reporting meetings of local government bodies, including the use of film, photography, social media and other means is available at [www.london.gov.uk/sites/default/files/Openness-in-Meetings.pdf](http://www.london.gov.uk/sites/default/files/Openness-in-Meetings.pdf).

There is access for disabled people, and induction loops are available. There is limited underground parking for orange and blue badge holders, which will be allocated on a first-come first-served basis. Please contact Facilities Management on 020 7983 4750 in advance if you require a parking space or further information.

If you, or someone you know, needs a copy of the agenda, minutes or reports in large print or Braille, audio, or in another language, then please call us on 020 7983 4100 or email [assembly.translations@london.gov.uk](mailto:assembly.translations@london.gov.uk).

Si usted, o algùn conocido desea recibir una copia del order del dia, acta o informe en Braille o en su propio idioma, y gratis, no dude en ponerse en contacto con nosotros llamando al teléfano 020 7983 4100 o por correo electrónico: [assembly.translations@london.gov.uk](mailto:assembly.translations@london.gov.uk).

Se você, ou algüem que conheça precisa uma cópia da ordem do dia, anotações ou relatorios em prensa grande ou Braille, ou em outra lingu, então por favour nos telephone em 020 7983 4100 ou e-mail [assembly.translations@london.gov.uk](mailto:assembly.translations@london.gov.uk).

Haddii ama ama qof aad taqaanid, uu ugu baahan yahay koobiga ajendhada, haddaladii ama warbixinta in far waaweyn loogu qoro ama farta qofka indoolaha akhrin karo, amaba luuqad kale, fadlan naga soo wac telefoonkan 020 7983 4100 ama email [assembly.translations@london.gov.uk](mailto:assembly.translations@london.gov.uk).

Ta ba ri enikeni ti o ba ni ife ni eda ewe nla ti igbimo awon asoju tabi papa julo ni ede ti abinibi won, ki o kansiya lori ero ibanisoro. Nomba wa ni 020 7983 4100 tabi ki e kan si wa lori ero [assembly.translations@london.gov.uk](mailto:assembly.translations@london.gov.uk).

જો તમને અથવા તમે જાણતાં હો તેવી કોઈ વ્યક્તિને એજન્ડા (કાર્યસૂચિ), મિનિટ્સ (ટૂંકી નોંધો) અથવા રિપોર્ટ્સ (અહેવાલો)ની નકલ મોટા અક્ષરોમાં છપાયેલી કે બ્રેઈલમાં અથવા બીજી કોઈ ભાષામાં જોઈતી હોય, તો કૃપા કરીને 020 7983 4100 ઉપર ફોન અથવા [assembly.translations@london.gov.uk](mailto:assembly.translations@london.gov.uk) ઉપર અમને ઈ-મેઈલ કરો.

আপনি বা আপনার পরিচিত কেউ যদি এজেন্ডা, মিনিট বা রিপোর্টের একটি কপি বড় ছাপা বা ব্রেইল অথবা অন্য কোন ভাষায় পেতে চান তবে দয়া করে আমাদেরকে 020 7983 4100 এ নাম্বারে ফোন করুন বা [assembly.translations@london.gov.uk](mailto:assembly.translations@london.gov.uk) এ ই-মেইলে যোগাযোগ করুন।

ਜੇ ਤੁਹਾਨੂੰ ਜਾਂ ਤੁਹਾਡੇ ਵਾਕਫ਼ ਕਿਸੇ ਹੋਰ ਵਿਅਕਤੀ ਨੂੰ, ਏਜੰਡੇ, ਮੀਟਿੰਗ ਦੀ ਕਾਰਵਾਈ ਜਾਂ ਰਿਪੋਰਟਾਂ ਦੀ ਕਾਪੀ, ਵੱਡੇ ਅੱਖਰਾਂ ਵਿੱਚ ਛਪਾਈ ਜਾਂ ਬਰੇਲ ਦੇ ਰੂਪ ਵਿੱਚ ਜਾਂ ਕਿਸੇ ਹੋਰ ਬੋਲੀ ਵਿੱਚ ਚਾਹੀਦੀ ਹੈ ਤਾਂ ਕਿਰਪਾ ਕਰਕੇ ਸਾਨੂੰ 020 7983 4100 'ਤੇ ਟੈਲੀਫ਼ੋਨ ਕਰੋ ਜਾਂ ਇਸ ਪਤੇ 'ਤੇ ਈਮੇਲ ਕਰੋ : [assembly.translations@london.gov.uk](mailto:assembly.translations@london.gov.uk)

اگر آپ یا آپ کے جاننے والے کسی فرد کو اس ایجنڈا کی کاپی، تفصیل یا رپورٹیں بڑے پرنٹ یا بریل یا کسی دوسری زبان میں درکار ہوں تو براہ کرم ہمیں 020 7983 4100 پر فون کیجئے یا درج ذیل ای میل پر رابطہ کیجئے [assembly.translations@london.gov.uk](mailto:assembly.translations@london.gov.uk)



Certificate Number: FS 80233

**Agenda  
GLA Oversight Committee  
Thursday 17 December 2015**

**1 Apologies for Absence and Chair's Announcements**

To receive any apologies for absence and any announcements from the Chair.

**2 Declarations of Interests** (Pages 1 - 4)

**The Committee is recommended to:**

- (a) Note the offices held by Assembly Members, as set out in the table at Agenda Item 2, as disclosable pecuniary interests;**
- (b) Note the declaration by any Member(s) of any disclosable pecuniary interests in specific items listed on the agenda and the necessary action taken by the Member(s) regarding withdrawal following such declaration(s); and**
- (c) Note the declaration by any Member(s) of any other interests deemed to be relevant (including any interests arising from gifts and hospitality received which are not at the time of the meeting reflected on the Authority's register of gifts and hospitality, and noting also the advice from the GLA's Monitoring Officer set out at Agenda Item 2) and to note any necessary action taken by the Member(s) following such declaration(s).**

**3 Minutes** (Pages 5 - 10)

**The Committee is recommended to confirm the minutes of the meeting of the GLA Oversight Committee held on 25 November 2015 to be signed by the Chair as a correct record.**

**4 Summary List of Actions** (Pages 11 - 46)

Report of the Executive Director of Secretariat  
Contact: John Barry; [john.barry@london.gov.uk](mailto:john.barry@london.gov.uk); 020 7983 4425

**The Committee is recommended to note the completed and outstanding actions arising from previous meetings of the GLA Oversight Committee.**

The appendix to the report set out on pages 17 to 45 is attached for Members and officers only but is available from the following area of the GLA's website:  
<https://www.london.gov.uk/what-we-do/gla-oversight-committee>

## **5 Action Taken Under Delegated Authority** (Pages 47 - 54)

Report of the Executive Director of Secretariat

Contact: John Barry; [john.barry@london.gov.uk](mailto:john.barry@london.gov.uk); 020 7983 4425

**The Committee is recommended to note the actions taken by the Chair of the Committee under delegated authority.**

## **6 Head of Paid Service Oral Update**

The Head of Paid Service to provide any service updates not covered in the rest of the agenda.

## **7 Garden Bridge Design Procurement** (Pages 55 - 56)

Report of the Executive Director of Secretariat

Contact: Katie Smith; [katie.smith@london.gov.uk](mailto:katie.smith@london.gov.uk); 020 7983 4423

**The Committee is recommended to note the report and the discussion with Boris Johnson MP, Chairman of Transport for London, and Mike Brown MVO, Commissioner of Transport for London.**

## **8 Shared Services Update** (Pages 57 - 130)

Report of Executive Director of Resources

Contact: Matthew Beals; 020 7983 5721; [matthew.Beals@london.gov.uk](mailto:matthew.Beals@london.gov.uk)

**The Committee is recommended to comment on and note the updated position, as set out in the report.**

The appendix to the report set out on pages 61 to 130 is attached for Members and officers only but is available from the following area of the GLA's website:

<https://www.london.gov.uk/what-we-do/gla-oversight-committee>

## **9 Work Programme for the GLA Oversight Committee** (Pages 131 - 136)

Report of the Executive Director of Secretariat

Contact: John Barry; [john.barry@london.gov.uk](mailto:john.barry@london.gov.uk); 020 7983 4425

**The Committee is recommended to note its work programme for the remainder of 2015-16 and identify any additional issues it wishes to consider at future meetings.**

**10 Date of Next Meeting**

The next meeting of the Committee is scheduled to be held on Thursday 21 January 2016 at 2.00pm in Committee Room 5.

**11 Any Other Business the Chair Considers Urgent**

This page is intentionally left blank

# Subject: Declarations of Interests

**Report to: GLA Oversight Committee**

**Report of: Executive Director of Secretariat**

**Date: 17 December 2015**

**This report will be considered in public**

## 1. Summary

- 1.1 This report sets out details of offices held by Assembly Members for noting as disclosable pecuniary interests and requires additional relevant declarations relating to disclosable pecuniary interests, and gifts and hospitality to be made.

## 2. Recommendations

- 2.1 **That the list of offices held by Assembly Members, as set out in the table below, be noted as disclosable pecuniary interests<sup>1</sup>;**
- 2.2 **That the declaration by any Member(s) of any disclosable pecuniary interests in specific items listed on the agenda and the necessary action taken by the Member(s) regarding withdrawal following such declaration(s) be noted; and**
- 2.3 **That the declaration by any Member(s) of any other interests deemed to be relevant (including any interests arising from gifts and hospitality received which are not at the time of the meeting reflected on the Authority's register of gifts and hospitality, and noting also the advice from the GLA's Monitoring Officer set out at below) and any necessary action taken by the Member(s) following such declaration(s) be noted.**

## 3. Issues for Consideration

- 3.1 Relevant offices held by Assembly Members are listed in the table overleaf:

---

<sup>1</sup> The Monitoring Officer advises that: Paragraph 10 of the Code of Conduct will only preclude a Member from participating in any matter to be considered or being considered at, for example, a meeting of the Assembly, where the Member has a direct Disclosable Pecuniary Interest in that particular matter. The effect of this is that the 'matter to be considered, or being considered' must be about the Member's interest. So, by way of example, if an Assembly Member is also a councillor of London Borough X, that Assembly Member will be precluded from participating in an Assembly meeting where the Assembly is to consider a matter about the Member's role / employment as a councillor of London Borough X; the Member will not be precluded from participating in a meeting where the Assembly is to consider a matter about an activity or decision of London Borough X.

<b>Member</b>	<b>Interest</b>
Tony Arbour AM	Member, LFEPA; Member, LB Richmond
Jennette Arnold OBE AM	Committee of the Regions
Gareth Bacon AM	Chairman of LFEPA; Chairman of the London Local Resilience Forum; Member, LB Bexley
Kemi Badenoch AM	
Mayor John Biggs AM	Mayor of Tower Hamlets (LB); Member, LLDC Board
Andrew Boff AM	Member, LFEPA; Congress of Local and Regional Authorities (Council of Europe)
James Cleverly AM MP	Member of Parliament
Tom Copley AM	Member, LFEPA
Andrew Dismore AM	Member, LFEPA
Len Duvall AM	
Roger Evans AM	Deputy Mayor; Committee of the Regions; Trust for London (Trustee)
Nicky Gavron AM	
Darren Johnson AM	Member, LFEPA
Jenny Jones AM	Member, House of Lords
Stephen Knight AM	Member, LFEPA; Member, LB Richmond
Kit Malthouse AM MP	Member of Parliament
Joanne McCartney AM	
Steve O'Connell AM	Member, LB Croydon; MOPAC Non-Executive Adviser for Neighbourhoods
Caroline Pidgeon MBE AM	
Murad Qureshi AM	Congress of Local and Regional Authorities (Council of Europe)
Dr Onkar Sahota AM	
Navin Shah AM	
Valerie Shawcross CBE AM	
Richard Tracey AM	Chairman of the London Waste and Recycling Board; Mayor's Ambassador for River Transport
Fiona Twycross AM	Member, LFEPA

[Note: LB - London Borough; LFEPA - London Fire and Emergency Planning Authority; LLDC – London Legacy Development Corporation; MOPAC – Mayor's Office for Policing and Crime]

3.2 Paragraph 10 of the GLA's Code of Conduct, which reflects the relevant provisions of the Localism Act 2011, provides that:

- where an Assembly Member has a Disclosable Pecuniary Interest in any matter to be considered or being considered or at
  - (i) a meeting of the Assembly and any of its committees or sub-committees; or
  - (ii) any formal meeting held by the Mayor in connection with the exercise of the Authority's functions
- they must disclose that interest to the meeting (or, if it is a sensitive interest, disclose the fact that they have a sensitive interest to the meeting); and
- must not (i) participate, or participate any further, in any discussion of the matter at the meeting; or (ii) participate in any vote, or further vote, taken on the matter at the meeting

UNLESS



- they have obtained a dispensation from the GLA's Monitoring Officer (in accordance with section 2 of the Procedure for registration and declarations of interests, gifts and hospitality – Appendix 5 to the Code).

- 3.3 Failure to comply with the above requirements, without reasonable excuse, is a criminal offence; as is knowingly or recklessly providing information about your interests that is false or misleading.
- 3.4 In addition, the Monitoring Officer has advised Assembly Members to continue to apply the test that was previously applied to help determine whether a pecuniary / prejudicial interest was arising - namely, that Members rely on a reasonable estimation of whether a member of the public, with knowledge of the relevant facts, could, with justification, regard the matter as so significant that it would be likely to prejudice the Member's judgement of the public interest.
- 3.5 Members should then exercise their judgement as to whether or not, in view of their interests and the interests of others close to them, they should participate in any given discussions and/or decisions business of within and by the GLA. It remains the responsibility of individual Members to make further declarations about their actual or apparent interests at formal meetings noting also that a Member's failure to disclose relevant interest(s) has become a potential criminal offence.
- 3.6 Members are also required, where considering a matter which relates to or is likely to affect a person from whom they have received a gift or hospitality with an estimated value of at least £25 within the previous three years or from the date of election to the London Assembly, whichever is the later, to disclose the existence and nature of that interest at any meeting of the Authority which they attend at which that business is considered.
- 3.7 The obligation to declare any gift or hospitality at a meeting is discharged, subject to the proviso set out below, by registering gifts and hospitality received on the Authority's on-line database. The on-line database may be viewed here:  
<http://www.london.gov.uk/mayor-assembly/gifts-and-hospitality>.
- 3.8 If any gift or hospitality received by a Member is not set out on the on-line database at the time of the meeting, and under consideration is a matter which relates to or is likely to affect a person from whom a Member has received a gift or hospitality with an estimated value of at least £25, Members are asked to disclose these at the meeting, either at the declarations of interest agenda item or when the interest becomes apparent.
- 3.9 It is for Members to decide, in light of the particular circumstances, whether their receipt of a gift or hospitality, could, on a reasonable estimation of a member of the public with knowledge of the relevant facts, with justification, be regarded as so significant that it would be likely to prejudice the Member's judgement of the public interest. Where receipt of a gift or hospitality could be so regarded, the Member must exercise their judgement as to whether or not, they should participate in any given discussions and/or decisions business of within and by the GLA.

## **4. Legal Implications**

- 4.1 The legal implications are as set out in the body of this report.

## **5. Financial Implications**

- 5.1 There are no financial implications arising directly from this report.

**Local Government (Access to Information) Act 1985**

List of Background Papers: None

Contact Officer: John Barry, Principal Committee Manager

Telephone: 020 7983 4425

E-mail: [john.barry@london.gov.uk](mailto:john.barry@london.gov.uk)

# MINUTES

**Meeting: GLA Oversight Committee**  
**Date: Wednesday 25 November 2015**  
**Time: 10.00 am**  
**Place: Committee Room 5, City Hall, The Queen's Walk, London, SE1 2AA**

Copies of the minutes may be found at <http://www.london.gov.uk/mayor-assembly/london-assembly/oversight>

**Present:**

Len Duvall AM (Chair)  
Tony Arbour AM (Deputy Chairman)  
Jennette Arnold OBE AM  
Andrew Boff AM  
Roger Evans AM  
Darren Johnson AM  
Joanne McCartney AM  
Caroline Pidgeon MBE AM  
Navin Shah AM

## **1 Apologies for Absence and Chair's Announcements (Item 1)**

- 1.1 An apology for absence was received from Gareth Bacon AM, for whom Andrew Boff AM attended as a substitute.

## **2 Declarations of Interests (Item 2)**

2.1 **Resolved:**

**That the list of Assembly Members' appointments, as set out in the table at Agenda Item 2, be noted as disclosable pecuniary interests.**

### **3 Minutes (Item 3)**

#### **3.1 Resolved:**

**That the minutes of the meeting of the GLA Oversight Committee held on 22 October 2015 be signed by the Chair as a correct record**

### **4 Summary List of Actions (Item 4)**

4.1 The Committee received the report of the Executive Director of Secretariat.

#### **4.2 Resolved:**

**That the completed and outstanding actions arising from previous meetings of the GLA Oversight Committee be noted.**

### **5 Action Taken Under Delegated Authority (Item 5)**

5.1 The Committee received the report of the Executive Director of Secretariat setting out the Committee's response to the Government consultation on proposal to increase joint working between emergency services, as agreed by the Chair of the GLA Oversight Committee, in consultation with the Deputy Chairman and party Group Leaders, under delegated authority.

#### **5.2 Resolved:**

**That the action taken by the Chair of the Committee under delegated authority be noted.**

### **6 Head of Paid Service Oral Update (Item 6)**

6.1 The Committee received the oral update of the Head of Paid Service.

6.2 The Head of Paid Service informed the Committee that, in light of the recent Paris killings, advice had been issued to staff travelling abroad on GLA business. The Committee requested that similar advice and details of the GLA's corporate travel insurance be sent to Assembly Members.

- 6.3 The Committee was also informed of the recent attendance of Darren Johnson AM, in his capacity of Chair of the Devolution Working Group, together with Sir Edward Lister, Mayor's Chief of Staff and Deputy Mayor for Policy and Planning, at the recent Communities and Local Government Committee evidence session in relation to the Government's Cities and Local Government Devolution Bill inquiry.
- 6.4 The Head of Paid Service further advised the Committee that work in respect of the forthcoming election and subsequent transition planning was under way, and that a series of election briefings delivered by the Head of Paid Service and the Monitoring Officer had begun.

## **7 Shared Services - Mayor's Office for Policing and Crime (Item 7)**

- 7.1 The Committee noted the report of the Executive Director of Secretariat as background to putting questions on the shared services arrangements of the Mayor's Office for Policing and Crime (MOPAC) to Helen Bailey, Chief Operating Officer, MOPAC..
- 7.2 During the course of the discussion, Joanne McCartney AM asked if MOPAC had given consideration to how the Human Resource (HR) functions might be undertaken as a shared service with other bodies. The Chief Operating Officer explained that because its payroll function was carried out by the Metropolitan Police Service (MPS) as part of the SSCL contract and its HR functions were currently provided by City Hall, it was possible that MOPAC might review the benefits of having both services provided jointly later in the year. The Head of Paid Service commented that the GLA would want to be part of any discussions on the matter as it was felt the transfer of HR functions to the MPS would require detailed consideration.
- 7.3 Joanne McCartney AM also asked if there were income generation possibilities to be derived from shared service arrangements, such as the internal audit function provided by MOPAC's Directorate of Audit, Risk and Assurance. The Chief Operating Officer explained that whilst there had been good reasons for taking on the audit function of other GLA bodies, a case had yet to be made for offering that service wider.
- 7.4 Caroline Pidgeon MBE AM asked if there were additional savings to be made on existing service contracts. It was stated that informal consideration had been given to where more long-term savings might be found and that although there was an ongoing process for finding smaller efficiencies, decisions would most likely be taken following a formal review of MOPAC at the start of the new Mayoral term.
- 7.5 Caroline Pidgeon MBE AM also referred to the finding of the London Assembly's Budget and Performance Committee report, *"To Protect and Save"*, in which concerns had been raised about MOPAC's long-term outsourcing strategy and the savings it aimed to make. The Chief

Operating Officer responded that efforts had been made to ensure an appropriate balance between commitment to long-term contracts and savings and that MOPAC's focus had been concentrated on letting contracts, bearing down on the cost of contracts, and giving thought to future synergies between contracts.

- 7.6 The Deputy Chairman, Tony Arbour AM, queried whether the provision of functions by a single entity might result in uncompetitive service provision and asked if the Collaborative Procurement Board was equipped to identify genuine savings. The Executive Director of Resources responded that part of the Board's process was to benchmark the cost of any shared function with best practice in the private sector and thereby offer the best economies.
- 7.7 The Chief Operating Officer was also questioned on, given the Assembly's preferred model for a potential successor scrutiny body to the London Fire and Emergency Planning Authority, whether MOPAC's functions could be carried out as a directorate of the GLA, in the way that housing and economic development functions had been brought in-house. The Chief Operating Officer responded that in view of the fact that MOPAC provided a diverse range of specialist functions, offered a level of senior engagement and had its own staffing terms and conditions and pension arrangements, there may be limited financial benefit to adopting such a model. Darren Johnson AM requested that the Head of Paid Service give consideration to this model at the time as considering potential successor scrutiny arrangements for the Fire Brigade. The Chair suggested that the Committee receive a future update on this matter as part of its regular consideration of shared services.

7.8 **Resolved:**

**That, subject to the comments made in discussion and recorded above, the report and discussion be noted.**

## **8 People's Question Time (Item 8)**

- 8.1 The Committee received the report of the Director of Communications and External Affairs.
- 8.2 Arising from the discussion, the Assistant Director, External Relations, agreed to give consideration to agreeing a longer-term timetable of People's Question Time (PQT) events, more closely integrated with the Assembly's calendar; to look at how Twitter and other forms of social media and interactivity could enhance future events; to review and collate a list of successful venues for future reference; to ensure that boroughs that had not hosted a PQT event previously would be given an opportunity in the new Mayoral term; and that the results of the post-PQT attendees' survey would be made available to Members.
- 8.3 The Chair, on behalf of the Committee, also thanked the Assistant Director and the External Relations team for their work organising the recent Remembrance Day Service.

8.4 **Resolved:**

**That the proposals for People's Question Time on Thursday 10 March 2016 be noted.**

**9 Draft Committee Timetable 2016-17 (Item 9)**

9.1 The Committee received the report of the Executive Director of Secretariat. Assembly Members suggested that, whilst in principle agreeing the draft timetable, further consideration be given to ensure the effectiveness of the Assembly's work, particularly in relation to the timing of meetings and media coverage.

9.2 **Resolved:**

**That the draft timetable of London Assembly and committee meetings for the 2016-17 year be agreed in principle, noting that the final programme of meetings is subject to related decisions by the London Assembly to be taken at the Annual Meeting in May 2016.**

**10 Secretariat Quarterly Review, Quarter 2, 2015-16 (Item 10)**

10.1 The Committee received the report of the Executive Director of Secretariat.

10.2 **Resolved:**

**That the core Secretariat quarterly monitoring report for the second quarter of 2015-16 (April – June 2015) be noted.**

**11 Work Programme for the GLA Oversight Committee (Item 11)**

11.1 The Committee received the report of the Executive Director of Secretariat.

11.2 The Committee was advised that, following informal discussions with the Mayor's Office and Transport for London, the Mayor and Mike Brown, Commissioner of TfL, would be available to attend the Committee's next meeting to discuss the Garden Bridge design procurement.

11.3 **Resolved:**

**(a) That the remainder of the Committee's work programme for 2015/16 be noted,**

**subject to the inclusion of an item on the Garden Bridge design procurement at its next meeting;**

**(b) That Boris Johnson MP, in his capacity as Chairman of TfL, and Mike Brown MVO, Commissioner of TfL, be invited formally to the 17 December 2015 meeting of the GLA Oversight Committee in order to discuss the Garden Bridge design procurement; and**

**(c) That authority be delegated to the Chair, in consultation with the Deputy Chairman and party Group Leaders, to agree any other necessary changes to the arrangements for the 17 December 2015 and subsequent meetings.**

## **12 Date of Next Meeting (Item 12)**

12.1 The next meeting of the Committee was scheduled to be held on Thursday 17 December 2015 at 2.00pm in Committee Room 5.

## **13 Any Other Business the Chair Considers Urgent (Item 13)**

13.1 There were no items of urgent business.

## **14 End of Meeting**

14.1 The meeting ended at 11.08am.

---

Chair

---

Date

**Contact Officer:** John Barry, Principal Committee Manager; Telephone: 020 7983 4425; Email: john.barry@london.gov.uk; Minicom: 020 7983 4458



# Subject: Summary List of Actions

**Report to: GLA Oversight Committee**

**Report of: Executive Director of Secretariat**

**Date: 17 December 2015**

**This report will be considered in public**

## 1. Summary

- 1.1 This report updates the Committee on the progress made on actions arising from previous meetings of the GLA Oversight Committee.

## 2. Recommendation

- 2.1 **That the Committee notes the completed and outstanding actions arising from previous meetings of the Committee, as listed below.**

### Actions Arising from the Meeting Held on 25 November 2015

Item	Topic	Action	Action By
<b>6</b>	<b>Head of Paid Service Oral Update</b> The Committee requested that advice and details of the GLA's corporate travel insurance be sent to Assembly Members.	Complete – the advice was sent to all Assembly Members on 1 December 2015.	Committee Clerk
<b>7</b>	<b>Shared Services - Mayor's Office for Policing and Crime</b> That the Head of Paid Service give consideration to carrying out MOPAC's functions as a directorate of the GLA and that the Committee receive a future update as part of its regular consideration of shared services.	In progress.	Head of Paid Service

City Hall, The Queen's Walk, London SE1 2AA

Enquiries: 020 7983 4100 minicom: 020 7983 4458 [www.london.gov.uk](http://www.london.gov.uk)

Item	Topic	Action	Action By
8	<p><b>People's Question Time</b></p> <p>The Assistant Director, External Relations, to give consideration to:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• agreeing a longer-term timetable of People's Question Time (PQT) events, more closely integrated with the Assembly's calendar;</li> <li>• looking at how Twitter and other forms of social media and interactivity could enhance future events;</li> <li>• review and collate a list of successful venues for future reference;</li> <li>• ensure that boroughs that had not hosted a PQT event previously would be given an opportunity in the new Mayoral term; and</li> <li>• make available the results of the post-PQT attendees' survey to Members.</li> </ul>	In progress.	Assistant Director, External Relations
11	<p><b>Work Programme for the GLA Oversight Committee</b></p> <p>a) That Boris Johnson MP, in his capacity as Chairman of TfL, and Mike Brown MVO, Commissioner of TfL, be invited formally to the 17 December 2015 meeting of the GLA Oversight Committee in order to discuss the Garden Bridge design procurement.</p> <p>b) That the Chair, in consultation with the Deputy Chairman and party Group Leaders, agree any other necessary changes to the arrangements for the 17 December 2015 and subsequent meetings of the GLA Oversight Committee.</p>	<p>Completed and dealt with elsewhere on this agenda.</p> <p>Completed, as detailed in Item 9 of this agenda, Work Programme for the GLA Oversight Committee.</p>	<p>Committee Clerk</p> <p>Committee Clerk</p>

## Actions Arising from the Meeting Held on 22 October 2015

Item	Topic	Action	Action By
6	<p><b>Mayor's Mentoring Programme</b></p> <p>The Committee requested additional information on the funding, aims and direction of any follow-up early intervention programmes planned.</p>	In progress.	Deputy Mayor for Education and Culture
7	<p><b>London Pensions Fund Authority</b></p> <p>The Committee requested the following additional information:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• The advice that had been provided to the LPFA that set out the legal basis for the proposed establishment of the Lancashire and London Pension Partnership;</li> <li>• Details of the formal consultation undertaken as part of the proposed merger with Lancashire County Pension Fund; and</li> <li>• An explanation of how the LPFA's conflicts policy would operate in the new proposed arrangement.</li> </ul>	In progress.	Chairman, London Pensions Fund Authority
8	<p><b>Garden Bridge Internal Audit Review</b></p> <p>The Committee requested the following additional information:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• A copy of the engagement letter from the former Commissioner to the Managing Director, Planning, that had instigated the audit process, as well as any other related correspondence and details of any agreed terms of reference for the investigation;</li> <li>• File notes of any meetings held with the Managing Director, Planning, or his team as part of the audit fieldwork;</li> <li>• Copies of the legal advice provided in relation to the audit report or procurement exercise;</li> <li>• Clarification on what conflicts of interest had been declared as part of the procurement exercise, in particular in relation to meetings with the Mayor; and</li> </ul>	Response attached as <b>Appendix 1</b> .	Director of Internal Audit, Transport for London

Item	Topic	Action	Action By
	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Clarification on whether TfL considered the procurements accorded with EU public works directives and public contracts regulations.</li> </ul>		

### Actions Arising from the Meeting Held on 24 February 2015

Item	Topic	Action	Action By
<b>6</b>	<p><b>Consultation on Shared Committee Services with the Old Oak and Park Royal Development Corporation</b></p> <p>As part of its annual review of GLA shared services, the Committee receives an update on the proposed arrangements, with particular reference to financial costs and potential conflicts of interest.</p>	To be dealt with at Item 8 of this agenda.	Committee Officer

### Actions Arising from the Meeting Held on 27 January 2015

Item	Topic	Action	Action By
<b>8</b>	<p><b>Consultation on Pan-GLA Group Collaborative Procurement Function</b></p> <p>The Committee requested an update in 2015/16 addressing the issues raised during the meeting:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Named individuals in each organisation to be held to account;</li> <li>Clearly set out milestones showing what would be achieved in the first two years;</li> <li>More ambitious, but achievable targets for savings over a reasonable timescale, with clarity about what savings were being made;</li> <li>The planned approach to ethical and fair trade procurement; and</li> <li>A focus on ensuring that TfL's approach to efficiency would be closely monitored.</li> </ul>	To be dealt with at Item 8 of this agenda.	Executive Director of Resources

## Actions Arising from the Meeting Held on 11 December 2014

Item	Topic	Action	Action By
<b>10</b>	<b>State of London Debate</b> The Committee to review at a future meeting the format of the State of London Debate with a view to assisting the next Mayoral administration.	To be dealt with at the Committee meeting in January 2016.	Committee Officer

## Actions Arising from the Meeting Held on 11 September 2014

Item	Topic	Action	Action By
<b>6</b>	<b>Shared Services: Consultation on Shared Treasury Management Functions</b> It was agreed that the GLA Oversight Committee reviews the shared treasury management arrangement between the GLA and the London Pensions Fund Authority after a year of operation.	To be dealt with at the Committee meeting in February 2016.	Committee Officer

### 3. Legal Implications

3.1 The Committee has the power to do what is recommended in this report.

### 4. Financial Implications

4.1 There are no financial implications arising from this report.

---

#### List of appendices to this report:

Appendix 1 - Correspondence Response from Internal Audit, TfL

#### Local Government (Access to Information) Act 1985

List of Background Papers:

Member Delegated Authority 661

Contact Officer: John Barry, Principal Committee Manager

Telephone: 020 7983 4425

Email: [john.barry@london.gov.uk](mailto:john.barry@london.gov.uk)

This page is intentionally left blank

# Transport for London



Our Ref:  
Your Ref: 56/2015

20 November 2015

Len Duvall AM  
Chair of the GLA Oversight Committee  
City Hall  
The Queen's Walk  
London SE1 2AA

**Transport for London**  
Internal Audit

Windsor House  
42-50 Victoria Street  
London SW1H 0TL

[www.tfl.gov.uk](http://www.tfl.gov.uk)

Dear Mr Duvall

## **GLA Oversight Committee – 22 October 2015 – Garden Bridge Design Procurement**

Thank you for your letter of 2 November 2015 addressed to Clive Walker. As your office has been advised, Mr Walker is on leave that has been booked for some time and I am replying in his absence.

Taking your questions in turn:

- The audit process for Garden Bridge was not commenced by an engagement letter from the former Commissioner to the Managing Director, Planning. Sir Peter Hendy's letter to Caroline Pidgeon MBE, AM was passed to TfL's internal audit team and the scope of work for the audit was prepared by that team who subsequently issued it to the Managing Director, Planning. I attach copies of Sir Peter Hendy's letter and the scope of work for the audit. I also attach a copy of an e-mail exchange seeking the principal auditee's comments on the engagement letter. This follows the usual practice of consulting the principal auditee prior to the finalisation of the terms of engagement for an audit.
- While we would not normally consider it appropriate to disclose legally privileged advice, in the interests of transparency on this occasion, I attach a copy of the legal advice on the procurement process. As you will have noted from the audit memo, at the stage the advice was given it wasn't clear what the extent of TfL's involvement would be in the project and the advice was given on the assumption that TfL might be the delivery body for the entire project. The advice sets out a number of options for the procurement process that might be used for the selection of the design team and concludes that "a design contest or a competition through OJEU might be a suitable process." Subsequently, a decision was taken to split the procurement into two parts with the first phase being a short design exercise, to be commissioned through a tender and the second part to be procured through the existing TfL consultancy frameworks.

- I attach the file notes of meetings undertaken with the Managing Director, Planning and his team members as part of the audit fieldwork.
- The Mayor was not involved in the procurement processes. No conflicts of interest were declared by those who were involved in the procurement processes.
- TfL accepts that, as identified in the audit report, there were some instances where TfL policy and procedure with regard to communication with bidders and tender evaluation were not fully complied with but we have not identified any evidence of adverse impact on the bidders concerned.

Yours sincerely



**Roy Millard**  
**Senior Audit Manager**





Caroline Pidgeon MBE AM  
Leader, London Assembly Liberal Democrat Group  
City Hall  
The Queen's Walk  
London  
SE1 2AA

15 June 2015

**Sir Peter Hendy CBE**  
Commissioner of Transport

Transport for London  
Windsor House  
42-50 Victoria Street  
London SW1H 0TL

Phone 0343 222 0000  
[www.tfl.gov.uk](http://www.tfl.gov.uk)

Dear *Caroline*

## **Garden Bridge**

Thank you for your recent letter setting out a number of detailed questions regarding the procurement process for the design of the Garden Bridge.

An initial Invitation to Tender (ITT) was issued in February 2013 to select a designer to develop the concept for a new bridge across the Thames in central London. A copy of this is attached to this letter. This was issued to three suitable designers/architects as at the time there was no approved TfL architectural framework in place. The value of this contract was under the OJEU threshold and therefore obtaining proposals from three nominated practices was an acceptable way forward.

The ITT document stated clearly the assessment criteria that would be used in the evaluation of bids with 75% of the evaluation based on technical criteria and 25% based on commercial criteria. For the commercial evaluation, the ITT made it clear that bids would be assessed on day rates not a fixed fee. This is quite common for an initial feasibility study where the scope is less clearly defined. In addition to this we also requested an estimate of total prices for the work, although the ITT made it clear these did not form part of the evaluation of bids. Three bids were received with technical responses, schedule of day rates and key personnel.

Whilst we are not able to reveal the exact day rates quoted by all three bidders for reasons of commercial sensitivity we can say that they were within a very narrow range, with the cost of the most expensive Principal Level or equivalent team member being less than 4% higher than the cheapest. As a result, all three submissions received the same commercial score in the evaluation.

We received a broad range of estimates for the total price from each of the bidders (Marks Barfield, £15,125, Wilkinson Eyre £49,939, and Heatherwick studio £173,000) showing that there was a very different interpretation of the scope of the brief by all three bidders. These estimates did not form part of the formal evaluation. In response to your question about redaction, the inconsistent redaction of the total prices between the three bids when information was supplied to the Architects' Journal as part of a Freedom of Information request was a simple and unfortunate case of human error and we have written to the journalist, Will Hurst to correct our mistake.

Following the assessment of all three bids, Heatherwick studio was awarded the contract based on the day rates submitted but with a capped fee of £60,000. The actual value of work undertaken under this contract was £52,000. The two evaluation reports that you refer to in your letter are in fact just different presentations of the same scores. The only difference is that one contains both the technical and commercial scores whereas the other contains just the technical scores.

A second tender was issued in April 2013 to progress the technical design of the bridge to a point where a planning application could be submitted. This procurement was for a consultant who could provide a range of technical services to progress the next stage of the work. The Invitation to Tender for this contract was issued to all 13 firms on the TfL Engineering Project Management Framework. A copy of the ITT for this procurement is attached to this letter. In response to this, we received submissions from all 13 consultants from the framework and following an evaluation of bids, Arup were appointed as lead consultant.

In this procurement, the ITT set out the scope of the technical work and made it clear that "*TfL anticipates that bidders may not have sufficient design capability in-house and has no objection to appropriately qualified designers being engaged by the Consultant as sub-contractors. This should be noted for the purpose of this tender*". In response to this and following their appointment, Heatherwick studio was retained a sub consultant as part of the Arup team, working directly to Arup.

To ensure we are being as transparent as possible, we have published all relevant documents relating to TfL's involvement in the Garden Bridge on our website at: <https://tfl.gov.uk/corporate/publications-and-reports/template-footbridge>.

In response to your letter and the general level of interest in the Garden Bridge, I have instructed a review of the overall process of procurement of the Garden Bridge design contracts, the findings of which I will publish in full.

As part of our commitment to delivering more river crossings to support London's growth I am pleased to say that we have granted funding of £170,000 to Sustrans, matched with £30,000 from businesses in the area, to investigate the potential of a new pedestrian and cycle bridge between Canary Wharf and Rotherhithe. Sustrans' detailed feasibility work is due to be completed in the summer and I await the results of their work with interest.

I trust that this response has provided the answer to your questions but if you require any further information, please do not hesitate to get back in touch.

Yours sincerely

A handwritten signature in red ink, appearing to be 'Peter Hendy', written in a cursive style.

**Sir Peter Hendy CBE**

Enc:

- Invitation to Tender for bridge design consultancy services – February 2013
- Invitation to Tender – Technical brief for consultancy services – April 2013

**To:** Richard De Cani, Managing Director of Planning

**Cc:** Howard Carter, General Counsel  
Sir Peter Hendy, Commissioner

**From:** Clive Walker  
Director of Internal Audit

**Phone:** 020 3054 1879

**Date:** 16 June 2015

**Ref:** IA 15 638

**Internal Audit Work on the procurement of design and development services for the Temple to South Bank footbridge Project**

Following our audit opening meeting on 9 June 2015, we have agreed the following details for this audit work.

***Audit Objective***

The objective of this audit is to provide assurance that the procurements of design and development services for the Temple to South Bank footbridge Project were undertaken in accordance with procurement regulations and approved procedures, and were open, fair and transparent.

***Scope***

This audit has been requested by the Commissioner, in response to questions raised by a member of the London Assembly.

The audit will focus on the control environment in relation to the following key risk areas in respect of the procurements of design and development services for the initial design and the detailed design and development:

- Procurement management processes and compliance with UK & EU guidance
- Selection and pre-qualification of bidders
- The process for developing and approving the Invitation to Tender, contract and associated documents
- Evaluation process for Invitation to Tender and management of bid clarifications

- Contract award and debriefing
- Arrangements for post contract award management.

The audit will be undertaken through a combination of desktop review of documentation and interviews with key personnel involved in the procurement exercise.

The output of the audit will be a memorandum, detailing our findings and providing a conclusion in relation to the audit's objective.

### ***Planned Audit Timetable***

Start of fieldwork	16 June 2015
Closing meeting	3 July 2015
Draft memorandum issued	10 July 2015
Interim memorandum issued	24 July 2015

### ***Audit Team***

The audit team will comprise:

Senior Audit Manager: Roy Millard (020 3054 1628)

Audit Manager: Mushtaq Ali

Auditor: Mark Reilly

### ***Internal Audit and Auditee Responsibilities***

In order to enable the audit process to be concluded as efficiently and effectively as possible, we make certain undertakings concerning our delivery of the audit, and we also ask you to accept certain responsibilities. The linked document contains details of our respective responsibilities together with information about the audit reporting progress.

In the event of any queries with the content of this memo or at any time during the course of the audit, please do not hesitate to contact the Senior Audit Manager or me to discuss.

Kind regards

Clive Walker  
**Director of Internal Audit**  
 Email: [clivewalker@tfl.gov.uk](mailto:clivewalker@tfl.gov.uk)

## Curry Justine

---

**From:** Millard Roy  
**Sent:** 06 November 2015 15:55  
**To:** [REDACTED]  
**Subject:** FW: Internal Audit Work on the procurement of design and development services for the Garden Bridge Project (IA 15638)  
**Attachments:** 15638 LoE Draft v2 - Planning tracked comments.docx

---

**From:** [REDACTED]  
**Sent:** 15 June 2015 14:03  
**To:** Reilly Mark (Internal Audit)  
**Cc:** Richard de Cani (MD Planning); Millard Roy; 'alimushtaq@tfl.gov.uk'  
**Subject:** FW: Internal Audit Work on the procurement of design and development services for the Garden Bridge Project (IA 15638)

Hello Mark

Thanks for sending this through. Please find attached a version of this letter with just a couple of tracked changes.

The naming point is for consistency with how we refer to this project.

Very happy to discuss both this and the documentation that you need to make a start.

Thanks

[REDACTED]

[REDACTED]

---

**From:** Reilly Mark (Internal Audit)  
**Sent:** Thursday, June 11, 2015 03:13 PM  
**To:** Richard de Cani (MD Planning)  
**Cc:** Ali Mushtaq; Millard Roy  
**Subject:** Internal Audit Work on the procurement of design and development services for the Garden Bridge Project (IA 15638)

Richard,

Following our meeting on Tuesday we have put the attached Letter of Engagement together. Please can you review and confirm any comments you may have.

Once agree we can issue and proceed to start the fieldwork immediately.

Kind Regards,

**Mark Reilly | Internal Audit**

TfL | 8th Floor, Windsor House, 42-50 Victoria Street, London, SW1H 0TL

T: 020 3054 8283. Auto: 88283 | M: 07974 727 810 | F: 0207 126 3214 | e-mail: [markreilly2@tfl.gov.uk](mailto:markreilly2@tfl.gov.uk)





**To:** Richard De Cani, Managing Director of Planning  
**Cc:** Howard Carter, General Counsel  
**From:** Clive Walker  
Director of Internal Audit  
**Phone:** 020 3054 1879  
**Date:** Dd June 2015  
**Ref:** IA 15 638

**Internal Audit Work on the procurement of design and development services for the ~~Garden Bridge~~ Temple to South Bank footbridge Project**

Following our audit opening meeting on 9 June 2015, we have agreed the following details for this audit work.

***Audit Objective***

The objective of this audit is to provide assurance that the procurements of design and development services for the ~~Garden Bridge Project~~ Temple to South Bank footbridge Project were undertaken in accordance with procurement regulations and approved procedures, and were open, fair and transparent.

***Scope***

This audit has been requested by ~~Managing Director of Planning~~ the Commissioner, in response to questions raised by a member of the London Assembly.

The audit will focus on the control environment in relation to the following key risk areas in respect of the procurements of design and development services for the initial design and the detail design and development:

- Procurement management processes and compliance with UK & EU guidance
- Selection and pre-qualification of bidders
- The process for developing and approving the Invitation to Tender, contract and associated documents
- Evaluation process for Invitation to Tender and management of bid clarifications
- Contract award and debriefing
- Arrangements for post contract award management.



The audit will be undertaken through a combination of desktop review of documentation and interviews with key personnel involved in the procurement exercise.

The output of the audit will be a memo, detailing our findings and providing a conclusion in relation to the audit's objective.

***Planned Audit Timetable***

Start of fieldwork	15 June 2015
Closing meeting	3 July 2015
Draft memo issued	10 July 2015
Interim memo issued	24 July 2015

***Audit Team***

Senior Audit Manager: Roy Millard (020 3054 1628)

Audit Manager: Mushtaq Ali

Auditor: Mark Reilly

***Internal Audit and Auditee Responsibilities***

In order to enable the audit process to be concluded as efficiently and effectively as possible, we make certain undertakings concerning our delivery of the audit, and we also ask you to accept certain responsibilities. The linked document contains details of our respective responsibilities together with information about the audit reporting progress.

In the event of any queries with the content of this memo or at any time during the course of the audit, please do not hesitate to contact the Senior Audit Manager or me to discuss.

Kind regards

  
Clive Walker  
**Director of Internal Audit**  
Email: [clivewalker@tfl.gov.uk](mailto:clivewalker@tfl.gov.uk)

## **Garden Bridge – Procurement Issues and Powers**

### **Mayoral Direction**

TfL's has a range of statutory functions and powers, as set out in the Greater London Authority Act 1999 (relating to "transport facilities and services") and as a highway authority.

It is, however, not completely clear that a footbridge is within those powers and it would be prudent to seek a delegation of the Mayors "wellbeing" powers under section 30 of the GLA Act and a direction that they be implemented, thereby incorporating the requirement into TfL's Statutory functions.

This is the approach that has been taken with cycling initiatives across TfL.

### **Procurement of Design Team**

The procurement of the design team for the bridge will need to be subject to competition through OJEU. It will be for the appropriate procurement team to write the procurement strategy but this note addresses the options available and concludes that a design contest is likely to be the most suitable process.

While "specialty design services" do not, as a matter of regulation, have to be advertised in OJEU, they relate to interior and furniture design and the better analysis is that the services required of the design team relate to architectural and engineering design would have to be advertised in OJEU.

The nature of a bridge being procured by TfL means that all procurements in relation to it (construction and maintenance etc, as well as the design team) will be governed by the Public Contracts Regulations 2006 (as opposed to the Utilities Contracts Regulations 2006).

There are several options for the procurement process that might be used for the selection of the design team and related issues:

1. Use TfL's consultancy frameworks

While this has the advantage of speed as it requires only a mini competition between capable members of the framework, it is constraint to those members of the framework. Given the aspirations for innovative design, as well as functionality, it may be that a bespoke approach to the market through OJEU is preferable.

2. Use the restrictive (or competitive dialogue or negotiated) procedure and place an OJEU notice

This approach has the benefit of addressing the market as a whole on a bespoke basis. It is, however, ordinarily expected that a restricted procedure (without negotiation) is used and this may not lend itself to the assessment of high quality design concepts. Even if the use of the competitive dialogue or negotiated procedure can be justified on the basis that the nature of the requirement means it can't be precisely specified (other bases are unlikely to

apply here), it may still be difficult to accommodate the assessment of high quality design concepts within the process.

3. Use a design contest

This is a specialist procedure that can be used following an OJEU process. While, administratively, the process is similar to any other OJEU based process and clear evaluation criteria etc will still be needed, it enables consideration of design concepts by a “jury”.

There are certain rules about the qualifications and composition of the jury and care will be needed if GLA representatives are involved to ensure that they do not compromise any planning decisions that may be required of the Mayor in due course.

The “prize” of the contest is generally the contract for the full design of the structure concerned. It is possible to give a monetary prize without the long term design contract, although intellectual property and collateral warranties would need thorough control to ensure any subsequent advisors (who would also have to be procured competitively) can rely on the winning design.

The nature of design proposals means that it is often the case that the ideal solution is the one prepared by the winner of the design contest, with elements of other proposals. It may be appropriate, therefore, to secure certain intellectual property of all the final stage contestants and to pay for that. In a similar vein, there is nothing to prevent the award of honoraria to final stage contestants if that is thought appropriate to secure sufficiently detailed submissions.

It should be noted that the rules on design contests remain largely unchanged in the proposed new procurement Directives due to come into force in the UK around 2014.

Given the design contest process is tailored to the sort of circumstances presented by the garden bridge, it seems the most suitable process to follow.

4. Relationship between design team members

It is anticipated that the bridge design team is unlikely to comprise a single organisation and at least disciplines relating to concept, engineering and architectural design will be required. These can be undertaken as separate appointments (with an appropriate structure of collateral warranties in place). It would, however, be simpler to appoint a single organisation to take liability and sub-contract the others; this may be less preferable to bidders than the multiple appointment approach but the procurement process could be designed to ensure that it is delivered.

5. Combination with other projects

TfL is considering building another footbridge across the Thames to connect the Vauxhall/Nine Elms/Battersea area with the northern side of the river.

An analysis in relation to procurement of the design team for that project will be broadly similar to that for the garden bridge and there is merit in considering having a single design contest process with two “prizes” available.

The approach would be similar to that taken with lots under other procurement processes, whereby there could be a separate winner for the design work for each project or a single winner for both.

Consideration will need to be given to possible timing of the projects as it will be important to ensure that design concept work is not undertaken so early that it is out of date by the time at which consents are sought and construction undertaken.

6. Level playing field

We are aware that Thomas Heatherwick has already raised with the GLA and TfL the possibility of a garden bridge across the river between Temple and South Bank and care will be needed to ensure that, particularly in relation to timing of the competition and its specification, other bidders have an equal opportunity to pull together all the relevant disciplines and to put their ideas forward.

7. Consents

Consents for both bridge projects will need to be considered in due course. Whatever the approach for seeking consents, undoubtedly, consultation will be required and it will be important to ensure that it is not, and does not appear to be, the case that decisions have already been made about the proposed structures.

8. Announcements

Any announcements about proposals for either bridge that take place before consultation is underway should be limited to the design contest and be speculative as to the final outcome, noting that consultation is required.

No specific details of the design contest itself that could be construed as giving anyone an unfair advantage should be made public before the contest is started.

9. Timing

The design contest process is not likely to be quicker than other OJEU based procurement processes and it should be noted that it is prudent to allow additional time for the logistics of administering the “jury” process, particularly if there are representatives from multiple organisations. It would be prudent to allow around nine months for the process.

## Meeting Notes

**Audit No:** 15638 Garden Bridge

**Attendees:**

██████████, Planning (██████████)

Mark Reilly, Internal Audit (MR)

**Meeting Date:** 19 June 2015

**Reason for Meeting**

Review of invoices and commercials relating to the 2 contracts

**Summary of Meeting**

**Introduction**

MR gave an overview of the audit and process

**Purchase Orders**

3 POs have been raised in relation to the 2 contracts, they are:

Thomas Heatherwick ██████████

Arup ██████████

Arup (Specialist Services) ██████████

**1<sup>st</sup> Contract**

The first PO ran from March – July 2013 and was set up at £70k, but final bill was £52k.

**2<sup>nd</sup> contract**

The first PO covered Arup only work and related to the Arup submission  
The second PO (\*502) relates to the specialists services provided by Arup sub consultants. Of which Thomas Heatherwick was one. The final PO value of this was £7.0m of which £6.9m has been invoiced.

All contractual relationships with Arup stopped in April 2015. At this point the garden bridge trust took over managing them.

**Management of the contract**

The invoices and costs were reviewed by ██████████ prior to being approved for payment.

TfL did not receive invoices from Heatherwick after the first contract.

**Action(s) to be taken**

■ to provide PO and invoice information to MR

## Meeting Notes

<b>Audit No:</b> 15638 Garden Bridge
<b>Attendees:</b> [REDACTED] Planning ([REDACTED]) Mark Reilly, Internal Audit (MR)
<b>Meeting Date:</b> 19 June 2015

<b>Reason for Meeting</b>
---------------------------

Review of the management of the procurement and the project

<b>Summary of Meeting</b>
---------------------------

### Introduction

MR gave an overview of the audit and process

[REDACTED] role

[REDACTED] got involved in the project at the procurement stage of the Arup contract

This was shortly after TfL were asked to progress the engineering design

### Procurement

Done through the EPMF framework, managed by [REDACTED] in Procurement  
Bidders were asked not to approach Heatherwick during the process

Expression of Interest then followed by an ITT

13 bids were returned and considered

[REDACTED] and 3 others from Planning undertook the technical evaluations of the bids, and [REDACTED] lead the commercial evaluation.

There was then a round of interviews with c.5 companies, this was in May/ June 2013.

Arup were appointed to undertake the design services contract.

The nature of the contract (and how little TfL knew about what was happening) meant that this was a "partnering" arrangement with Arup, to help develop.

### **Garden Bridge Trust**

There were issues with the establishment of the trust and this led to TfL leading the project for longer than was ever envisaged.

TfL asked to take to planning, but this changed following discussions with the Mayor and TfL asked to keep the project running.

Once formed the trust becomes the Sponsor / Promoter of the scheme and TfL involvement remains but more of a light touch.

In practice TfL ran the project until April 2015.

The trust are now in full control.

### **Conflict of Interest**

■■■■ remembers that there were discussions on who was the trustee of the garden bridge and the impact this may have on contracts (Joanna Lumley and Thomas Heatherwick)

Legal were involved with this and the best person to speak to is ■■■■ and Richard de Cani.

### **Procurement**

The prices submitted against the scope in the ITT was used as the estimate set up.

The use of Heatherwick by Arup is something we should speak to RdC about. ■■■■ remembers Arup requested them and managed them as a sub consultant.

### **TfL role**

The TfL role in the management of the project was never expected to be to the extent it turned out.

TfL always intended to handover to GBT asap, but there were some issues in getting them to the appropriate capability.

■■■■ worked with TfL Finance to ensure GBT was capable of managing this project, and this was part of the funding agreement.

■■■■ confirmed that project assurance was not involved in this project.



**Action(s) to be taken**

text

## Meeting Notes

**Audit No:** 15638 Garden Bridge

**Attendees:**

██████████, Planning (████)

Mark Reilly, Internal Audit (MR)

Mushtaq Ali, Internal Audit (MA)

**Meeting Date:** 24 June 2015

### Reason for Meeting

Following review of the procurement file, a meeting was held to clarify several points on the procurement of Arup in 2013

### Summary of Meeting

#### Introduction

MR also set out the findings and the questions that IA had.

#### Did TfL consider Arup relationship with Heatherwick as a potential conflict?

████ not aware that this was seen as an issue.

Was aware there were discussions previously on the trust, but not on this.

Arup said they weren't involved with THS at the bidding stage

#### In the evaluation of the tenders, there are rough workings and final workings, why is this? (And the changes in the commercial scores)

████ doesn't what the files are we are discussing as he wasn't involved in collating the evaluation scores.

████ does not know why the commercial scores changed.

████ wasn't involved in the scores and there was a second submission.

Any questions on the commercials we should ask █████

#### Was there a second submission from Arup?

████ not aware of second submission on the tender

#### Was there contact with Arup about their commercial score?

████ does not remember, if it was it would be by commercial

#### Why has only Arup been marked up on the technical scores?

████ view was that Arup were clear leaders in the interviews

The reason the others went down, is "from memory" there were some questions on the way they answered the questions.

**How were the interviews conducted?**

The interview panel was [REDACTED], [REDACTED], [REDACTED] and [REDACTED]  
[REDACTED]

Everyone scored separately and then there was a look across the scores. Similar to the first evaluation meeting.

**Who has the individual evaluation sheets prepared during the evaluation?**

[REDACTED] is not sure who has them

The ones he has he thinks have been lost in office moves.

[REDACTED] cannot remember if they were put onto soft copy.

[REDACTED] remembers that [REDACTED] had a laptop with him and that he captured the scores.

**Use of THS by Arup**

Arup requested that THS be brought on board is how [REDACTED] remembers discussion.

With regard to the language in the Commercial Summary from Arup, [REDACTED] feels that it is open to interpretation. And disagrees with the IA view.

[REDACTED] view is that we should speak to RdC on the THS role.

<b>Action(s) to be taken</b>
------------------------------

## Meeting Notes

<b>Audit No:</b> 15638 Garden Bridge
<b>Attendees:</b> [REDACTED], Planning ([REDACTED]) Mark Reilly, Internal Audit (MR)
<b>Meeting Date:</b> 30 June 2015

<b>Reason for Meeting</b>
---------------------------

Review of role in evaluation process for Arup contract

<b>Summary of Meeting</b>
---------------------------

### Introduction

MR gave an overview of the audit and process

### Role

[REDACTED] was part of TW team doing the technical evaluation

[REDACTED] was looking at engineering scores  
Others at the other 4 areas being submitted

Wasn't involved in any other part of the procurement

The evaluation was split into technical and commercial and [REDACTED] never saw the commercial submissions.

### Review process

7<sup>th</sup> May – team met and the process was explained. [REDACTED] circulated the submissions and scoring sheets

10<sup>th</sup> May – met for consensus meeting

From [REDACTED] memory Arup were not the best on Engineering but were on the other areas.

Arup were top overall after the technical submission

4 companies brought forward for interview

14<sup>th</sup> May 09:00 Atkins

14<sup>th</sup> May 15:00 Motts

14<sup>th</sup> May 09:00 Rambolls

16<sup>th</sup> May 09:30 Arup

There was then a meeting to review the scores.

Arup were not the overall winners at this point

■ believes that contact was made with Arup to revise their prices.  
Believes RdC spoke to Arup about their prices.

■ not sure the exact date of the contact with Arup on prices

Financials were not discussed at the interviews as far as ■ can remember.

#### **Evaluation scores**

The scores were captured by ■ at the meeting.

■ can't remember what happened to the individual score papers.

Action(s) to be taken
-----------------------

## Meeting Notes

**Audit No:** 15638 Garden Bridge

**Attendees:**

██████████ Planning (██████████)

Mark Reilly, Internal Audit (MR)

**Meeting Date:** 2 July 2015

**Reason for Meeting**

Review of role in evaluation process for Arup contract

**Summary of Meeting**

**Introduction**

MR gave an overview of the audit and process

**Role**

██████████ had no specific role in the project prior to the evaluation

Had advised earl on regarding potential consent routes and issues – relating to a generic crossing

Was part of the technical evaluation team – looking at the environment area mainly

**Review process**

Remembers that technically Arup was a well written bid, can't remember exactly how he scored it

There was a mixed bag of submissions – some did well, some poorly

There were variances in strengths and weaknesses

██████████ would have scored the bids in relation to the criteria

██████████ focus on Environmental side of the bids

**Wash up meeting**

Wash up was held with the technical evaluation team and the commercial

There were general discussions on the scores and a consensus was reached at this meeting

██████████ can't remember who scored highest at this meeting

Thinks Arup scored well, but can't remember

### **Interview selection**

█ doesn't remember how this was decided  
not involved in the commercial side of scoring

Memory tells him that Arup were expensive, but not really involved in that side

### **Interview process**

The point of the interview was to pick up on uncertainties in the written submissions – where the uncertainty remains this may impact the scores

Remembers 2 in particular, Arup & Ramboll

At the interview Arup were very strong – thinks due to their involvement in the bridge development prior to the tender process

Came across very strongly – put an experienced and respected team together

Doesn't recall Ramboll giving a bad interview

On the environment side they were a little weak, Arup on this came across stronger

Didn't recall Ramboll being poor

Remember Arup and Ramboll were the strongest

There was a discipline in Ramboll that had some uncertainty, transport █ thinks

Arup were very good

### **Engagement with bidders**

█ had no involvement in the commercial assessment  
No knowledge of any engagement with the bidders

Does not recall any pressure on the team during the process

<b>Action(s) to be taken</b>
------------------------------

## Meeting Notes

**Audit No:** 15638 Garden Bridge

**Attendees:** Roy Millard, Internal Audit (RM)  
Mushtaq Ali, Internal Audit (MA)  
Mark Reilly, Internal Audit (MR)  
Richard de Cani, TfL Planning (RdC)

**Meeting Date:** 7 July 2015

### Reason for Meeting

Meeting with Richard to seek clarification on the issues identified during the audit.

### Summary of Meeting

#### Introduction

RM gave an overview of the work to date and the progress made.

#### Procurement of Heatherwick

RdC gave an overview of the procurement and what were some of the key points.

#### Timing was critical

The mayor wanted to explore whether the bridge was feasible

The challenge was to get something new / innovative

#### There was a real time pressure to get some ideas

The 3 bidders were chosen from tfl knowledge

#### Heatherwick email of the 08 February 2013 – brief sent

THS had been to see the mayor

RdC was keeping them informed because of their discussions with the Mayor

Wanted to make sure they knew the process and the timescales that would be applied

The email was to do this

#### Clarification email 26 February

RdC not clear on this one

Remembers that it was about their rates and the people in the bid document

Joanna Lumley role in the design? What would she do?

Stuart Wood was the main contact for THS on this, not Thomas Heatherwick

THS confirmed the rates and the approach they would take



**RdC not sure what documentation he has on this**

**Evaluation of the bids**

Aware that [REDACTED] had been involved, **does not remember specific legal advice**

The evaluation was on day rates as per the ITT, not the estimated cost

Need to check with commercial on who did the day rate analysis

Scoring should always be commercial

**RdC did not do the commercial scoring – cant comment on scores**

With this being a small study, the approach used would have appropriate for a £60k piece of work.

Would have done a different approach with hindsight.

The approach adopted was because we had previous experience of all parties involved.

**There was pressure from the mayor to get something out quickly**

Now TfL has a panel in place for this type of work to address this

Context of the timing needs to be considered

THS had no view as to how this would develop

A design competition is the preferred route now

**Award of Contract**

RdC remembers that the THS request to be lead designer and own IP was rebutted

TfL maintained both at this point

**Invoice values**

RdC was asked why there was someone charged at £1875/day but this wasn't included in the evaluation

RdC not sure why

**RdC view was that spend was within the scope and the output was good and appropriate.**

**TfL got what it wanted and within cost.**

**Contract with Arup**

██████████ running the project for the Arup procurement

██████████ was spoken to (RdC knows the question we are going to ask)  
RdC confirms that he approached Arup to reduce their price – commercial were fully aware of this move

RdC comments that this may not be approved by audit

Arup were the technically best output and TfL got them for a cheaper price – RdC view is that this action saved £1.5m

Arup originally did not want to reduce their fee, but they subsequently did

██████████ was supportive of this approach – revised fees submitted, RdC thinks to but we will need to check.

**RdC can't remember exactly what we told ARUP in on this**

### **Use of THS by Arup**

A lot of legal time on this one on the role of the designer

Arup were contracted to work up the design

Arup requested that they use THS and DPA on the project

Arup wanted TfL to contract with THS and DPA directly. TfL said no and this reflects the language used in the commercial summary.

██████████ gave the legal input into the ITT.

We knew this may happen, and the audit needs to understand how and why this happened.

### **Recommendations**

There was a discussion with RdC on his views on potential recommendations from this review.

RdC thinks that a design competition is how work like this should be done now.

Need to consider how TfL deals with the activity that goes on outside of the project (GLA, etc)

Get a longer view on where procurements may go

Capability of commercial for this type of work

**Action(s) to be taken**

**Following the meeting RdC sent through an explanation of why the documents relating to the evaluation were no longer available.**

This page is intentionally left blank

# Subject: Action Taken Under Delegated Authority

**Report to: GLA Oversight Committee**

**Report of: Executive Director of Secretariat**

**Date: 17 December 2015**

**This report will be considered in public**

## 1. Summary

- 1.1 This report summarises the action taken by the Chair of the GLA Oversight Committee under delegated authority since the date of the last meeting.

## 2. Recommendation

- 2.1 **That the Committee notes the actions taken by the Chair of the GLA Oversight Committee under delegated authority.**

## 3. Background

- 3.1 Under the Chair's standing delegation as set out in Standing Orders, the Chair may do anything which is calculated to facilitate, or is conducive or incidental to, the exercise of any of that body's functions including entering into correspondence on that body's behalf. Under section 54 of the GLA Act 1999 (as amended) the Assembly may delegate relevant functions to individual Members.

## 4. Issues for Consideration

- 4.1 As part of its ongoing work on Transport for London's (TfL) procurement of the Garden Bridge design, the Chair of the GLA Oversight Committee, following consultation with the Deputy Chairman and party Group Lead Members, wrote to the Chair of TfL's Audit and Assurance Committee setting out the Committee's concerns on this matter. The letter is attached as **Appendix 1**.
- 4.2 Under the delegated authority granted to him at the GLA Oversight Committee meeting of 25 November 2015, the Chair of the Committee also rescheduled items of business for the 17 December 2015 and subsequent meetings in order to facilitate the attendance of the Mayor and

the Commissioner of TfL, in order to answer further questions on the procurement of the Garden Bridge design, as detailed in Item 9 of this agenda, Work Programme for the GLA Oversight Committee.

## 5. Legal Implications

- 5.1 Under section 34 of the Greater London Authority Act 1999 (as amended), the Authority, acting under the Mayor or Assembly, may do anything that is considered to facilitate or is conducive or incidental to the exercise of any of the functions of the Assembly.
- 5.2 The Assembly may, under section 54 of the GLA Act 1999 (as amended) delegate relevant functions to individual Members. The decision making function on this matter has, accordingly, been properly delegated by the Assembly, through one of its committees, to the Chair of the GLA Oversight Committee.

## 6. Financial Implications

- 6.1 There are no financial implications arising from this report.

---

### List of appendices to this report:

**Appendix 1** - Letter to the Chair of TfL's Audit and Assurance Committee

<b>Local Government (Access to Information) Act 1985</b>
List of Background Papers: Member Delegated Authority (MDA 661)
Contact Officer: John Barry, Principal Committee Manager Telephone: 020 7983 4425 Email: <a href="mailto:john.barry@london.gov.uk">john.barry@london.gov.uk</a>

Len Duvall AM, Chair of the GLA Oversight Committee

City Hall  
The Queen's Walk  
London SE1 2AA  
Switchboard: 020 7983 4000  
Minicom: 020 7983 4458  
Web: [www.london.gov.uk](http://www.london.gov.uk)

**Keith Williams**

Chair of TfL's Audit and Assurance Committee  
Transport for London  
Windsor House  
42-50 Victoria Street  
London, SW1H 0TL

3 December 2015

Dear Mr Williams

**TfL's internal audit review of the Garden Bridge design procurement**

I am writing to you as Chair of the GLA Oversight Committee to outline our concerns about how the internal audit on the procurement process for the Garden Bridge design contract was carried out. The specific points relate to the TfL 90711 Design Services, awarded to Thomas Heatherwick Studios, which has been the subject of two meetings of the GLA Oversight Committee in September and October of this year.

These concerns relate primarily to the process of compiling the final published internal report; how decisions were made to remove or dilute critical statements; and the switch in focus of the audit from fairness and transparency to value for money considerations late in the process.

The GLA Oversight Committee has a wide ranging brief including several internal responsibilities related to staffing and approving scrutiny expenditure. It also deals with and determines any questions, issues or other matters not falling within the approved subject area and terms of reference of any other committee. It is under this remit that the GLA Oversight Committee has examined issues related to the Garden Bridge procurement.

One of the themes which the GLA Oversight Committee often returns to is transparency. In 2013, the Committee published a report, *Transparency in the GLA Group*, which stressed the importance of transparency and accountability in public bodies:

*There are clear benefits to transparency. It can help mitigate the risks of poor practice, poor value for money, reputational damage and even corruption. The public also has a fundamental right to know how public money is being used.*

In the spirit of this drive for greater transparency, we ask that our concerns are taken into consideration at the next Audit and Assurance Committee, on 8 December.

## *Background to the GLA Oversight Committee's work on the Garden Bridge*

On 17 September, the GLA Oversight Committee examined the procurement of the Garden Bridge's design contract with Richard De Cani, Managing Director of Planning at TfL, Will Hurst, Deputy Editor of *Architect's Journal* and Walter Menteth of Walter Menteth Architects. Concerns had been raised about the fairness and transparency of the process after a series of documents were released to Will Hurst under the Freedom of Information Act. Although TfL had declared that it was satisfied that the process was robust, Sir Peter Hendy, former Chief Executive of TfL, ordered an internal audit review of the procurement and agreed to publish the results. The audit report was released to the public on 16 September and formed the basis of our Committee's discussion on the 17<sup>th</sup>.

Following this meeting, GLA Oversight Committee Members were sent what appeared to be an earlier draft of the internal audit review which had been submitted to the Managing Director of Planning at TfL on 22 July 2015. Once the draft was confirmed as authentic, I wrote to TfL on 30 September to request *"all iterations of the internal audit review document of the procurement of design and development services for the Temple to South Bank Footbridge Project, alongside any emails or notes relating to the changes that have been made to the document."* TfL complied on the 15<sup>th</sup> October, with a 470 page hard copy submission.

It was clear that substantial changes had been made by senior management to the original draft presented to them by the Internal Audit team on the 22 July. The GLA Oversight Committee requested that Clive Walker, Director of Internal Audit, appear before the Committee on 22 October. Our concerns relate to the changes to the report suggested by senior management and agreed to by Mr Walker, and Mr Walker's evidence to the Committee in October.

### *Issue 1 – Focus of the Audit*

We are concerned that the focus of the audit has changed over the course of the review. The original Audit Objective agreed was to

*"provide assurance that the procurements of the design and development services for the Temple to South Bank footbridge Project are undertaken in accordance with procurement regulations and approved procedures and were open, fair and transparent."*<sup>1</sup>

This scope was reproduced in each subsequent Internal Review report, and formed the basis of the original conclusion reached by the Internal Review team in the 22 July draft (ie before it was changed by senior management). This conclusion stated that *"there were a number of instances where the procurements deviated from TfL policy and process and OJEU guidance [...] and, taken together, these adversely impact on the openness and objectivity of the procurements"*.

Following that draft, the focus of the audit appears to have shifted from looking primarily at fairness and transparency to focusing mainly on a value for money conclusion. Despite the Objective and Scope of the Audit remaining the same in subsequent versions, the conclusion in

---

<sup>1</sup> Memo from Director of Internal Review to the Managing Director of Planning, 16 June 2015 – submitted to the GLA Oversight Committee by TfL on 20 November 2015



the 15 September (ie final) draft stated, *“The audit did not find any evidence that would suggest that the final recommendations did not provide value for money from the winning bidders”*.

In his oral evidence to the Oversight Committee in September, TfL’s Managing Director of Planning stressed the value for money conclusion several times as the ultimate mitigation for criticisms of the procurement process. For example, *“What this audit has confirmed is that that initial procurement was robust. It did offer value for money and it was acceptable for the job that we were doing at that time.”*

From evidence heard by the Committee, it appears that the suggestion to focus on value for money did not come from the Internal Audit team. In describing the sequence of events, the Director of Internal Audit said that, following initial drafts of the report, senior management asked him if there was anything that could be said on the issue of value for money. The Director of Internal Audit formulated the value for money judgement, and it appeared first in drafts dated 6 August, quite late into the process, and despite not having been addressed in the evidence gathered by the Internal Review team. Mr Clive Walker said that:

*“I do not think we did really change the focus of the report. The actual issues that are raised are all around matters of transparency and openness, issues like the fact that there was contact with one of the bidders to ask them to drop their price when others were not contacted and so forth. The main issues that are in the report are about issues of transparency and openness”*.

**We do not believe that this constitutes an adequate explanation for the apparent switch in focus of the audit. The reason the Commissioner had the audit undertaken was to give reassurance that the procurement had been fair and transparent and that rules had not been breached in order to achieve a predetermined outcome. Given the changes and the sources of these changes we do not consider that the Audit report can provide such reassurance and doubts about the openness and transparency of this procurement process remain.**

## *Issue 2 – The conclusion*

The 22 July draft includes the amended conclusion reached by the Internal Review team. It summarised a list of errors found over the course of the review before reaching its final conclusion on openness and objectivity (ie *“taken together, these adversely impact on the openness and objectivity of the procurements”*). The list of errors included:

- There was no procurement strategy to manage and deliver each procurement;
- There were informal contacts with individual bidders in each procurement; and
- There was a lack of clear segregation of duties between TfL Planning and TfL Commercial in the evaluation of TfL 90711 Design Services.

Once the draft was circulated to senior management, the conclusion underwent substantial changes. The summary of errors was removed, as was the finding on openness and objectivity.

The conclusion was also re-written to include mitigating statements about TfL's actions in the procurement process, which arguably contradict the findings contained in the body of the report. For example:

*“For these procurements the approach was not agreed at the outset, TfL’s role in the project was unclear and this was a strong factor in there not being an agreed strategy from the commencement... However, the audit did not identify any issues that would suggest that the final recommendation in both cases was not sound.”*

This statement appears questionable in light of the original conclusion which stated that the fairness and transparency of the procurement process had been compromised.

**It is notable that the conclusion in the final audit report also forms the basis of its executive summary. We believe that neither the conclusion nor the executive summary accurately reflect the critical findings contained in the body of the published report, and don't therefore include the most important criticisms of both individual and organisational conduct during this procurement process.**

### *Issue 3 – Senior Management input*

In examining this issue, a broader concern has arisen among Committee Members about the degree of influence senior managers, who are the subject of a review, have over both its findings and conclusions. From our analysis of the audit trail, it appears that substantial changes were suggested by the Managing Director of Planning, whose personal conduct and that of his department were a major focus of the review. Ultimately, the original draft completed by the internal review team raised significant questions about his role, yet it appears that he was allowed to suggest changes which eased or removed that criticism completely.

**The Committee understands that the Director of Internal Audit had the final say on all changes related to the draft before publication. However, the degree of change, and the lack of any clear justification for the extent of the changes agreed to by the Director of Internal Audit raises questions about the ultimate independence of the audit's findings.**

In summary, while we welcomed Sir Peter Hendy's quick response to concerns raised by Assembly Members and others in connection with the procurement of the Garden Bridge design contract, we are disappointed with the way it was carried out. Our letter highlights three main issues:

- We are concerned about the switch in focus of the audit to value for money. We do not consider that the final Audit report provides adequate reassurance about the process and we continue to have doubts about the openness and transparency of this procurement exercise.
- We believe that the executive summary and the conclusion do not accurately reflect the audit's actual, and more critical, findings as set out in the main body of the published report.

- The number and tone of changes to previous drafts of the audit report suggested by the Director of Internal Audit raises questions about the ultimate independence of the audit's findings.

I would be grateful if you would raise these issues with the Audit and Assurance Committee during discussion of the Internal Review report at your meeting on 8 December. We would also welcome a response from the Committee to these concerns.

Yours sincerely

A handwritten signature in black ink that reads "Len Duvall". The signature is written in a cursive style with a large, prominent 'L' and 'D'.

**Len Duvall AM**  
**Chair of the GLA Oversight Committee**

This page is intentionally left blank

# Subject: Garden Bridge Design Procurement

**Report to: GLA Oversight Committee**

**Report of: Executive Director of Secretariat**

**Date: 17 December 2015**

**This report will be considered in public**

## 1. Summary

- 1.1 This report provides background information to the GLA Oversight Committee in putting questions to the Mayor of London, Boris Johnson MP, in his capacity as Chairman of Transport for London (TfL), and Mike Brown MVO, Commissioner of Transport for London, on the Garden Bridge design procurement process.

## 2. Recommendation

- 2.1 **That the report and the discussion with Boris Johnson MP, Chairman of Transport for London, and Mike Brown MVO, Commissioner of Transport for London, be noted.**

## 3. Background

- 3.1 The Garden Bridge is a proposed 366 metre pedestrian bridge between the areas of Temple Underground Station on the north bank of the Thames and the South Bank. The Bridge's final cost is estimated at £175 million. The construction and future maintenance of the Bridge is the responsibility of a charity, the Garden Bridge Trust. The Trust will receive £60 million in public funding (£30 million from TfL, of which £20 million will be in the form of a loan to the Trust, and £30 million from the Treasury), and is aiming to raise the rest through private donations
- 3.2 At its meeting on 17 September 2015, the GLA Oversight Committee discussed the procurement of the Garden Bridge's design contract with guests including Richard De Cani, Managing Director of Planning at TfL, Walter Menteth, of Walter Menteth Architects, and Will Hurst, Deputy Editor of Architects Journal. The GLA Oversight Committee also examined the Internal Review of the procurement process carried out by TfL, with the Director of Internal Review, Clive Walker, on 22 October 2015. A full transcript of each meeting can be found at: <https://www.london.gov.uk/what-we-do/gla-oversight-committee>

## 4. Issues for Consideration

- 4.1 The GLA Oversight Committee's previous work on the Garden Bridge procurement process has raised serious, strategic questions about how the project was established, and the role that TfL played in developing the Garden Bridge as both a design, and a practical reality. Members of the GLA Oversight Committee will explore these issues with Boris Johnson MP, in his capacity as Chairman of Transport for London, who was the main driver behind this project, and Mike Brown MVO, Commissioner of Transport for London.

## 5. Legal Implications

- 5.1 The Assembly has the power to do what is recommended in this report.

## 6. Financial Implications

- 6.1 There are no financial implications to the GLA arising from this report.

---

**List of appendices to this report:** None

<b>Local Government (Access to Information) Act 1985</b>
List of Background Papers: None
Contact Officer: Katie Smith, Head of Scrutiny and Investigations
Telephone: 020 7983 4423
E-mail: <a href="mailto:katie.smith@london.gov.uk">katie.smith@london.gov.uk</a>

# Subject: Shared Services Update

**Report to: GLA Oversight Committee**

**Report of: Executive Director of Resources**

**Date: 17 December 2015**

**This report will be considered in public**

## 1. Summary

- 1.1 This paper provides an update to the Committee on the position of a number of shared service arrangements between the functional bodies of the GLA that were in place or have been put in place since the Committee last discussed the matter in December 2014.

## 2. Recommendation

- 2.1 **That the Committee comments on and notes the updated position, as set out in this report.**

## 3. Background

- 3.1 Shared services and related functional delegations and arrangements were last discussed by the GLA Oversight Committee at its December 2014 meeting. Earlier this year, a schedule of the shared service arrangements that were in place for each of the functional bodies was presented and discussed. The schedule included, where available, details of estimated and actual savings that had been achieved for the arrangements listed.
- 3.2 Since December 2014, the Committee has also been consulted on a number of shared service arrangements:
- January 2015 – consultation on a pan-GLA Group collaborative procurement team;
  - February 2015 - Consultation on shared committee services with the Old Oak and Park Royal Development Corporation; and
  - June 2015 - consultation on shared insurance functions.

## 4. Issues for Consideration

- 4.1 Updates on some of the shared service arrangements that the Committee has previously expressed interest in are set out overleaf.

## GLA Group Collaborative Procurement Function

- 4.2 The GLA Group Collaborative Procurement Team (GCPT) was established on 1 April 2015. The team was established to manage the common and low complexity procurement expenditure for the GLA and each of the functional bodies and the Metropolitan Police Service (MPS).
- 4.3 The categories managed by the team are professional services; recruitment; marketing; utilities; office supplies and equipment; travel; print; uniform; fuel; and postal services. Since the 1 April substantial work has been undertaken including the creation of strategies for each of the in-scope categories and marketing of the work of the team to the commercial teams and clients of each of the functional bodies.
- 4.4 The GLA Collaborative Procurement Board, which is chaired by the Mayor's Chief of Staff and comprises a representative from each of the functional bodies, oversees the governance of the collaborative procurement team and has been meeting on a regular basis since the creation of the team. Board meetings have also been attended by a representative of an appropriate consultancy (on a pro bono basis) in order that the representative can give impartial professional advice to the Board. Amongst other items of work the Board has considered and discussed various updates to the category strategies including endorsement of the Media Planning & Buying and Strategic Thinking, Creative Development & Production Services Procurement Strategy. In considering the strategies the Board is focused on exploring opportunities for further collaboration across more complex areas of expenditure with a view to potentially increasing the level of savings that can be achieved for each of the functional bodies.
- 4.5 Milestones and savings targets for the GCPT are being monitored by the Board and this includes the establishment of a savings tracker. In establishing the team it was recognised that it was likely 12 to 15 months for optimum saving delivery to be achieved. Approximately £1.8 million in cashable savings was forecast to be achieved in the first year of the function's operation. To date £380,000 of cashable savings and £240,000 of non cashable savings have been achieved across a range of categories including recruitment, consultancy and office supplies and equipment. **Appendix 1** - under the GCPT section of the schedule - includes further details of these savings.
- 4.6 The Board has also been monitoring the staffing compliment of the GCPT (which is hosted by TfL and is using TfL office space and processes) against the work plan for the team to ensure value for money is being achieved.
- 4.7 Committee Members have previously expressed interest in the scope for increasing ethical and fair trade procurement through the collaborative procurement function. The function is expected to work in accordance with the GLA responsible procurement policy and all new opportunities for collaboration that are explored will be done so within the framework of this policy. It also expected that by collaborating in procurement and stream lining supply chain effectiveness the collaborative function will help to reduce transportation of supplies on London's roads and help to reduce emissions and congestion.



## Shared Treasury Management Function

- 4.8 Since 2011 the GLA has expanded provision of treasury services to London Fire and Emergency Planning Authority (LFEPA), the London Legacy Development Corporation (LLDC), the Mayor's Office for Policing and Crime (MOPAC) and the London Pensions Fund Authority (LPFA). This has enabled group resources to be pooled to create a specialised unit with greatly enhanced opportunities for succession planning, professional development and separation of duties. Overall, this has led to much greater resilience and financial control across the Group in this technical and potentially high-risk service. In particular, the smaller participants have been able to eliminate "key person risk" and benefit from high level strategic input from the GLA's senior treasury officers, reducing the reliance on external consultants. This approach has allowed the participating members of the group to absorb, without increasing the overall establishment, an increase in investments of £2.24 billion and borrowing of £3.25 billion, including the management of complex financing projects such as Crossrail and the NLE.
- 4.9 Since 2012, Annual consultancy costs have been halved (saving £25,000 per annum) and the opportunities created by combining the group teams have enabled services to be delivered as usual while individual officers concentrated on complex borrowing transactions. Joint delivery of the function has led to sharing of best practice and greater convergence of risk appetites and strategy across the group. Moreover, the shared Group Treasury team is well placed to identify opportunities for intragroup transactions, potentially eliminating intermediaries' fees.
- 4.10 A cornerstone of the shared service is the Group Investment Syndicate (GIS) which enables participants' funds to be invested jointly. This has many financial advantages including efficiencies (one transaction rather than five) and allowing all participants to enjoy vastly increased purchasing power (the GIS currently exceeds £2bn). More importantly, it delivers significant risk reduction via increased scope for diversification and improved liquidity. The purchasing power and dedicated dealing resources of the GIS have facilitated healthy investment performance, exceeding the market benchmark for equivalent risk by 50bps since inception (currently 16bps). The most recent participant, the LPFA, estimates the value of improved performance versus its former arrangements at over £750,000 from inception.

## Shared Services Schedule

- 4.11 An updated schedule of shared service arrangements for each of the functional bodies is attached as **Appendix 1**. This updated schedule reflects any new shared service and framework arrangements that have been entered into by the functional bodies since the last version of the schedule was considered by the Committee. Where applicable, updates on items that were presented in previous versions of the schedule have also been included and those items that are no longer relevant have been removed.

## 5. Legal Implications

- 5.1 Under section 401A of the GLA Act 1999, "Arrangements may be entered into by relevant London authorities for the provision of administrative, professional or technical services by any one or more of them to any one or more of them, whether for consideration or otherwise". The GLA, its functional bodies, and the LPFA are among the "relevant London authorities" defined in section 401A. Therefore it is within the powers of the GLA, its functional bodies, and the LPFA, to enter into arrangements with each other for the provision of HR and IT, committee clerking, treasury management, investment, property management, legal, internal audit, and procurement, services.

- 5.2 Detailed legal comments on the shared services set out in this paper were included in the consultation documentation and relevant decision papers for the establishment of the services.

## **6. Financial Implications**

- 6.1 The shared service arrangements outlined in this paper are expected to deliver efficiency gains and/or cashable savings. Where the data is available the estimated and actual annual savings achieved to date are set out in the body of the update report and in the Shared Services Schedule under **Appendix 1**.

---

### **List of appendices to this report:**

**Appendix 1** – Shared Services Update

#### **Local Government (Access to Information) Act 1985**

List of Background Papers:

Shared Services Schedule submitted to the Principal Committee Manager on 26 January 2015

Consultation on Pan-GLA Group Collaborative Procurement Function – 27 January 2015

Consultation on Shared Committee Services with the Old Oak and Park Royal Development Corporation – 24 February 2015

Shared Service: Consultation on Shared Insurance Functions – 30 June 2015

Contact Officer: Matthew Beals, Financial Analyst

Telephone: 020 7983 5721

E-mail: [Matthew.Beals@london.gov.uk](mailto:Matthew.Beals@london.gov.uk)

**Shared Services Schedule**

**Table of Contents**

<b>Page Number</b>	<b>Content</b>
<b>2</b>	<b>MOPAC</b>
<b>11</b>	<b>LFEPA</b>
<b>26</b>	<b>GLA</b>
<b>39</b>	<b>LLDC</b>
<b>43</b>	<b>TfL</b>
<b>67</b>	<b>OPDC</b>
<b>69</b>	<b>GLA Collaborative Procurement Team Savings</b>

# MOPAC

## Shared Services Schedule

### Mayor's Office for Policing and Crime

#### A. Functional delegations

Ref	Delegation to:	Service provided to:	Service provided:	Estimated Direct Saving (£'000s pa)	Actual Direct Saving (£'000s pa)	Estimated Indirect Saving (£'000s pa)	Actual Indirect Saving (£'000s pa)	Notes
A8	GLA	MOPAC	IT Services including: customer support services; support for all live systems; infrastructure management; developing the IT service; overseeing the quality of the IT service					See D8
A9	GLA	MOPAC	Media services – press officer		118.0			More effective, consistent and integrated approach to media service for GLA and MOPAC
A10	GLA	MOPAC	Treasury management					The transfer of the staff and function should improve risk management, and better returns from higher volumes and pooled funds are anticipated. See summary in covering report.
A20	TfL	MOPAC	Legal Services (as required)		97.0			A more robust and comprehensive service has been delivered for MOPAC arising from the capacity which TfL has.
A21	GLA	MOPAC	HR services		47.0			Effective from December 2013. The £47k is the anticipated annual full year saving. There are one-off system development costs in the first year of operation.

**MOPAC**

**C. Management and co-location**

Ref	Hosted by:	Responsibility:	Service provided:	Estimated Direct Saving (£'000s pa)	Actual Direct Saving (£'000s pa)	Estimated Indirect Saving (£'000s pa)	Actual Indirect Saving (£'000s pa)	Notes
C4	LFEPa	MPS	PCSO base at Holloway		150.0			This is a delivered saving, whereby the base is now located at the LFEPa premises and Highbury Vale Police Station was closed in March 2013 and the revenue savings from this closure are now being realised, through savings in rates, utilities etc
	<i>Under review / pending:</i>							
C7	LFEPa	MOPAC	Sharing facilities at Purley Fire Station					Work continues to ensure contact point will be provided at Purley Fire station. The Fire station is due to be completed by February 2016, this co-location will allow the contact point to be relocated and the area occupied for this current service, in other premises, to be released/reallocated.

**D. Contractual, voluntary and other arrangements**

Ref	Provided by:	Service provided to:	Service provided:	Estimated Direct Saving (£'000s pa)	Actual Direct Saving (£'000s pa)	Estimated Indirect Saving (£'000s pa)	Actual Indirect Saving (£'000s pa)	Notes
D8	GLA	MOPAC	City Hall accommodation		142.0			See A8 – includes GLA Technology Group ICT support to both MOPAC staff at City Hall (included in facility fee) and at ESB. Effective from June 2013. Savings figure of £142k are full year savings.
D16	LFEPa	MPS	Seconded officer working within SO15 providing the single point of contact for urgent or sensitive operational issues of relevance to LFB					The post supports SO15 on a part time basis. The post is funded in full by LFB, SO15 provide accommodation and computer terminal. Saving would equate to advice provided for free by seconded officer to MPS, however cannot quantify this.

## MOPAC

### E. Collaborative procurement (procurement savings relating to the GLA Collaborative Procurement Function are set out in a separate section below)

Ref	Service provided to:	Framework /Contract:	Service provided (company):	Above OJEU threshold?	Reason for not following a GLA Group framework	Estimated Direct Saving £'000s pa	Actual Direct Saving £'000s pa	Estimated Indirect Saving £'000s pa	Actual Indirect Saving £'000s pa	Notes
E31	LFEPA	MOPAC	Childcare Vouchers	No	GLA Framework used					The contract for childcare vouchers has now been incorporated into the broader staff benefits package. The previous contract had achieved savings of £803.6k and was recorded here - this has now been removed as the arrangement has changed as noted. The item is left in the schedule for completeness.
E32	LFEPA	MOPAC	Cleaning Consumables	YES	GLA Framework used					An initial 5% savings assumption for economies of scale through the re-tender was envisaged. However, the MPS's proposed pricing of the re-tender resulted in an increase in spend by approximately 7.56% (£10,413) per annum. This resulted from an increase in demand due to operational requirements.
E45	MOPAC, on behalf of MPS	GPS and other Government frameworks	Stationery	YES	Current supplier offered better value for money and fit the requirement		91.1			
E46	MOPAC, on behalf of MPS	GPS and other Government frameworks	Consultancy		Use of National Consultancy One Framework					N/A. Defined within E132 and E133
E47	MOPAC, on behalf of MPS	Crown Commercial Services	Energy	YES	No GLA framework existed.		648.4			

## MOPAC

Ref	Service provided to:	Framework /Contract:	Service provided (company):	Above OJEU threshold?	Reason for not following a GLA Group framework	Estimated Direct Saving £'000s pa	Actual Direct Saving £'000s pa	Estimated Indirect Saving £'000s pa	Actual Indirect Saving £'000s pa	Notes
E50a	MOPAC, on behalf of MPS	Crown Commercial Services	Supply of vehicles	YES	N/A					See items E50a) - E50f) below
E50b	MOPAC, on behalf of MPS	Crown Commercial Services	Supply of response cars	YES	Home Office Framework		473.7			
E50c	MOPAC, on behalf of MPS	Crown Commercial Services	Fuel Cards (Allstar)	YES	Home Office Framework					
E50d	MOPAC, on behalf of MPS	Crown Commercial Services	Large Commercial Vehicles	YES	N/A					Contract expired September 2014
E50e	MOPAC, on behalf of MPS	Crown Commercial Services	Response Vans	YES	Home Office Framework		241.8			
E50f	MOPAC, on behalf of MPS	Crown Commercial Services	Unmarked vehicles	YES	Home Office Framework		148.0			
E62	TfL/MPS /Boroughs and City Police	TfL/MPS/Boroughs and City Police	CCTV	YES	CCTV Product tender was awarded March 13 for use by all GLA bodies (as well as FCO, Network Rail and MOJ). (Please see LoHAC details below).					The MPS use a sole supplier framework agreement for CCTV. Not applicable.

**MOPAC**

Ref	Service provided to:	Framework /Contract:	Service provided (company):	Above OJEU threshold?	Reason for not following a GLA Group framework	Estimated Direct Saving £'000s pa	Actual Direct Saving £'000s pa	Estimated Indirect Saving £'000s pa	Actual Indirect Saving £'000s pa	Notes
E63	TfL/GLA /MPS	TfL/GLA/MPS GLA led contract	Daily Press Cutting Service	YES	The MPS are currently collaborating with TfL & GLA. Previously the MPS were unable to engage due to the Procurement timeframes of each body not being conducive.		35.0			
E129	Available to all forces	MPS, through MOPAC	Mobile phones (Vodafone)	YES	TfL Wireless Communications Framework Contract (ITC10686) was awarded in April 09 for use of all GLA bodies and the London Boroughs		514.0		401.5	



**MOPAC**

Ref	Service provided to:	Framework /Contract:	Service provided (company):	Above OJEU threshold?	Reason for not following a GLA Group framework	Estimated Direct Saving £'000s pa	Actual Direct Saving £'000s pa	Estimated Indirect Saving £'000s pa	Actual Indirect Saving £'000s pa	Notes
E130	Available to all forces	MPS, through MOPAC	Legal services	YES	There wasn't a suitable one in place when the MPS needed to go to market. The reason the MPS didn't create a GLA framework was because when we needed to go to market TfL was not in a position to engage (we had been advised TfL was the de facto procurement team managing. GLA requirements for legal services), as they were not in a position to scope their requirements and therefore join our procurement.		300.0		400.0	

## MOPAC

Ref	Service provided to:	Framework /Contract:	Service provided (company):	Above OJEU threshold?	Reason for not following a GLA Group framework	Estimated Direct Saving £'000s pa	Actual Direct Saving £'000s pa	Estimated Indirect Saving £'000s pa	Actual Indirect Saving £'000s pa	Notes
E131	Available to all forces	MPS, through MOPAC	Body armour (Home Office mandated)	Yes	Mandated by Home Office	4,744.8	255.6			Please note that the estimated savings are based on identified usage and will only be correct if the MPS purchases the volume of armours.
E132	Available to 7 forces, TfI	MPS, through MOPAC	Professional Services	Yes		299.0	257.0			
E133 <sup>a</sup>	Available to GLA, TfL, LLDC, LFEPA	MPS, through MOPAC	Estate Management Services & Construction	Yes	GLA are on the framework	Circa between £500k and £1m	2,740.2			
E133 <sup>b</sup>	MOPAC on behalf of MPS	Crown Commercial Services	Print Services	Yes	No GLA Framework exists		270.0			
E133 <sup>c</sup>	MOPAC on behalf of MPS		Ballistic Helmets	No	No GLA Framework exists	12.0				Savings start date 01/12/2014.
E133 <sup>d</sup>	MOPAC on behalf of MPS	MoJ Framework	Dog Food	Yes	No GLA Framework exists	8.1	24.5			
E133 <sup>e</sup>	MOPAC on behalf of MPS	TVP National Framework	Driver Improvement Scheme	Yes	No GLA Framework exists					Contract expired June 2014
E133 <sup>f</sup>	MOPAC on behalf of MPS	Crown Commercial Services	Heating Oil	Yes	No GLA Framework exists but all GLA now buy through Crown Commercial Services		34.9			
E133 <sup>g</sup>	MOPAC on behalf of MPS	TFL	ANPR TFL PIPS	Yes	No GLA Framework exists		17.0			

## MOPAC

Ref	Service provided to:	Framework /Contract:	Service provided (company):	Above OJEU threshold?	Reason for not following a GLA Group framework	Estimated Direct Saving £'000s pa	Actual Direct Saving £'000s pa	Estimated Indirect Saving £'000s pa	Actual Indirect Saving £'000s pa	Notes
E133h	MOPAC on behalf of MPS	West Yorkshire Framework	Public Order Helmets	Yes	Used West Yorkshire Framework		55.0			
E134	MOPAC on behalf of MPS	Available to GLA	Facilities Management Integrator	Yes	No GLA Framework exists but all GLA now buy through Crown Commercial Services		9,673.5			
E157	MOPAC on behalf of MPS	Home Office National Single Supplier Framework	Forensic Services	Yes	No GLA Framework exists		3,842.9			
E158	MOPAC on behalf of MPS	Home Office National Single Supplier Framework	Forensic Consumables	Yes	The MPS has more specific requirements for PASS quality,	67.5				Please note that the estimated savings are based on identified usage and will only be correct if the MPS purchases the volume of consumables.
E159	MOPAC on behalf of MPS	MPS/NPIA/ASL	Airwave	Yes	Mandated Home Office National Framework		520.7		69.9	
E160	MOPAC on behalf of MPS	Open to all UK Police Forces, Fire & Rescue & GLA	Staff Benefits Combined Package	Yes	No GLA Framework exists	82.2				Please note that the estimated savings are based on identified opportunities and will only be correct if the MPS purchases the amount estimated.
E161	MOPAC on behalf of MPS	NUMS - available to all UK police forces	Uniform, Clothing & Accessories	Yes	No GLA Framework exists	150.3				Please note that the estimated savings are based on identified opportunities and will only be correct if the MPS purchases the volume estimated.

## MOPAC

Ref	Service provided to:	Framework /Contract:	Service provided (company):	Above OJEU threshold?	Reason for not following a GLA Group framework	Estimated Direct Saving £'000s pa	Actual Direct Saving £'000s pa	Estimated Indirect Saving £'000s pa	Actual Indirect Saving £'000s pa	Notes
E162	MOPAC on behalf of MPS	National Police Mobile Framework	ICT Hardware	Yes	The existing framework did not match MPS specifications		57.4			
E163	MOPAC on behalf of MPS	Sprint II Framework	ICT Software	Yes	The existing framework did not match MPS specifications	722.0	41.9			Please note that the estimated savings are based on identified opportunities and will only be correct if the MPS purchases the amount estimated.
E164	MOPAC on behalf of MPS	Various	ICT Services	Yes	N/A	727.0	279.1			Please note that the estimated savings are based on identified opportunities and will only be correct if the MPS purchases the estimated service.
E165	MOPAC on behalf of MPS	GPS and other Government frameworks	Vehicle Parts	Yes	Mandated Home Office National Framework		30.1			

## LFEPA

### London Fire and Emergency Planning Authority

#### A. Functional Delegations

Ref	Delegation to:	Service provided to:	Service provided:	Estimated Direct Saving (£'000s pa)	Actual Direct Saving (£'000s pa)	Estimated Indirect Saving (£'000s pa)	Actual Indirect Saving (£'000s pa)	Notes
A2	GLA	LFEPA	Treasury Management		321.0			Report FEP 1895 Authority's average rate of return 0.61% against LIBID at 0.45% approximately.  See summary in covering report.
A3	GLA	LFEPA	Clerk and Democratic Services		84.0			Report FEP 1638
A4	GLA	LFEPA	Member services		85.0			Report FEP 1973
A12	LPFA	LFEPA	Firefighters' Pension Services		8.0			Report FEP 1959
A14	MOPAC	LFEPA	Internal Audit		70.0			There was a saving of £5k in FEP 1960 and £65k for the Deputy Audit Manager Post in the 2012/13 Budget Report. The 2012/13 Budget Report included a target saving of £10k for this shared service as part of the summary sundries saving item, £5k higher than that achieved, excluding the post saving.

Page 71

#### B. Statutory arrangements

Ref	Provided by:	Service provided to:	Service provided:	Estimated Direct Saving (£'000s pa)	Actual Direct Saving (£'000s pa)	Estimated Indirect Saving (£'000s pa)	Actual Indirect Saving (£'000s pa)	Notes
B3	LPFA	LFEPA	LGPS Pension Services					Statutory service

**LFEPA**

**C. Management and co-location**

Ref	Hosted by:	Responsibility:	Service provided:	Estimated Direct Saving (£'000s pa)	Actual Direct Saving (£'000s pa)	Estimated Indirect Saving (£'000s pa)	Actual Indirect Saving (£'000s pa)	Notes
C3	LFEPA	LAS	Co-location at Barnet and Acton		61.0			£61250 rental income for Barnet. Rental income for Acton was £13000 but the shared service arrangement has now ended. We have no access to LAS saving data.
C6	TfL	LFEPA	Co-location of LFEPA's secondary data centre and associated network connectivity to TfL's Woking data centre		28.0			Report FEP 1449 set out two viable options for how this requirement should be met. The option chosen cost £287,640 but the alternative option cost £315,567, meaning the shared service option was £28k cheaper.

**D. Contractual, voluntary and other arrangements**

Ref	Provided by:	Service provided to:	Service provided:	Estimated Direct Saving (£'000s pa)	Actual Direct Saving (£'000s pa)	Estimated Indirect Saving (£'000s pa)	Actual Indirect Saving (£'000s pa)	Notes
D15	LFEPA	LWRB	Office accommodation at 169 Union St. This includes mail, IT and media services.		85.0			2012/13 budget report - Rental income of £85k . No access to LWRB saving data .
D20	MPS	LFEPA	Dedicated network connectivity to the police national network for secure interagency email communication and storage of information classified as 'restricted'.		160.0			>£300k saving start up costs (avoidable cost)
D21	LFEPA	LPFA	Office accommodation at 169 Union St.		750.0			Letting of office accommodation to LPFA. Total Annual income is £750,000 for year 2015/16

**LFEPA**

Ref	Provided by:	Service provided to:	Service provided:	Estimated Direct Saving (£'000s pa)	Actual Direct Saving (£'000s pa)	Estimated Indirect Saving (£'000s pa)	Actual Indirect Saving (£'000s pa)	Notes
D19	LFEPA	London Travel Watch	Office accommodation at 169 Union St.		130.0			Letting of office accommodation to LTW. Total Annual income is £130,000 for year 2015/16
D22	LFEPA	London Ambulance Service	Office accommodation at 169 Union St and Southwark Training Centre		704.0			Letting of office accommodation to LAS.at Union street and Southwark Training Centre Total Annual income is £703,691 for year 15/16 including Service charge
D23	LFEPA	GLA	Office accommodation at 169 Union Street		637.5			Letting of office accommodation to GLA . Total Annual income is £637,500 for year 15/16

**E. Collaborative procurement (procurement savings relating to the GLA Collaborative Procurement Function are set out in a separate section below)**

Page 73

Ref	Service provided to:	Framework /Contract:	Service provided (company):	Above OJEU threshold?	Reason for not following a GLA Group framework	Estimated Direct Saving £'000s pa	Actual Direct Saving £'000s pa	Estimated Indirect Saving £'000s pa	Actual Indirect Saving £'000s pa	Notes
E13	LFEPA	Eastern Shires Purchasing Organisation (ESPO)	Mailroom Equipment (Pitney Bowes)	No	No known GLA framework available at the time of award					LFEPA will, as standard practice, identify and compare existing Central or Local government frameworks, as these often present the most economically advantageous arrangement on the basis of volume discount particularly when compared with the cost of undertaking our own procurement. This is certainly the practice should a comparable GLA contract be unavailable. However, it is difficult for LFEPA to determine a quantifiable saving as a third party because any commercial discounts the supplier may have offered would have been set during the original framework procurement.

**LFEPA**

Ref	Service provided to:	Framework /Contract:	Service provided (company):	Above OJEU threshold?	Reason for not following a GLA Group framework	Estimated Direct Saving £'000s pa	Actual Direct Saving £'000s pa	Estimated Indirect Saving £'000s pa	Actual Indirect Saving £'000s pa	Notes
E14	LFEPA	ESPO	Gym Equipment (Pulse Fitness Ltd)	YES	No known GLA framework available at the time of award					As note for E13. This contract has now expired.
E15	LFEPA	ESPO	HR E-Recruitment Systems (Tribal Resourcing Ltd)	No	No known GLA framework available at the time of award					As note for E13. This contract has now expired.
E16	LFEPA	ESPO	Gym Equipment Maintenance (Sportsafe UK Ltd)	YES	No known GLA framework available at the time of award					As note for E13.
E17	LFEPA	Firebuy Consortium	Foam (Auxquimia SA)	YES	No known GLA framework available at the time of award			55.0		Savings estimated against if the quantities of foam ordered are equivalent to the usage in 2009/10. Quantities of Foam required are variable according to the number and type of incidents occurring over which the Authority has no control. Savings relate to financial year 2011/12.
E18	LFEPA	Government Procurement Service (GPS)	Travel Management Services (Redfern)	YES	No known GLA framework available at the time of award					As note for E13.
E19	LFEPA	GPS	Sprint II Framework (SCC)	YES	No known GLA framework available at the time of award					As note for E13.



**LFEPA**

Ref	Service provided to:	Framework /Contract:	Service provided (company):	Above OJEU threshold?	Reason for not following a GLA Group framework	Estimated Direct Saving £'000s pa	Actual Direct Saving £'000s pa	Estimated Indirect Saving £'000s pa	Actual Indirect Saving £'000s pa	Notes
E20	LFEPA	GPS	Management Consultancy (Mott McDonald)	No	No known GLA framework available at the time of award					As note for E13.
E21	LFEPA	GPS	Stationery (Banner Business Services Ltd)	YES	No known GLA framework available at the time of award					As note for E13.
E22	LFEPA	GPS	Computer consumables (XMA)	YES	No known GLA framework available at the time of award	12.0				The savings are based on a comparison with the cost of purchase of the total volume purchased over a twelve month period against the same volume at the new contract prices. Relates to financial year 2012/13.
E24	LFEPA	GPS	Multifunctional devices (Cannon UK Ltd)	YES	No known GLA framework available at the time of award					LFEPA will, as standard practice, identify and compare existing Central or Local government frameworks, as these often present the most economically advantageous arrangement on the basis of volume discount particularly when compared with the cost of undertaking our own procurement. This is certainly the practice should a comparable GLA contract be unavailable. However, it is difficult for LFEPA to determine a quantifiable saving as a third party because any commercial discounts the supplier may have offered would have been set during the original framework procurement.

**LFEPA**

Ref	Service provided to:	Framework /Contract:	Service provided (company):	Above OJEU threshold?	Reason for not following a GLA Group framework	Estimated Direct Saving £'000s pa	Actual Direct Saving £'000s pa	Estimated Indirect Saving £'000s pa	Actual Indirect Saving £'000s pa	Notes
E25	LFEPA	GPS	Building Materials (Grafton Merchanting UK Ltd)	No	No known GLA framework available at the time of award					As note for E13.  This contract has now expired.
E26	LFEPA	GPS	Security (MITIE)	YES	GLA framework not available at the time of award			32.0		Reduction in growth bid that had been set aside on the assumption of expected increase in costs. Relates to financial year 2011/12.
E27	LFEPA	GPS	Accounting Advice Services (BDO LLP)	No	No known GLA framework available at the time of award			88.0		Comparison against the market average of all tenders compared to the winning bid price for the identified work. Relates to financial year 2013/14
E30	LFEPA	GPS	Energy (Gas and Electricity – British Gas, EDF Energy, Corona Gas)	YES	No known GLA framework available at the time of award					As note for E13.
E33	LFEPA	CCS	Temporary Labour (Adecco)	YES	The TfL framework comprised only of a list of approved suppliers whilst LFEPA required a Managed Vendor Service to minimise costs					As note for E13.

**LFEPA**

Ref	Service provided to:	Framework /Contract:	Service provided (company):	Above OJEU threshold?	Reason for not following a GLA Group framework	Estimated Direct Saving £'000s pa	Actual Direct Saving £'000s pa	Estimated Indirect Saving £'000s pa	Actual Indirect Saving £'000s pa	Notes
E166	LFEPA	TFL Framework TFL 90440	The provision of Strategic, Financial and Commercial Advice for its Vehicles Project and other major procurements (Grant Thornton UK LLP)	NO						As note for E13.
E167	LFEPA	GPS CITHS RM721/L3	Provision of two tape libraries	NO	No known GLA framework available at the time of award					As note for E13.
E168	LFEPA	West Midlands Ambulance Service	supply of Body Armour hard and soft plates, Body Armour carrier & kit bag (Aegis Engineering Ltd)	NO	No known GLA framework available at the time of award					As note for E13.
E169	LFEPA	West Midlands Ambulance Service	supply of ballistic helmets (NP Aerospace)	NO	No known GLA framework available at the time of award					As note for E13.

**LFEPA**

Ref	Service provided to:	Framework /Contract:	Service provided (company):	Above OJEU threshold?	Reason for not following a GLA Group framework	Estimated Direct Saving £'000s pa	Actual Direct Saving £'000s pa	Estimated Indirect Saving £'000s pa	Actual Indirect Saving £'000s pa	Notes
E170	LFEPA	West Midlands Ambulance Service	supply of ballistic coverall and helmet cover (Rig Equipment Ltd)	NO	No known GLA framework available at the time of award					As note for E13.
E171	LFEPA	TFL Contract	Subscriptions and Journals (Prenax)	NO						TfL have procured on behalf of all functional bodies. New Contract from 1/2/15
E172	LFEPA	Halton Housing Trust via Sector	Vehicle Leasing (Days Contract Hire, Lex Auto Lease, Alphabet)	NO	No known GLA framework available at the time of award					As note for E13.
E173	LFEPA	TFL Framework 90272	Office chairs (Interstuhl)	NO			4.3			Savings are dependant upon number of chairs ordered and relate to 2013/14.
E174	LFEPA	YPO Framework 000447	The Provision and Supply of Smoke Alarms and Related Products (Sprue Aegis)	YES	No known GLA framework available at the time of award					As note for E13.
E175	LFEPA	GLA/TFL	Mobile Safety Patrols (Servoca Secure Services Ltd)	NO						As note for E13.

**LFEPA**

Ref	Service provided to:	Framework /Contract:	Service provided (company):	Above OJEU threshold?	Reason for not following a GLA Group framework	Estimated Direct Saving £'000s pa	Actual Direct Saving £'000s pa	Estimated Indirect Saving £'000s pa	Actual Indirect Saving £'000s pa	Notes
E176	LFEPA	GPS Framework RM721/L2	Deployment of Cisco Firewalls and Associated Consultancy (Softcat Limited)	YES	No known GLA framework available at the time of award					As note for E13.
E177	LFEPA	GPS Framework	Diesel Fuel for Fire Stations (Hall Fuels)	YES	No known GLA framework available at the time of award					As note for E13.
E178	LFEPA	ESPO 144	Workwear: Sweatshirts (Burlington Uniforms)	YES	No known GLA framework available at the time of award					As note for E13.
E179	LFEPA	ESPO 144	Workwear: Jackets (Burlingtons Uniforms)	YES	No known GLA framework available at the time of award					As note for E13.

**LFEPA**

Ref	Service provided to:	Framework /Contract:	Service provided (company):	Above OJEU threshold?	Reason for not following a GLA Group framework	Estimated Direct Saving £'000s pa	Actual Direct Saving £'000s pa	Estimated Indirect Saving £'000s pa	Actual Indirect Saving £'000s pa	Notes
E180	LFEPA	GPS	Supply of ICT Hardware Support and Maintenance Services (Computacenter)	YES	LFEPA identified 3 possible GLA frameworks, 2 with MPS and 1 with TfL. MPS contracts are specialised ones and not available to any other bodies. TfL contract does not include hardware break/fix services and regardless would not be awarded in time for us to use.	540.0				Previous contract of 3 years + 2 years cost £3.8m. New 5 year (no extensions) contract will cost £1.7m. This does not include call out charges and other hourly rates. However the scope has been reduced with some services taken in-house. Discount of £268,205 in total agreed in exchange for a 15% service credit regime rather than 30%. Estimated savings are apportioned per annum over the 5 years for the contract commencing 2014/15.
E181	LFEPA	TfL 90208	Provision of Office Relocation and Installation Services (Harris Installation Services Ltd)	NO						As note for E13.

**LFEPA**

Ref	Service provided to:	Framework /Contract:	Service provided (company):	Above OJEU threshold?	Reason for not following a GLA Group framework	Estimated Direct Saving £'000s pa	Actual Direct Saving £'000s pa	Estimated Indirect Saving £'000s pa	Actual Indirect Saving £'000s pa	Notes
E182	LFEPA	CCS Consultancy ONE RM1502 Lot 2.1	A Study of the Experience of the Operation of the Regulatory Reform (Fire Safety) Order 2005 in London (BRE Global Ltd)	NO	No known GLA framework available at the time of award					As note for E13.

**LFEPA**

Ref	Service provided to:	Framework /Contract:	Service provided (company):	Above OJEU threshold?	Reason for not following a GLA Group framework	Estimated Direct Saving £'000s pa	Actual Direct Saving £'000s pa	Estimated Indirect Saving £'000s pa	Actual Indirect Saving £'000s pa	Notes
E183	LFEPA	Buy for Good (C0096)	Electric Vehicle (Chargemaster plc) Chargepoints	NO	Transport for London had established a framework agreement for the Supply, Installation and Maintenance of Charge Points in March 2011. However due to the rapid development in technology for EVs and the associated EVCs, the Birmingham City Council 'Buy For Good' Framework Agreement established in 2013 was considered more appropriate for use as spec more up to date and the reduced complexity of the agreement			790.0		Grant funding of up to a total sum of £790,000 of which 75% is funded by the Office of Low Emission Vehicles (OLEV) and 25% by the Supplier. Relates to financial year 2014/15.



**LFEPA**

Ref	Service provided to:	Framework /Contract:	Service provided (company):	Above OJEU threshold?	Reason for not following a GLA Group framework	Estimated Direct Saving £'000s pa	Actual Direct Saving £'000s pa	Estimated Indirect Saving £'000s pa	Actual Indirect Saving £'000s pa	Notes
E184	LFEPA	CCS RM721/L2 (CITHS)	Provision of Server Equipment (Computacenter)	NO	No known GLA framework available at the time of award					As note for E13.
E185	LFEPA	CCS RM721/L1 (CITHS)	Citrix NetScaler and Associated Maintenance (Kelway UK Ltd)	NO	No known GLA framework available at the time of award					As note for E13.
E186	LFEPA	Consultancy One	Consultancy Support for Departmental Review (Quoimus Ltd)	NO	No known GLA framework available at the time of award					As note for E13.
E187	LFEPA	HTE Europe	Childcare Vouchers (EdenRed UK Group)	NO	No known GLA framework available at the time of award					As note for E13.
E188	LFEPA	ESPO S3	Executive Search (IRG t/a Burnsden)	NO	No known GLA framework available at the time of award					As note for E13.

**LFEPA**

Ref	Service provided to:	Framework /Contract:	Service provided (company):	Above OJEU threshold?	Reason for not following a GLA Group framework	Estimated Direct Saving £'000s pa	Actual Direct Saving £'000s pa	Estimated Indirect Saving £'000s pa	Actual Indirect Saving £'000s pa	Notes
E189	LFEPA	CCS Framework	Fuel Cards and Associated Services Framework Agreement RM1027 (All Star Business Solutions Ltd)	YES	No known GLA framework available at the time of award				3.0	Saving achieved through mini competition under framework resulting in price reduction. Relates to financial year 2014/15.
E190	LFEPA	ESPO 275	Contract for the Provision of Vehicle Glass Replacement and Repair Services	YES	No known GLA framework available at the time of award					As note for E13.
E191	LFEPA	CCS - Consultancy One RM1502 Lot 1	Consultancy Services For Partnership Situational Awareness	NO	No known GLA framework available at the time of award					As note for E13.
E192	LFEPA	CCS - Consultancy One RM1502 Lot 1	Consultancy Services for Control Room Data Sharing	NO	No known GLA framework available at the time of award					As note for E13.
E193	LFEPA	CCS RM860	Provision of a Wide Area Network	YES	No known GLA framework available at the time of award					As note for E13.

**LFEPA**

Ref	Service provided to:	Framework /Contract:	Service provided (company):	Above OJEU threshold?	Reason for not following a GLA Group framework	Estimated Direct Saving £'000s pa	Actual Direct Saving £'000s pa	Estimated Indirect Saving £'000s pa	Actual Indirect Saving £'000s pa	Notes
E194	LFEPA	TfL/90748	Kingsland FS - Consideration Valuation Report	NO						As note for E13.
E215	LFEPA	TfL/90748	Southwark FS - Consideration Valuation Report	NO						As note for E13.
E195	LFEPA	ESPO ref 900W	Provision of Chilled Mains Drinking Water Dispenser Services	NO	No known GLA framework available at the time of award					As note for E13.
E196	LFEPA	CCS - PSN Services RM1498 Lot 1	Provision of Internet Services	YES	No known GLA framework available at the time of award					As note for E13.
E197	LFEPA	CCS Framework RM1054 Technology Products (Lot 1: Technology Hardware)	Mobile Data Terminals and Other Devices for Vehicles and Fire Appliances	YES	No known GLA framework available at the time of award					As note for E13.

GLA

Greater London Authority

A. Functional delegations

Ref	Delegation to:	Service provided to:	Service provided:	Estimated Direct Saving (£'000s pa)	Actual Direct Saving (£'000s pa)	Estimated Indirect Saving (£'000s pa)	Actual Indirect Saving (£'000s pa)	Notes
A7	GLA	LPFA	Treasury Management		50.0			Based on fee due to be paid. See summary in covering report.
A11	LFEPA	GLA	Payroll		66.0			MD866 - savings based on service being provided on cost recovery basis
A13	MOPAC	GLA	Internal Audit		10.0			Internal Audit was previously outsourced at the GLA. MOPAC provides an internal audit service to the MPS and LFEPA as well, providing some synergies across the GLA Group.
A15	TfL	GLA	Procurement		-			Financial savings not quantifiable - savings based on use of framework contracts and better negotiation of contracts based on increased base.
A16	TfL	GLA	Legal (for Mayoral functions)		300.0 to 500.0			Annual savings of £221k were estimated in the December 2009 business case. Following the transfer and staff integration further efficiencies have been realised exceeding the original savings estimate. Other benefits include having a broader activities and resource expertise skills base at TfL and effective consistent business processes, policies and procedures delivered across the GLA group. The extent of the legal work has increased significantly with the expansion of the GLA's functions. Current savings are estimated at £0.3m - £0.5m pa.
A17	TfL	GLA	IT services including: · Data Hosting · Business Continuity · Internet Services		17.5			TfL costs included in provision of SAP service. This cost is £18.5K per year compared with £36K a year which is what the GLA was paying each year for an external service. This service also a higher quality, more resilient service than we were able to procure from the market.

GLA

Ref	Delegation to:	Service provided to:	Service provided:	Estimated Direct Saving (£'000s pa)	Actual Direct Saving (£'000s pa)	Estimated Indirect Saving (£'000s pa)	Actual Indirect Saving (£'000s pa)	Notes
A18	TfL	GLA	Professional support and management of Compulsory Purchase Order functions		276.0			MD1254 - the saving is based on the write down of the external professional fees element of the GLA and GLAP CPO provision at the close of 13/14.
A19	TfL	GLA	Services to settle Compulsory Purchase Order claims	56.0	163.0			MD1147 - the saving of 163 is based on the 12/13 budget of £694k and actual costs of £531k in 13/14
A24	TfL	GLA	The GLA inherited a number of significant CPO programmes in April 2012 including those associated with the Olympic Park, Wembley Stadium, Silvertown Way and a range of smaller non-Olympic projects. To manage these a shared service arrangement was entered into with Transport for London (TfL) under which the latter provides the GLA with professional advice and support relating to the inherited CPOs, the Southall CPO and to any future CPOs made.					The GLA has not managed these CPOs in house so does not have a baseline to compare savings; however, the greater benefit is the management expertise that TfL has brought.
A23	TfL	GLA	Insurance			25.0		Based on estimate of time released of a senior manager from this functional delegation.

**GLA**

**B. Statutory arrangements**

Ref	Provided by:	Service provided to:	Service provided:	Estimated Direct Saving (£'000s pa)	Actual Direct Saving (£'000s pa)	Estimated Indirect Saving (£'000s pa)	Actual Indirect Saving (£'000s pa)	Notes
B1	GLA	DCLG	2007-13 and 2014-20 European Regional Development Fund programme management					DCLG have agreed to pay GLA an annual sum until 2015-16 in respect of GLA's role as an Intermediate Body for managing EU funds. This covers approximately half the Intermediate Body's staff and overheads costs. Remaining costs are claimed in arrears from the European Union via ERDF 'Technical Assistance'.
B2	GLA	GLA	LGPS Pension Services					Statutory service.

**C. Management and co-location**

Ref	Hosted by:	Responsibility:	Service provided:	Estimated Direct Saving (£'000s pa)	Actual Direct Saving (£'000s pa)	Estimated Indirect Saving (£'000s pa)	Actual Indirect Saving (£'000s pa)	Notes
C5)	TfL	GLA	Co-location of GLA's secondary data centre and associated network connectivity to TfL's Woking data centre		50.0			TfL have provided the GLA with rack space and a managed service as part of the SAP service. Following market testing estimated that this would cost the GLA an additional £50K per year.

**D. Contractual, voluntary and other arrangements**

Ref	Provided by:	Service provided to:	Service provided:	Estimated Direct Saving (£'000s pa)	Actual Direct Saving (£'000s pa)	Estimated Indirect Saving (£'000s pa)	Actual Indirect Saving (£'000s pa)	Notes
D1	GLA	DWP	2007-13 and 2014-20 European Social Fund programme management					DWP have agreed pay GLA an annual sum until 2015-16 in respect of GLA's role as an Intermediate Body for managing EU funds. This covers approximately half the Intermediate Body's staff and overheads costs. Remaining costs are claimed in arrears from the European Union via ESF 'Technical Assistance'.

GLA

Ref	Provided by:	Service provided to:	Service provided:	Estimated Direct Saving (£'000s pa)	Actual Direct Saving (£'000s pa)	Estimated Indirect Saving (£'000s pa)	Actual Indirect Saving (£'000s pa)	Notes
D2	GLA	Functional bodies and boroughs	Intelligence Unit services (e.g. opinion research, and demography/policy analysis) provided on a largely ad hoc basis in response to specific requests					This has been split out across the 6 items listed below.
D2a (subset of D2)	GLA Economics	Functional bodies and boroughs	GLA Economics consultancy framework	1.0+				<p>GLA Economics has renewed its consultancy framework. The framework allows various people across the GLA functional bodies as well as all London boroughs to procure consultancy services in a range of areas in a quicker and, therefore, less costly way. Over the course of the framework, this should save public sector bodies a not insignificant amount in staff time.</p> <p>The exact savings will depend on the number of contracts that go through the framework and the number of bodies that use the framework. The figure provided here is best considered as a minimum estimate of the saving that could be achieved by bodies that use the service.</p>
D2b (subset of D2)	Opinion Research and Statistics (ORS)	MOPAC	ANPR consultation	30.0				This savings relates to a project that took place in 2013-14 and the savings figure reported is one-off in 2013-14 only. It is included for completeness.

GLA

Ref	Provided by:	Service provided to:	Service provided:	Estimated Direct Saving (£'000s pa)	Actual Direct Saving (£'000s pa)	Estimated Indirect Saving (£'000s pa)	Actual Indirect Saving (£'000s pa)	Notes
D2c (subset of D2)	GLA	Local Authorities	Census Information Scheme	275.0				Calculation based on following: all 33 local authorities paid £20k at the outset of the scheme giving a total cost of £660k. The cost to local authorities of employing a census analyst on a half-time contract at £30kpa pro rata would be £15k per year. Multiplied out to cover three years and for all authorities. Total saving then pro rata'd over 3 years of scheme. Figure here provided is therefore estimated annual saving for the London Boroughs for each of the 3 years of the scheme.
D2d (subset of D2)	GLA - GIS & Infrastructure Team	TfL	Misc. mapping requests: - LDC data query for Yiewsley and West Drayton transport scheme - Extraction and analysis of LDC data for Woolwich project - Extraction and analysis of LDC data for Barking station project	1.0				This is a subset of D2
D2e (subset of D2)	GLA - GIS & Infrastructure Team	FBs	Interactive map of GLA (and partners) land and asset portfolio with search for asset category/location, InfoClick and locator search	2.0 to 3.0				This is a subset of D2



GLA

Ref	Provided by:	Service provided to:	Service provided:	Estimated Direct Saving (£'000s pa)	Actual Direct Saving (£'000s pa)	Estimated Indirect Saving (£'000s pa)	Actual Indirect Saving (£'000s pa)	Notes
D2f (subset of D2)	GLA - GIS & Infrastructure Team	TfL	Census Information service and support of two users at TfL through SASPAC	2.0				<p>This is a subset of D2</p> <p>SASPAC is a specialist software application developed and managed by the GLA's Intelligence Unit. It provides access to the national Census statistics and is used by a large number of public sector organisation in London and across Great Britain.</p> <p>In 2010 an OJEU procurement exercise was undertaken in collaboration with TfL's Procurement and Legal teams to establish a Framework of suitable suppliers to provide development and support services for the project. A review of the existing GLA Frameworks by IU/TG conducted at the time had concluded that there were no suitable suppliers in place. Following a successful OJEU procurement process, a 4 year Framework was established in November 2010. The savings estimate here included is the per annum savings over the 4 years of the framework.</p>
D3	GLA	GLA and TfL	GLA Economics	1.0 +				<p>TfL use GLA Economics' employment projections and medium-term economic forecasts for planning purposes. TfL fund GLA Intelligence for these and related services. The benefit TfL derive will be in excess of this amount – though the figure here provided is best considered as a minimum estimate (of the extra benefit derived). The actual saving will depend on the amount of analysis provided to TfL over and above the amount it funds.</p>

GLA

Ref	Provided by:	Service provided to:	Service provided:	Estimated Direct Saving (£'000s pa)	Actual Direct Saving (£'000s pa)	Estimated Indirect Saving (£'000s pa)	Actual Indirect Saving (£'000s pa)	Notes
D6	GLA	Mayor's Fund for London	City Hall accommodation	54.0				The Mayor's fund was paying a service charge of £72k for use of city hall facilities / shared services. This reduced to £54k from March 2014, but increased to £75,600 from 1 April 2015. This might be seen as additional income that would not otherwise be available to the GLA as it is unlikely that a replacement tenant could be found - the income is therefore included as an estimated saving.
D9	HCA	GLA	Provision of specific housing IT systems - IMS / PCS					The budget is £168,000 for change requests, and there are no savings to record as utilising another service provider hasn't at present been looked into; however, this is currently being investigated.
D12	HCA	GLA	Equity mortgages					Metropolitan Housing currently pay the HCA for managing the GLA's other Equity Mortgages (not Help to Buy). No savings have been made to GLA budgets as work has never been carried out in-house.
D13	LFEPa	GLA	London Resilience					From 1 February 2015, LFEPa has undertaken the London Resilience function on behalf of the GLA. No immediate efficiency savings have arisen but there will be effectiveness gains achieved from bringing together the boroughs', LFEPa's and the GLA's resilience teams under the same management. The Mayor will continue to be accountable to the Assembly and others for his London Resilience leadership role.
D24	TfL	GLA	TfL's Legal Documents Registry and Property Asset Register Storage is used to store GLAP legal deeds and documents.		22.3			The GLA does not have the physical capacity, software or resources to undertake these activities internally. Prior to entering into contract, GLAP also considered using an external supplier; however, total costs for over five years was £171,619 whereas total costs for TfL was £60,000. The TfL contract saves GLAP a total of £111,619 over five years.

**GLA**

Ref	Provided by:	Service provided to:	Service provided:	Estimated Direct Saving (£'000s pa)	Actual Direct Saving (£'000s pa)	Estimated Indirect Saving (£'000s pa)	Actual Indirect Saving (£'000s pa)	Notes
D25	Opinion Research and Statistics (ORS)	GLA	Journal management.					This relates to time saving rather than financial savings. TFL have conducted a competitive procurement exercise for journal provision. The GLA have access to this contract due to shared services agreement.
D26	Opinion Research and Statistics (ORS)	GLA	Library Management System	10.0				The GLA no longer require a bespoke Library Management System (LMS). In 2015 the LFB are conducting a procurement exercise to identify a LMS provider for the next five years, and it is anticipated that we will save money by sharing this service.
D27	Opinion Research and Statistics (ORS)	Functional Bodies and London Boroughs	Information Services (bulletins and topic alerts)	14.4				

GLA

Ref	Provided by:	Service provided to:	Service provided:	Estimated Direct Saving (£'000s pa)	Actual Direct Saving (£'000s pa)	Estimated Indirect Saving (£'000s pa)	Actual Indirect Saving (£'000s pa)	Notes
D28	GLA (ESF Delivery Unit)	GLA & MOPAC	Project and portfolio management services. For MOPAC this includes managing European Social Fund projects, coordinating a YOT champions group and the evaluation, leading on all internal and external reporting and audits, submitting claims, monitoring and reviews, 'lessons learned' input to new programme development etc.	19.0				<p>The Intelligence Delivery Unit provides project management services to a number of other GLA Units. For example, the team manages the ESF Youth projects on behalf of the Health and Communities Unit. Three of the ESF Youth projects provide employment and resettlement support for young offenders. These programmes were developed in partnership with MOPAC, who maintain an ongoing interest in the outcomes from the perspective of resettlement and reduction in reoffending. The Delivery Unit provides a 0.8 FTE project manager to manage the YO projects, including coordinating the YOT champions group, chaired by MOPAC, and is leading on the evaluation as well as all internal and external reporting, monitoring, audits, claims etc. The team has also ensured that 'lessons learned' are fed in to the development of new MOPAC programmes.</p> <p>The ESF Youth projects would have to be managed by the GLA, as budget holder, so it is difficult to quantify the additional benefit or savings. The figures here are a best estimate based on 0.3 FTE per month of Delivery Unit input to activities over and above those it would normally be required to provide when managing a 'standard' ESF project. These additional activities include liaison with the YOTs, meetings with the secure estate, additional work on the evaluation to capture MOPAC-specific information, and approximately 10+ days direct and practical support with the preparation of the specification for MOPAC and the MPS's new PRU/Gangs ESF 2014-20 proposal.</p>

Page 94

**E. Collaborative procurement (procurement savings relating to the GLA Collaborative Procurement Function are set out in a separate section below)**

GLA

Ref	Service provided to:	Framework /Contract:	Service provided (company):	Above OJEU threshold?	Reason for not following a GLA Group framework	Estimated Direct Saving £'000s pa	Actual Direct Saving £'000s pa	Estimated Indirect Saving £'000s pa	Actual Indirect Saving £'000s pa	Notes
E8	GLA / LFEPA	GLA/LFEPA	Catering (OCS)	YES	Framework followed					LFEPA picked up option from GLA contract; therefore GLA bore the tender costs. This is a nil subsidy commercial contract and therefore the risk is on the contractor with a profit share in place should they exceed their contracted income budget.
E9	GLA, MOPAC, LFEPA, LPFA and LLDC	GLA	Treasury advisors (Capita)	No	None exists	50.0				Total estimated saving for all functional bodies i.e. approx £8k per functional body
E10	GLA/Westminster	GLA/Westminster	Trafalgar/Parliament Squares cleaning/horticulture (Veolia)	YES	Framework followed		8.675  Actual saving on tender costs but is one off not per annum.	5.0 pa		Estimated savings based on volume purchases of consumables through LBW contract, volume hiring agency personnel on LBW contract, shared admin services and free use of Westminster depots for short term storage.
E48	TfL / GLA / MPS	TfL / GLA / MPS	Facilities management	YES	N/A					Currently there are no GLA savings to report - work is underway to identify contracts within the MPS run facilities framework that might be utilised by the GLA.

GLA

Ref	Service provided to:	Framework /Contract:	Service provided (company):	Above OJEU threshold?	Reason for not following a GLA Group framework	Estimated Direct Saving £'000s pa	Actual Direct Saving £'000s pa	Estimated Indirect Saving £'000s pa	Actual Indirect Saving £'000s pa	Notes
E63	TfL/GLA /MPS	TfL/GLA/MPS	Media monitoring and press cutting	YES			GLA 13/14 - 4.8 GLA pa from 14/15 - 9.6 TfL pa - 14.4 MPS pa - 35.0	Further saving to the group lies within the administration of the contract. The new contract will be administered by the GLA as such saving valuable administration time to the TfL, Crossrail and MPS.		The new contract offers further financial savings to all groups from the second year of contract which overall will save the group a further £10,000.  This collaborative working is still continuing with extending the contract to LLDC and the London Fire Brigade and discussions are presently taking place. Although this will not offer financial savings to the GLA it should/could offer financial savings to these groups with the saving of administration time.
E64	TfL/GLA	TfL/GLA	E&I Training / Dignity and Inclusion Training				10.6			The saving that was previously reported was £9k; however, this was based on the forecast delivery of 6 workshops per year. In 2014-15 10 sessions were delivered which has resulted in a slightly lower savings figure of £6.6k per annum. In 2015-16 6 sessions have been delivered resulting in an estimated saving of 4k

GLA

Ref	Service provided to:	Framework /Contract:	Service provided (company):	Above OJEU threshold?	Reason for not following a GLA Group framework	Estimated Direct Saving £'000s pa	Actual Direct Saving £'000s pa	Estimated Indirect Saving £'000s pa	Actual Indirect Saving £'000s pa	Notes
E198	GLA/TfL	GBM		YES		-	8.675 Actual saving on tender costs but is one off not per annum. circa £4,500 on inflationary costs savings. This is a one off for the current year.	-	-	Savings on the cost of a tender – this is one off not per annum. See also saving detailed under E1) on TfL tab: £15k per annum for GLA. GBM agreed to freeze inflationary costs on the contract for TfL for one year in return for a contract extension. This offer was extended to the GLA due to the collaborative nature of the contract.
E199	GLA/TfL	Archiving contract	Crown	YES		-	8.675 Actual saving on tender costs but is one off not per annum.	-	-	Savings on the cost of a tender – this is one off not per annum. Estimated savings will be made should the contract be renewed in 6 months time by TfL
E200	GLA/TfL /local authorities	Stationery contract	Office Depot	YES		-	17.350 Actual saving on tender costs but is one off not per annum.	-	-	This contract was renewed in June saving an further £8675 on new tender costs

GLA

Ref	Service provided to:	Framework /Contract:	Service provided (company):	Above OJEU threshold?	Reason for not following a GLA Group framework	Estimated Direct Saving £'000s pa	Actual Direct Saving £'000s pa	Estimated Indirect Saving £'000s pa	Actual Indirect Saving £'000s pa	Notes
E201	TFL & GLA	TFL & GLA	Provision of wireless communications including; voice/data/associated airtime & services. (Telefonica & O2)	Yes		75.0	-	-	-	TFL and the GLA have undertaken a joint procurement for wireless telephony services. Estimated saving for the GLA in the region of £75K in the first year.
E202	TfL/GLA	TfL/GLA	Professional Development (Tattersall)				2.2			The estimate is based on a saving of £100 per training delivery day against a standard training delivery cost of 800 per day. Contract in place from Sep 2014. Savings in 2014-15 (12 days) £1200. Savings in 2015-16 (11 days) £1100
E203	TfL/GLA	TfL/GLA	Management Development Capita				7.0			The estimate is based on a saving of £250 per training delivery day. Contract in place from Sep 2014/ Savings in 2014-15 (18 days) £4,500. Savings in 2015-16 (10 days) £2,500
E204	TfL/GLA	TfL/GLA	ILM programmes Capita				2.0			The estimate is based on a saving of £125 per training delivery day. Contract in place from Sep 2014. Savings in 2014-15 £875 (7 days) Savings in 2015-16(9 days) £1125.
E213	GLA	TfL	Employee Assistance Programme				2.3			
E214	GLA	TfL	Employee Health Screening				70.0			Savings recorded is total cumulative saving over 3 yr period



**Appendix 1  
LLDC**

**London Legacy Development Corporation**

**A. Functional delegations**

Ref	Delegation to:	Service provided to:	Service provided:	Estimated Direct Saving (£'000s pa)	Actual Direct Saving (£'000s pa)	Estimated Indirect Saving (£'000s pa)	Actual Indirect Saving (£'000s pa)	Notes
A5	GLA	LLDC	Treasury Management	De minimis				De minimis amount. See summary in covering report.
A6	GLA	LLDC	Wide range of clerking services	2.0	2.0			Formal arrangements for the GLA secretariat service came into effect on 1 September 2014. The savings here represent printing, postage/courier cost savings for up to 50 Board and Committee meetings per annum. There is also an efficiency saving (unpriced) from staff time not spent on these activities allowing other tasks to be undertaken.
A22	MOPAC	LLDC	Internal Audit	14.5				From 2015/16, LLDC's internal audit services will be provided by MOPAC. MOPAC are offering more days for approximately the same costs as LLDC's current provider. Savings are £14,560 a year.
A23	TfL	GLA, LFEPa and LLDC	Insurance					Insurance Services now being provided to LLDC by TfL
A26	TfL	LLDC	Legal services					TfL took on provision of legal services to LLDC on 1 May 2014. Savings of £0.9m were estimated over the three financial years (14/15, 15/16 and 16/17) in the business case presented to LLDC's Chairman's Committee in December 2013. Continuity was ensured through the permanent transfer of three members of LLDC's in-house legal team to TfL and an additional three members of the team on a temporary basis. LLDC can draw on the broad range of expertise and skills at TfL and benefit from discounts through TfL frameworks with external legal firms. These are unquantified savings. The extent of the legal work has increased significantly since the original transfer was made and the savings are being reviewed.

**Appendix 1  
LLDC**

**B. Statutory arrangements**

Ref	Provided by:	Service provided to:	Service provided:	Estimated Direct Saving (£'000s pa)	Actual Direct Saving (£'000s pa)	Estimated Indirect Saving (£'000s pa)	Actual Indirect Saving (£'000s pa)	Notes
B4	LPFA	LLDC	LGPS Pension Services	Unknown – Statutory provider				Expected corporate contributions in 2015/16 to remain at same level as 2014/15.

**E. Collaborative procurement (procurement savings relating to the GLA Collaborative Procurement Function are set out in a separate section below)**

Ref	Service provided to:	Framework /Contract:	Service provided (company):	Above OJEU threshold?	Reason for not following a GLA Group framework	Estimated Direct Saving (£'000s pa)	Actual Direct Saving (£'000s pa)	Estimated Indirect Saving (£'000s pa)	Actual Indirect Saving (£'000s pa)	Notes
E205	LLDC	TFL	Recruitment	yes	N/A					Not known yet as the service has only started recently
E132	LLDC	HCA	Planning Services: Outline Planning application to support the Regeneration of Hackney Wick	yes	No known GLA framework available at the time of award					It is not possible to provide this information as LLDC were not responsible for the setting up of the frameworks and therefore have no knowledge of any commercial discounts that the suppliers may have offered during the tender phase, or the framework owner may have negotiated i.e. discounted day rates, rate cards etc. In terms of man power, it is recognised that significant efficiencies are secured by utilising an existing framework compared with procuring goods/ services using for example, the Restricted Procedure. An estimate of this saving is c60days.
E133	LLDC	HCA	Design and Construction Consultancy Services	yes	No known GLA framework available at the time of award					As in E132

**Appendix 1  
LLDC**

Ref	Service provided to:	Framework /Contract:	Service provided (company):	Above OJEU threshold?	Reason for not following a GLA Group framework	Estimated Direct Saving £'000s pa	Actual Direct Saving £'000s pa	Estimated Indirect Saving £'000s pa	Actual Indirect Saving £'000s pa	Notes
E134	LLDC	CCS	Gas Supply for Stadium	no	No known GLA framework available at the time of award					As in E132
E135	LLDC	LLDC	Event: Big Lunch	no	N/A					
E136	LLDC	LLDC	Event: Manderville Place Launch	no	N/A					
E137	LLDC	ESPO	Security	yes	No known GLA framework available at the time of award					As in E132
E138	LLDC	TFL	Cost Consultant University Quarter	yes	N/A					As in E132
E139	LLDC	TFL	Design: Westfield Avenue/Montfichet Road Reconfiguration Study	no	N/A					As in E132
E140	LLDC	CCS G Cloud	Finance System	yes	No known GLA framework available at the time of award					As in E132

**Appendix 1  
LLDC**

Ref	Service provided to:	Framework /Contract:	Service provided (company):	Above OJEU threshold?	Reason for not following a GLA Group framework	Estimated Direct Saving £'000s pa	Actual Direct Saving £'000s pa	Estimated Indirect Saving £'000s pa	Actual Indirect Saving £'000s pa	Notes
E141	LLDC	GLA/TFL	Design: HWFI Enhanced Connectivity - DESIGN TEAM	yes	N/A					
E142	LLDC	GLA/TFL	Engineering: HWFI Enhanced Connectivity - LEAD ENGINEER	yes	N/A					
E143	LLDC	GLA/TFL	Design: Stratford Station	yes	N/A					
E144	LLDC	LLDC	Event: Art on the Move	no	N/A					
E145	LLDC	LLDC	Event picnic in the Park	no	N/A					

TfL

Transport for London

**C. Management and co-location**

Ref	Hosted by:	Responsibility:	Service provided:	Estimated Direct Saving (£'000s pa)	Actual Direct Saving (£'000s pa)	Estimated Indirect Saving (£'000s pa)	Actual Indirect Saving (£'000s pa)	Notes
C1	GLA	TfL	TfL Board/Committee services					This activity does achieve financial cost savings for TfL although in terms of the size of TfL budgets, the savings are relatively small. However, there are also non-cashable efficiency benefits achieved through the improved ways of working with the GLA. In terms of the size of its own local budgets the GLA receives a significant level of income from TfL and LLDC in order to provide this service.

**D. Contractual, voluntary and other arrangements**

Ref	Provided by:	Service provided to:	Service provided:	Estimated Direct Saving (£'000s pa)	Actual Direct Saving (£'000s pa)	Estimated Indirect Saving (£'000s pa)	Actual Indirect Saving (£'000s pa)	Notes
D3	GLA	GLA and TfL	GLA Economics					Limited financial benefits are expected from this activity, the key benefits will involve the improved ways of working and sharing of data

**E. Collaborative procurement (procurement savings relating to the GLA Collaborative Procurement Function are set out in a separate section below)**

Ref	Service provided to:	Framework /Contract:	Service provided (company):	Above OJEU threshold?	Reason for not following a GLA Group framework	Estimated Direct Saving £'000s pa	Actual Direct Saving £'000s pa	Estimated Indirect Saving £'000s pa	Actual Indirect Saving £'000s pa	Notes
E1	GLA	TfL	Cleaning (GBM)	YES	Framework followed	115.0				£100,100 TfL £15,080 GLA (PCS58 and 59 in 2012/13)

TfL

Ref	Service provided to:	Framework /Contract:	Service provided (company):	Above OJEU threshold?	Reason for not following a GLA Group framework	Estimated Direct Saving £'000s pa	Actual Direct Saving £'000s pa	Estimated Indirect Saving £'000s pa	Actual Indirect Saving £'000s pa	Notes
E2	GLA	TfL	Health and safety (White, Young, Green)	No	Framework followed					TfL have been unable to collect or provide savings data for this particular initiative as the delivery of savings is predicated on usage by service users compared to previous budgets and usage along with market assumptions. This data is not readily accessible as there is no central database which has recorded it. We will continue to work with both our suppliers and GLA partners to understand if data collection is possible and develop a joint proposal to measure and track future efficiency savings for shared service activity.
E3	GLA	TfL	Archiving (Crown)	YES	Framework followed					As for E2
E4	GLA	TfL	Stationery (Office Depot)	YES	Framework followed		68.0			Rebate for: 2012/13 (TfL £19,024 GLA £312) 2011/12 (TfL £44,674 GLA £1,421 Crossrail £2,914).  <b>The savings reported are for one year only.</b>
E5	GLA	TfL	Reprographics Printing (TfL in-house)	No	Framework followed					As for E2
E6	GLA	TfL	Courier	No	Framework followed					As for E2
E7	GLA	TfL	Newspapers and Journals (SETS)	No	Framework followed					As for E2
E12	GLA	TfL	EUC2 (Computer)	YES						As for E2

TfL

Ref	Service provided to:	Framework /Contract:	Service provided (company):	Above OJEU threshold?	Reason for not following a GLA Group framework	Estimated Direct Saving £'000s pa	Actual Direct Saving £'000s pa	Estimated Indirect Saving £'000s pa	Actual Indirect Saving £'000s pa	Notes
E34	LFEPa	TfL	Financial & Commercial Advice (Grant Thornton LLP)	YES	GLA Framework used					As for E2
E38	LLDC	TfL	Corporate tax compliance and advisory services	YES	GLA framework used					As for E2
E43	LLDC	GLA/TfL	Events Framework	YES	GLA framework used					As for E2
E48	TfL / GLA / MPS	TfL / GLA / MPS	Facilities management	YES	N/A					As for E2
E51	TfL	GPS	Faxes and Photocopier (Canon & Ricoh)							As for E2
E52	TfL	Improvement and Efficiency South east	Carpeting							As for E2
E53	TfL	London Councils Supply Group (LCSG)	Stationery & IT Consumables (Office Depot)							As for E2
E54	TfL	LCSG	Janitorial Items							As for E2
E55	TfL	Yorkshire Purchasing Organisation	Franking Machines (Neopost)			103.0				(Ref: 2012/13 PCS 005)

TfL

Ref	Service provided to:	Framework /Contract:	Service provided (company):	Above OJEU threshold?	Reason for not following a GLA Group framework	Estimated Direct Saving £'000s pa	Actual Direct Saving £'000s pa	Estimated Indirect Saving £'000s pa	Actual Indirect Saving £'000s pa	Notes
E57	TfL/GLA	TfL	Temporary Labour Services (39 Suppliers on a PSL)	YES						As for E2
E59	TfL/GLA	TfL	Permanent Recruitment Services (44 Suppliers on a PSL)	YES						As for E2
E60	TfL	TfL/London Boroughs	Engineering & Project Management Framework (33 Suppliers on a Framework)	YES						Savings against maximum rates have been achieved throughout the life of the contract but have not been captured in a manner that allows for analysis.
E61	TfL/London Boroughs	TfL/London Boroughs	Highways maintenance	YES	The London Highways Alliance Contract (LoHAC) was set up by TfL and went live in April 2013 for use by TfL and the London Boroughs (Please see LoHAC details below).					As for E2



## TfL

Ref	Service provided to:	Framework /Contract:	Service provided (company):	Above OJEU threshold?	Reason for not following a GLA Group framework	Estimated Direct Saving £'000s pa	Actual Direct Saving £'000s pa	Estimated Indirect Saving £'000s pa	Actual Indirect Saving £'000s pa	Notes
E62	TfL/MPS /Boroughs and City Police	TfL/MPS/Boroughs and City Police	CCTV	YES	CCTV Product tender was awarded March 13 for use by all GLA bodies (as well as FCO, Network Rail and MOJ). (Please see LoHAC details below).	3,000.0				Awarded: 2013 Duration: 4 years The framework is envisaged to have ~£30mil worth of spend across the group, and is aiming to achieve a 10% saving. <b>Please note the £3m savings reported are for the total savings for the duration of the framework rather than per annum</b>
E63	TfL/GLA /MPS	TfL/GLA/MPS	Media monitoring and press cutting	YES			GLA 13/14 - 4.8 GLA pa from 14/15 - 9.6 TfL pa - 14.4 MPS pa - 35.0	Further saving to the group lies within the administration of the contract. The new contract will be administered by the GLA as such saving valuable administration time to the TfL, Crossrail and MPS.		The new contract offers further financial savings to all groups from the second year of contract which overall will save the group a further £10,000.  This collaborative working is still continuing with extending the contract to LLDC and the London Fire Brigade and discussions are presently taking place. Although this will not offer financial savings to the GLA it should/could offer financial savings to these groups with the saving of administration time.

TfL

Ref	Service provided to:	Framework /Contract:	Service provided (company):	Above OJEU threshold?	Reason for not following a GLA Group framework	Estimated Direct Saving £'000s pa	Actual Direct Saving £'000s pa	Estimated Indirect Saving £'000s pa	Actual Indirect Saving £'000s pa	Notes
E65	TfL/GLA /London Transport Museum	TfL/GLA/London Transport Museum	Events Framework							As for E2
E66	TfL	GPS	Electricity Supply – two GPS frameworks being used - EDF Energy (higher volume requirements) and British Gas (low volume requirements)	YES	Other member of the GLA Group also use GPS for this - Met Police and LFEPA					As for E2
E67	TfL	GPS	Gas Supply - Corona Energy	YES	Other members of the GLA Group also use GPS for this - Met Police and LFEPA					As for E2
E68	TfL	GPS	Specialist Cloud services (P3M Systems Ltd)	YES						As for E2
E69	TfL	GPS	Commoditised IT Hardware and Software RM721 (SBL, Insight)	YES						As for E2

TfL

Ref	Service provided to:	Framework /Contract:	Service provided (company):	Above OJEU threshold?	Reason for not following a GLA Group framework	Estimated Direct Saving £'000s pa	Actual Direct Saving £'000s pa	Estimated Indirect Saving £'000s pa	Actual Indirect Saving £'000s pa	Notes
E70	TfL	GPS	Multi-Disciplinary Framework (Deloitte)	YES						As for E2
E71	TfL/GLA	TfL/GLA	Architectural, Design and Urbanism Panel	YES		To be confirmed				Savings will be measured for each call off against maximum rates
E72	TfL/GLA	TfL	Framework Agreement for the Provision of Services (Asperity Employee Benefits Limited)	YES						As for E2
E73	TfL/London Boroughs	TfL/London Boroughs	Traffic Control Maintenance Service	YES	Currently being re-tendered by TfL. No other Frameworks identified with the requisite scope or flexibility to meet the requirement.	7,000.0				New Contract to be awarded 2014. Duration: 6 years Service is provided by TfL and re-charged to Boroughs as appropriate. Savings already released from TfL Budget.

TfL

Ref	Service provided to:	Framework /Contract:	Service provided (company):	Above OJEU threshold?	Reason for not following a GLA Group framework	Estimated Direct Saving £'000s pa	Actual Direct Saving £'000s pa	Estimated Indirect Saving £'000s pa	Actual Indirect Saving £'000s pa	Notes
E74	TfL/London Boroughs	TfL/London Boroughs	Safety Camera replacement	YES	No Frameworks identified that can supply Home Office Type Approved (HOTA) Safety Cameras	7,600.0				* Estimated Cost avoidance negotiated against initial proposed prices and specification optimisation for Lots 1 and 3 <b>Please note the £7.6m savings reported are for the total savings for the duration of the framework rather than per annum</b>
E78	TfL Group & GLA	TfL (Surface)	Barclays Cycle Superhighways Cycle Safety Checks Framework (Cycle Confident Ltd, Cycle Training UK Ltd, Bike Works, Have Bike Partnership LLP)	YES	No other Frameworks identified with the requisite scope or flexibility to meet the requirement.	15.0				Awarded: 18/02/13 Duration: 4yrs Target saving is 5% on estimated spend of £300k

TfL

Ref	Service provided to:	Framework /Contract:	Service provided (company):	Above OJEU threshold?	Reason for not following a GLA Group framework	Estimated Direct Saving £'000s pa	Actual Direct Saving £'000s pa	Estimated Indirect Saving £'000s pa	Actual Indirect Saving £'000s pa	Notes
E79	TfL Group & GLA	TfL (Surface)	Provision of Electric Vehicles and Ultra Low Carbon Vehicles and Vehicle Maintenance Services (ZAP, Citroen UL Ltd, Colt Car Co ltd, Smith Electric Vehicles Europe Ltd, Allied Vehicles Ltd, Electric Motorcycles ltd, Mercedes Benz UK ltd, Tata Motors PLC, Ashwoods Automotive Plc, BMW UK Ltd, Toyota (GB) Plc, Micro Vett Spa, AVID Vehicles ltd, EVF Spa, Lease Plan UK Ltd, Allied Vehicles Ltd)	YES						As for E2

**TfL**

Ref	Service provided to:	Framework /Contract:	Service provided (company):	Above OJEU threshold?	Reason for not following a GLA Group framework	Estimated Direct Saving £'000s pa	Actual Direct Saving £'000s pa	Estimated Indirect Saving £'000s pa	Actual Indirect Saving £'000s pa	Notes
E80	TfL Group	TfL (Surface)	Framework Agreement for Early Contractor Involvement & Construction (Hochtief, BAM Nuttall, Costain, Skanska)	YES						As for E2

TfL

Ref	Service provided to:	Framework /Contract:	Service provided (company):	Above OJEU threshold?	Reason for not following a GLA Group framework	Estimated Direct Saving £'000s pa	Actual Direct Saving £'000s pa	Estimated Indirect Saving £'000s pa	Actual Indirect Saving £'000s pa	Notes
E81	TfL Group	TfL (Surface)	Bulk purchase of street furniture and miscellaneous items of equipment (AGD Systems; Aldridge; Bristol Industrial; Clearview; Henry Williams; Mallatite; Motus; NAL; Peek (Imtech Traffic and Infrastructure ); Ritherdon; Siemens; Signpost; Telent; Thermotor; Time 24; Traffic Systems (TSL))	YES						Savings will be dependent on product mix and volume estimated Savings achieved of up to 36% on individual items although some inflationary increases seen on other items
E82	TfL Group	TfL (Surface)	Supply and Installation of traffic control CCTV (Tyco Fire & Integrated Solutions (UK) Ltd )	YES						As for E2

TfL

Ref	Service provided to:	Framework /Contract:	Service provided (company):	Above OJEU threshold?	Reason for not following a GLA Group framework	Estimated Direct Saving £'000s pa	Actual Direct Saving £'000s pa	Estimated Indirect Saving £'000s pa	Actual Indirect Saving £'000s pa	Notes
E83	TfL Group & GLA	TfL (Surface)	TfL Signage Framework (AJ Wells, Stocksigns, Trueform, Pearce, Merson, Link Signs.)	YES	No other Frameworks identified with the requisite scope or flexibility to meet the requirement.	2,000.0				Awarded: June 2012 Duration: 4 years Framework savings estimate over life of framework - £2m <b>Please note the £2m savings reported are for the total savings for the duration of the framework rather than per annum</b>
E84	TfL Group & GLA	TfL (Surface)	Pan London Cycle Training Services (Cycle Confident Ltd)	YES						As for E2
E85	TfL Group & GLA	TfL (Surface)	Smarter Travel Programme - Workplace Cycle Training Services (Bikeworks, Cycle Confident, Cycle Systems)	YES	No other Frameworks identified with the requisite scope or flexibility to meet the requirement.	30.0				Awarded: 04/03/11 Duration: 3 yrs 11 mths Target saving is 5% on estimated spend of £600k  <b>The savings reported were over the duration of the framework which has now ended</b>



TfL

Ref	Service provided to:	Framework /Contract:	Service provided (company):	Above OJEU threshold?	Reason for not following a GLA Group framework	Estimated Direct Saving £'000s pa	Actual Direct Saving £'000s pa	Estimated Indirect Saving £'000s pa	Actual Indirect Saving £'000s pa	Notes
E86	TfL Group & GLA	TfL (Surface)	DCPC - Driver Certificate of Professional Competence. (Skills Training Ltd, M2 Training Ltd, AA DriveTech Ltd)	NO	No other Frameworks identified with the requisite scope or flexibility to meet the requirement.	10.0				Awarded: 16/08/11 Duration:2yrs 5 months  <b>The savings reported were over the duration of the framework which has now ended</b>
E87	TfL Group & GLA	TfL (Surface)	Magnetometers for SCOOT Deployment (Golden River Traffic Ltd)	YES						As for E2

TfL

Ref	Service provided to:	Framework /Contract:	Service provided (company):	Above OJEU threshold?	Reason for not following a GLA Group framework	Estimated Direct Saving £'000s pa	Actual Direct Saving £'000s pa	Estimated Indirect Saving £'000s pa	Actual Indirect Saving £'000s pa	Notes
E88	TfL Group, GLA & Boroughs	TfL (Surface)	London Highway Alliance Contract South (EM Highway Services Ltd)	YES	* The LoHAC contract has not been included within the body of the table as it is classed as operational, however given the size of the opportunity of savings that have been estimated to be delivered by TfL alone it has been highlighted as an example of the potential that shared commercial frameworks could deliver.	-	300,000.0			Awarded: 2013 Duration: 8 years Frameworks accessible to both TfL and London Boroughs. Tendered rates and prices represent a saving of 25 per cent against TfL's previous contracts. Savings potential for boroughs will vary dependant on a number of factors including the type of works to be delivered under their call-off. For borough contracts that have been evaluated, efficiencies in the region of 15-30 per cent have been shown. Savings of £300m already released from TfL Budget. <b>PLEASE NOTE THE £300M SAVING FIGURE IS THE TOTAL CUMULATIVE SAVINGS FIGURE ACROSS THE WHOLE OF THE 8 YEAR FRAMEWORK PERIOD AND NOT THE PER ANNUM FIGURE.</b>

TfL

Ref	Service provided to:	Framework /Contract:	Service provided (company):	Above OJEU threshold?	Reason for not following a GLA Group framework	Estimated Direct Saving £'000s pa	Actual Direct Saving £'000s pa	Estimated Indirect Saving £'000s pa	Actual Indirect Saving £'000s pa	Notes
E89	TfL Group, GLA & Boroughs	TfL (Surface)	London Highway Alliance Contract Central (Colas, VolkerHighways and URS (CVU))	YES						As for E2
E90	TfL Group, GLA & Boroughs	TfL (Surface)	London Highway Alliance Contract North West (Conway AECOM)	YES						As for E2
E91	TfL Group, GLA & Boroughs	TfL (Surface)	London Highway Alliance Contract North East (Ringway Jacobs Ltd)	YES						As for E2
E92	GLA, Borough & functional bodies	TfL (Surface)	Legible London Programme: Totem manufacture, supply, installation and maintenance (Trueform Engineering Ltd)	YES	No other Frameworks identified with the requisite scope or flexibility to meet the requirement.	500.0				Awarded:16/07/10 Duration: 3yrs11mths Majority of spend is conducted by London Boroughs Target savings is 5%  <b>The savings reported were over the duration of the framework which has now ended</b>

## TfL

Ref	Service provided to:	Framework /Contract:	Service provided (company):	Above OJEU threshold?	Reason for not following a GLA Group framework	Estimated Direct Saving £'000s pa	Actual Direct Saving £'000s pa	Estimated Indirect Saving £'000s pa	Actual Indirect Saving £'000s pa	Notes
E93	GLA, Borough & functional bodies	TfL (Surface)	Cycle Parking Framework (Bellsure, Bike Dock, Broxap, Cyclehoop, Cyclepods and Lockitsafe.)	YES	No other Frameworks identified with the requisite scope or flexibility to meet the requirement.	360.0				Awarded: 30/01/13 Duration: 3yrs11mths Target saving is 5% on estimated spend of £7.2m  <b>Please note the £360k savings reported are for the total savings for the duration of the framework rather than per annum</b>
E94	TfL Group, GLA & Boroughs	TfL (Surface)	Supply, installation and maintenance of Charge Point Infrastructure (Pod Point Ltd, Chargemaster PLC, Ringway Infrastructure Ltd.)	YES	No other Frameworks identified with the requisite scope or flexibility to meet the requirement.	175.0				Awarded :01/03/11 Duration: 3yrs 11mths Target saving is 5% on estimated spend of £3.5m  <b>The savings reported were over the duration of the framework which has now ended</b>
E95	TfL Group	TfL (Surface)	Smarter Travel Programme - Workplace Cycle Parking Equipment (Allpark Ltd, Bike Dock Solutions Ltd, Broxap Ltd and Cyclehoop Ltd.)	YES	No other Frameworks identified with the requisite scope or flexibility to meet the requirement.	35.0				Awarded: 23/02/11 Duration: 4 years Target saving is 5% on estimated spend of £700k  <b>The savings reported were over the duration of the framework which has now ended</b>

TfL

Ref	Service provided to:	Framework /Contract:	Service provided (company):	Above OJEU threshold?	Reason for not following a GLA Group framework	Estimated Direct Saving £'000s pa	Actual Direct Saving £'000s pa	Estimated Indirect Saving £'000s pa	Actual Indirect Saving £'000s pa	Notes
E96	TfL Group, Boroughs , Foreign & Commonwealth Office, Ministry of Justice, Met Police, Highway Agency, Network Rail, City of London Police, Train Operating Companies and the above supply chains	TfL (Surface)	Pan-TfL CCTV Product Framework (Anixter Ltd, ADI-Gardiner Ltd.)	YES	No other Frameworks identified with the requisite scope or flexibility to meet the requirement.	3,000.0				Awarded: 2013 Duration: 4 years The framework is envisaged to have ~£30mil worth of spend across the group, and is aiming to achieve a 10% saving. <b>Please note the £3m savings reported are for the total savings for the duration of the framework rather than per annum</b>
E97	TfL Group, GLA and TfL Suppliers	TfL (Surface)	CCTV - Supply of Equipment (Digital Barriers Services Ltd)	YES						As for E2

TfL

Ref	Service provided to:	Framework /Contract:	Service provided (company):	Above OJEU threshold?	Reason for not following a GLA Group framework	Estimated Direct Saving £'000s pa	Actual Direct Saving £'000s pa	Estimated Indirect Saving £'000s pa	Actual Indirect Saving £'000s pa	Notes
E98	TfL Group	TfL	Contactless Payment Oyster Cards Suppliers on the framework: ASK S. A, AustraiCards, Exceet, Gemalto	YES						As for E2
E99	TfL Group	TfL / GLA	Integration and Middleware Services (Detica)	YES						As for E2
E100	TfL Group	TfL	SAP Managed Service (including hosting & third line support). (Axon)	YES						As for E2
E101	TfL Group & GLA	TfL	Mobile Applications : hosting/development/support & maintenance (BT, Trapeze, MDV, 2erqo)	YES						As for E2

TfL

Ref	Service provided to:	Framework /Contract:	Service provided (company):	Above OJEU threshold?	Reason for not following a GLA Group framework	Estimated Direct Saving £'000s pa	Actual Direct Saving £'000s pa	Estimated Indirect Saving £'000s pa	Actual Indirect Saving £'000s pa	Notes
E102	TfL Group	TfL	Technical Smartcard Consultancy Services (Consult Hyperion / Crisp Telecom Ltd / PA Consulting)	YES						As for E2
E103	TfL Group & GLA & London Boroughs	TfL	GIS Applications & Services Framework. Applications - Desktop/web /mobile/other & Support/Services & training (ESRI, Pitney Bowes, Intergraph,	YES						As for E2
E105	TfL Group & GLA	TfL	Telephone Accessories & Consumables	YES						As for E2
E106	TfL & GLA	TfL / GLA	Provision of wireless communications including; voice/data/associated airtime & services. (Telefonica & O2)	YES		1,825.0				The savings are based on the cost difference between the original contract rates and the revised contract rates. The difference in the old and new rates were identified as a cashable saving received in the form of a rebate from the supplier. The share of the saving is £1.8m for TfL and £25k for the GLA

TfL

Ref	Service provided to:	Framework /Contract:	Service provided (company):	Above OJEU threshold?	Reason for not following a GLA Group framework	Estimated Direct Saving £'000s pa	Actual Direct Saving £'000s pa	Estimated Indirect Saving £'000s pa	Actual Indirect Saving £'000s pa	Notes
E107	TfL & GLA	TfL	On Demand' Colocation Datacentre catering for continuous growth. (Telecity Group)	YES						As for E2
E108	TfL & GLA	TfL	PCI Audit: Validates compliance with PCI Payment and Card Industry Standard (NCC Group)	YES						As for E2



TfL

Ref	Service provided to:	Framework /Contract:	Service provided (company):	Above OJEU threshold?	Reason for not following a GLA Group framework	Estimated Direct Saving £'000s pa	Actual Direct Saving £'000s pa	Estimated Indirect Saving £'000s pa	Actual Indirect Saving £'000s pa	Notes
E109	TfL & GLA	TfL & GLA	Digital Services Framework: Lot 1: design/ front end build/ technical build/content management. L2: requirements definition/ information architecture/ usability testing. L3: load testing/system testing/accessibility testing/compatibility testign.L4 security testing.	YES		540.0				Negotiated supplier rebates for 2013-14 from 4 suppliers on the framework.
E206	All government entities	TfL	CompeteFor	N/A		1,000.0				Inherited supply chain system from LDA now let as a concession contract. Service now provided as service concession (saving per annum)

TfL

Ref	Service provided to:	Framework /Contract:	Service provided (company):	Above OJEU threshold?	Reason for not following a GLA Group framework	Estimated Direct Saving £'000s pa	Actual Direct Saving £'000s pa	Estimated Indirect Saving £'000s pa	Actual Indirect Saving £'000s pa	Notes
E207	TfL Group	Bulk purchase of street furniture and miscellaneous items of equipment	AGD Systems; Aldridge; Bristol Industrial; Clearview; Henry Williams; Mallatite; Motus; NAL; Peek (Imtech Traffic and Infrastructure); Ritherdon; Siemens; Signpost; Telent; Thermotor; Time 24; Traffic Systems (TSL)	YES						Savings will be dependent on product mix and volume estimated Savings achieved of up to 36% on individual items although some inflationary increases seen on other items
E208	GLA	GLA	GLA VAT Helpdesk	No						As for E2
E209	TfL Group & GLA	Cycle Training Services	Barclay's Cycle Superhighways Training Services	YES	No other Frameworks identified with the requisite scope or flexibility to meet the requirement.	10.0				Awarded: 12/02/13 Duration: 1 yr 6 mths. This is a single supplier framework. Target saving is 5% on estimated spend of £20.2k

TfL

Ref	Service provided to:	Framework /Contract:	Service provided (company):	Above OJEU threshold?	Reason for not following a GLA Group framework	Estimated Direct Saving £'000s pa	Actual Direct Saving £'000s pa	Estimated Indirect Saving £'000s pa	Actual Indirect Saving £'000s pa	Notes
E210	TfL, MPS, GLA	Detection and Enforcement Infrastructure	Management, support, maintenance and replacement of a network of Automatic Number Plate Recognition (ANPR) cameras and other related services referred to as Detection and Enforcement Infrastructure (D&EI) to support the Central London Congestion Charging and Greater London Low Emission Zone schemes and other traffic monitoring and enforcement schemes. (Siemens)	YES		44,500.0				Savings achieved through competitive tendering. Value measured against budget £44.5m savings in current business planning period. A further £18.5million identified for the life of the contract that extends beyond the business plan if the planned budget was extrapolated. <b>PLEASE NOTE THE £45.5M SAVING FIGURE IS THE TOTAL CUMULATIVE SAVINGS FIGURE TO 2023/24 AND NOT THE PER ANNUM FIGURE.</b>

TfL

Ref	Service provided to:	Framework /Contract:	Service provided (company):	Above OJEU threshold?	Reason for not following a GLA Group framework	Estimated Direct Saving £'000s pa	Actual Direct Saving £'000s pa	Estimated Indirect Saving £'000s pa	Actual Indirect Saving £'000s pa	Notes
E211	TfL, GLA	TfL	Print Management and Distribution (CDS)	YES		17.0				Savings identified through tendering
E212	All government entities, private businesses, voluntary and charitable organisations	TfL	Freight Operator Recognition Scheme - FORS (AECOM)	N/A		15,300.0				The scheme has grown faster than TfL expected and was covering most of the UK and some operators in Europe, TfL managed three contracts to satisfy the requirement, but all of them were tendered and designed for a smaller scheme. TfL previously funded all of the contracts which with the current growth was unsustainable within the business plan. This new agreement has put in place a concessionaire who is responsible for growing the scheme nationally and ensuring that the level of subsidy from TfL decreases to the point where the scheme is self funding. <b>PLEASE NOTE THE £15.3M SAVING FIGURE IS THE TOTAL CUMULATIVE SAVINGS FIGURE FOR THE DURATION OF THE CONTRACT AND NOT THE PER ANNUM FIGURE.</b>

**OPDC**

**Old Oak and Park Royal Development Corporation**

**A. Functional delegations**

Ref	Delegation to:	Service provided to:	Service provided:	Estimated Direct Saving (£'000s pa)	Actual Direct Saving (£'000s pa)	Estimated Indirect Saving (£'000s pa)	Actual Indirect Saving (£'000s pa)	Notes
A26	GLA	OPDC	HR Services and Organisational Development					OPDC was established on 1 April 2015. OPDC receives all of its support services from the GLA or members of the GLA Group. The decision to provide support services on this shared basis means that there is no comparator on which to calculate incremental savings but savings having been made compared to the cost of procuring the services externally. Cashable and non-cashable savings relating to OPDC services procured through the GLA Collaborative Procurement Team (GCPT) are set out in the GCPT schedule.
A27	TfL	OPDC	Legal Services					As for A26
A28	TfL	OPDC	Procurement					As for A26
A29	TfL	OPDC	SAP Financials					As for A26
A30	GLA	OPDC	External relations and media					As for A26
A31	GLA	OPDC	Government Relations					As for A26
A32	GLA	OPDC	Financial services incl Treasury Management and Banking					As for A26
A33	GLA	OPDC	Secretariat and Committee Services					As for A26
A34	GLA	OPDC	IT					As for A26
A35	GLA	OPDC	Public Liaison Unit Services					As for A26

**OPDC**

**C. Management and co-location**

Ref	Hosted by:	Responsibility:	Service provided:	Estimated Direct Saving (£'000s pa)	Actual Direct Saving (£'000s pa)	Estimated Indirect Saving (£'000s pa)	Actual Indirect Saving (£'000s pa)	Notes
C8	GLA	OPDC	Office Accommodation incl. Facilities Management of Office Space	-	-	-	-	OPDC was established on 1 April 2015. OPDC receives all of its support services from the GLA or members of the GLA Group. The decision to provide support services on this shared basis means that there is no comparator on which to calculate incremental savings but significant savings having been made compared to the cost of procuring the services externally. Cashable and non-cashable savings relating to OPDC services procured through the GLA Collaborative Procurement Team (GCPT) are set out in the GCPT schedule.

**Appendix 1  
GCPT**

**GLA Collaborative Procurement Team (GCPT)**

Ref	Procurement service provided by:	Service provided to:	Procurement service provided:	Estimated Direct Saving (£'000s pa)	Actual Direct Saving (£'000s pa)	Estimated Indirect Saving (£'000s pa)	Actual Indirect Saving (£'000s pa)	Notes
F1	GLA Collaborative Procurement Team	LFEPA	Recruitment		135.0		10.0	LFEPA to move onto the TfL Hays recruitment contract. £100k initial one off saving, + £35K p.a to follow. Move to Hays in Jan 2016. Indirect saving is non-cashable one yr only saving and is due to fact LFEPA do not need to re-let their recruitment contract via a formal OJEU process
F2	GLA Collaborative Procurement Team	OPDC	Consultancy		82.5			OPDC utilising various TfL frameworks for provision of consultancy services. Savings calculated by comparing budget for service to actual procured cost.
F3	GLA Collaborative Procurement Team	GLA	Recruitment		49.5			Use of a TfL framework. Saving calculated by comparing budget for service to actual procured cost.
F4	GLA Collaborative Procurement Team	OPDC	Financial Services		30.0		95.0	Use of a TfL framework. Actual direct saving calculated by comparing budget for service to actual procured cost. Indirect saving based on GCPT negotiation with supplier reducing the procured cost of service
F5	GLA Collaborative Procurement Team	GLA	Consultancy		18.0			Use of a TfL framework. Actual direct saving calculated by comparing budget for service to actual procured cost.
F6	GLA Collaborative Procurement Team	TfL	Stationery		63.6			Use of a TfL framework. Actual direct saving calculated by comparing budget for service to actual procured cost. £63.6k saving each year for 3.5 years
F7	GLA Collaborative Procurement Team	GLA	Print				16.0	Print supplier reduced costs via mini competitions on behalf of GLA / TfL. Saving are for the full 2014/15 financial year

**OPDC**

Ref	Procurement service provided by:	Service provided to:	Procurement service provided:	Estimated Direct Saving (£'000s pa)	Actual Direct Saving (£'000s pa)	Estimated Indirect Saving (£'000s pa)	Actual Indirect Saving (£'000s pa)	Notes
F8	GLA Collaborative Procurement Team	TfL	Print				121.0	Print supplier reduced costs via mini competitions on behalf of GLA / TfL. Saving are for the full 2014/15 financial year. TfL achieved saving of 6.5% against previous spend



# Subject: Work Programme for the GLA Oversight Committee

**Report to: GLA Oversight Committee**

**Report of: Executive Director of Secretariat**

**Date: 17 December 2015**

**This report will be considered in public**

## 1. Summary

- 1.1 This report provides details of proposed work and the schedule of meetings for the current Assembly year (2015/16). The Committee has a rolling work programme so work may continue beyond each Assembly year.

## 2. Recommendation

- 2.1 **That the Committee notes the remainder of its work programme for 2015/16, as set out in this report, and identifies any additional issues it wishes to consider at future meetings.**

## 3. Background

- 3.1 The GLA Oversight Committee has the following overall functions:
- Management and administration of the budget of the Assembly and Secretariat, and overseeing the Assembly's scrutiny work programme;
  - Having oversight, on behalf of the London Assembly, of the Greater London Authority's (GLA) corporate governance policies and activities;
  - Maintaining a watching brief in respect of the activities of the senior officers appointed by the Mayor; and
  - Responding to consultations from the Head of Paid Service and scrutinising the Head of Paid Service function.
- 3.2 Additionally, it was agreed at the Annual Assembly meeting of 11 May 2012 that the GLA Oversight Committee's terms of reference include provision to scrutinise any actions or decisions taken by the Mayor on matters relating to education. The Committee can also scrutinise civil contingency arrangements in London, the provision of services to the public and the performance of utilities in London.

## **4. Issues for Consideration**

4.1 The main work areas of the Committee are summarised below.

### **Assembly Budget and Scrutiny Work Programme**

4.2 The Committee allocates the Assembly's budget and receives a report in March each year on that subject (following the approval of the overall amount of the budget and in advance of the start of the financial year in question).

4.3 The Committee receives quarterly monitoring reports from the Secretariat, scheduled for the Committee meetings in June, September, November and January.

4.4 The Committee approves individual proposals for non-routine expenditure from the scrutiny programme budget which are referred to the Committee by the subject-related committees during the year. The timing of these reports depends upon when the subject-related committees approve projects and refer proposals for expenditure.

4.5 The Committee approves proposals for rapporteurships referred from subject-related committees during the course of the year.

4.6 The Committee also has the power to consider any issue which does not fall into the remit of one of the subject-related committees (for instance, cross-cutting equalities and governance issues).

### **Staffing Consultations and Appointments**

4.7 The Committee will be invited to respond to consultations from the Head of Paid Service (HoPS) from time to time during the year. The Committee's role in relation to these consultations is reactive and therefore the work programme does not predict what reports will be presented and when.

4.8 The Assembly has a role in appointing the statutory officers to the Authority, and this Committee has delegated authority to fulfil that role as and when the need arises. At its meeting of 22 May 2012, the GLA Oversight Committee agreed that the Head of Paid Service Performance Review Panel be established as a working group, and this meets annually (with the most recent meeting held 16 December 2014).

### **Other Items of Consideration**

4.9 At the Committee's meeting of 29 January 2013, it was proposed that the Committee receives quarterly updates on the evaluation of the Mayor's Mentoring Programme. It was agreed subsequently, given the Committee's level of contentment with the progress and direction of the programme over the previous year, that updates be provided bi-annually throughout 2014/15. Following the update received by the Committee at its meeting of 11 December 2014, the Committee received a further update following the final phase of the programme at its 22 October 2015 meeting.

4.10 At its meeting on 21 March 2013, the Committee asked that it be consulted formally on the annual staff pay review; as the settlement reached in 2014 covered a two-year period, the annual pay review has not been scheduled as an item on the work programme for this Assembly year.

- 4.11 At its meeting on 25 February 2014, the Committee agreed to receive details of the progress made to address GLA workforce equalities issues, dealt with as part of the Committee's regular Workforce Monitoring Report and update.

### **Scrutiny of the Head of Paid Service Function**

- 4.12 The Committee usually receives reports on the following issues during the course of the year:
- Annual Workforce Monitoring Report, incorporating complaints monitoring (plus a six-monthly update); and
  - Governance.
- 4.13 The Committee also receives a report on the Draft Annual Governance Statement (dealt with by the Committee at its meeting in July this year).

### **Shared Services**

- 4.14 Having previously considered a number of consultation proposals from the Mayor for shared services, the GLA Oversight Committee continues to receive an annual update on the progress of shared services across the Group and considers any proposals that may come forward. Following its consultation on shared services proposals in relation to the Old Oak and Park Royal Development Corporation (OPDC) at its meeting in February 2015, the Committee also requested that as part of its annual shared services report it receives an update on the proposed arrangements for the OPDC, with particular reference to financial costs and potential conflicts of interest. It was agreed that for this Assembly year, shared services be dealt with over the course of three separate meetings to consider a range of pan-GLA group collaborations (September and November 2015, and February 2016); however, due to time constraints at the September GLA Oversight Committee meeting, it was agreed that the item due to be discussed at that meeting would be rescheduled for consideration at this meeting.

### **Treasury Management**

- 4.15 It was agreed at its meeting of 11 September 2014, that the GLA Oversight Committee reviews the shared treasury management arrangement between the GLA and the London Pensions Fund Authority after a year of operation. The item will be considered as part of the Committee's update on shared services scheduled for 25 February 2015.

### **Mayor's Fund for London**

- 4.16 At the November 2014 meeting of the Committee, it was proposed that the Committee considers scrutinising the Mayor's Fund for London; this item has been scheduled for consideration at the meeting of 25 February 2016.

### **State of London Debate**

- 4.17 The Committee is consulted annually on arrangements for the State of London Debate but following the discussion at its 11 December 2014 meeting, it was agreed that it should undertake a broader review of the way in which the event is organised, with a view to assisting the next Mayoral administration. The State of London Debate is scheduled for consideration at the Committee's meeting on 21 January 2016.

### **Older People**

- 4.18 In addition to fielding a cross-party panel of Assembly Members to attend the national Age Friendly Cities conference on 16 March 2014, organised jointly by the GLA, Positive Ageing in London and the UK Urban Ageing Network, it was agreed that the GLA Oversight Committee considers the Mayor's work on older people in London as part of the Committee's 2015/16 work programme and the matter has therefore been scheduled for the Committee's meeting on 10 March 2016.

### **Pan-GLA Group Collaborative Procurement Function**

- 4.19 Following discussion of the procurement shared service function at its meeting in January 2015, the Committee requested an update in 2015/16 addressing the issues that had been raised during the meeting, namely:

- Named individuals in each organisation to be held to account;
- Clearly set out milestones showing what would be achieved in the first two years;
- More ambitious, but achievable targets for savings over a reasonable timescale, with clarity about what savings were being made;
- The planned approach to ethical and fair trade procurement; and
- A focus on ensuring that TfL's approach to efficiency would be closely monitored.

- 4.20 This item is being considered as part of the Shared Services item elsewhere on this agenda.

### **Transparency of the GLA Group**

- 4.21 In June 2013, the GLA Oversight Committee published *Transparency of the GLA Group* – authored by its rapporteur, Mayor John Biggs AM. At its meeting in March 2015, the Committee agreed a proposal to appoint Mayor John Biggs AM as rapporteur to carry out a follow-up investigation to assess the progress that has been made since the original report and to make recommendations to improve transparency in the GLA Group and the wider GLA family. It had been anticipated that the Committee might need to discuss this matter at its meeting in January 2016 but this is not likely to be the case.

### **Transport for London (TfL) Board Governance**

- 4.22 Following a request from the Assembly's Transport Committee, it was agreed that the GLA Oversight Committee undertakes a review on behalf of the Assembly on the TfL Board's corporate governance arrangements with a view to assessing whether they are fit for purpose. This was undertaken at the Committee's meeting in July 2015.

### **Garden Bridge**

- 4.23 Following the passing of a motion at the London Assembly (Plenary) meeting in June 2015, which called on the Mayor to carry out a full audit of the Garden Bridge project's procurement, and to remove Transport for London funding, it was agreed that the Committee considers the matter further. The issue was initially dealt with at the Committee's September meeting, but following the release of additional information, the item was also considered at its meeting of 22 October 2015. The Committee will conclude its investigation on this matter by putting questions to the Mayor, in his capacity as Chairman of Transport for London, and Mike Brown MVO, Commissioner, Transport for London at this meeting.

## Meeting Dates

4.24 The table set out below shows the Committee's remaining meeting dates for the 2015/16 Assembly year and agenda items. This timetable and agenda items are reviewed and updated as appropriate.

Date of meeting	Main Agenda Items (subject to agreement)
Thursday, 21 January 2016 at 2.00pm in Committee Room 5	<ul style="list-style-type: none"><li>• HoPS Oral Update</li><li>• HoPS Consultation Reports (if any)</li><li>• Secretariat Quarterly Monitoring Report Q3</li><li>• Assembly's Requirements for Information to be Included in the Mayor's Annual Equalities Report</li><li>• Mayor's Annual Equalities Report</li><li>• Workforce Report</li><li>• State of London Debate</li></ul>
Thursday, 25 February 2016 at 2.00pm in Committee Room 5	<ul style="list-style-type: none"><li>• HoPS Oral Update</li><li>• HoPS Consultation Reports (if any)</li><li>• Assembly Annual Report</li><li>• Shared Services - Treasury Management/Single Property Unit</li><li>• Mayor's Fund for London</li></ul>
Thursday, 10 March 2016 at 2.00pm in Committee Room 5	<ul style="list-style-type: none"><li>• HoPS Oral Update</li><li>• HoPS Consultation Reports (if any)</li><li>• Allocation of Assembly Budget</li><li>• Older People</li></ul>

## 5. Legal Implications

5.1 The Assembly has the power to establish committees to discharge its functions, and the GLA Oversight Committee is one such committee. The work programme is in accordance with the GLA Oversight Committee's terms of reference.

## 6. Financial Implications

6.1 There are no financial implications for the purposes of this report.

---

**List of appendices to this report:** None

### Local Government (Access to Information) Act 1985

List of Background Papers: None

Contact Officer: John Barry, Principal Committee Manager

Telephone: 020 7983 4425

E-mail: [john.barry@london.gov.uk](mailto:john.barry@london.gov.uk)

This page is intentionally left blank