

Phase I of the GHIE development (completed in July 1997) consists of seven units of between 55 and 74 sq. m. (590-800 sq. ft) together with a management block (office, reception area, counselling room and meeting room). A second phase of 20 units of between 26 and 120 sq. m (280-1290 sq. ft) was completed in March 1999.

The capital cost of Phase 1 was met jointly by the District and County Councils with grant aid from the EU RECHAR II programme. Phase 2 was funded through SRB Challenge Funds, the EU RECHAR II programme and the East Midlands Development Agency.

The Swadlincote 'spoke' office of Business Link Southern Derbyshire (now the Small Business Service) has been located at the George Holmes Business Centre since April 1999. The Council's Business Support Officer assists Counsellors from the Derby & Derbyshire Business Venture in providing information and advice to existing small businesses and those considering starting up new enterprises. Larger businesses (employing ten or more people) and those with growth potential are put in touch with Business Link's own team of Business Development Advisors. The Business Support Officer also provides administrative assistance to occupants of the workspace and other local businesses (subject to set charges) and organises the hire of the meeting/training room.

Income from the workspace units helps to offset total costs.

RETAIL & OFFICE UNITS

The Council owns 7 shop units, an office and a cafe which were constructed in 1987 as part of a scheme, which included new public conveniences and a reconstructed bus park; 4 shop units at the side of the town Hall; 4 shop units located on housing estates; 3 other buildings in the Town Centre used as offices and a Snooker Centre.

11.0 PERFORMANCE

11.1 Current methods of recording and reporting performance in addition to any PI's

11.2 Feedback from clients

Building Maintenance are intending to carry out customer satisfaction surveys w/e from 01/01/02

11.3 External reviews/Inspections/Reports on service

District Audit undertook a study into Asset Management within the authority in 2000/01. Their findings very much influenced our AMP and also the scoping of this Review. We are acting on the report's recommendations which are being outworked through the AMP process and through this review.

11.4 Known views of the industry/market place

12.0 RELATIONSHIP TO OTHER SERVICES

12.1 Interaction and interface with any other parts of the Service

Asset Management involves many different sections within the Council which interact with each other and with other services such as Planning and Environmental Health.

Building Maintenance

DSO	Leisure
Other Contractors	Estates
Consultants	Legal
	Finance
	Outside Building Users

12.2 Interaction and interface with external organisations/partners

This includes the chamber of trade & commerce, market traders federation, community, allotment associations and individual holders, National forest, other local authorities, contractors, bus companies

South Derbyshire District Council has delegated the strategic development of the Rosliston Forestry Centre site to the Executive on the basis that the knowledge and influence of senior executives from the Forestry Commission and National Forest Company can be used to help in the site's future development.

The first 3 years of the Management Contract was predominantly funded by these partners and they continue to be key players in the development of the long-term management contract for the site.

12.3 Shared resources, equipment and facilities – NONE UNLESS YOU COUNT THE DELPH WHICH IS USED OCCASIONALLY BY VOLUNTARY GROUPS

12.4 Key linkages and relationships

13.0 USER AND EMPLOYEE INVOLVEMENT

13.1 Consultation structures

The Council is committed (as identified in property objective A above) to consult the community on the best use of assets. It has developed a **Consultation Strategy** to ensure that statutory requirements are met, that limited resources are used economically, efficiently and effectively, and that consultation continues to be meaningful and relevant to local people and other stakeholders.

It has also signed up to the Derbyshire Consultation Principles.

13.2 Involvement of service users

The Council has identified a number of key stakeholders who need to be consulted:

- Council staff, particularly as occupiers of Civic Offices and Depot
- Those who use the Council's other directly held assets such as the Town Hall, Sports Pavilions and Parks, Toilets, Car Parks, Bus Shelters
- Users of facilities operated by third parties i.e Market and Leisure Centres
- Tenants of commercial premises
- If possible, non-users of Council assets - i.e why don't they use them?

Over the last few months we have undertaken several pieces of consultation work as set out below:

- All commercial tenants were questioned on their views about the condition of their premises, speed and quality of repairs, signage, access & parking, the overall service provided by the Council as Landlord, and whether the Council should continue to manage the premises or whether it might be more appropriate for the day to day management to be handled by agents or another organisation.
- In 1999, bi-annual meetings were established with all of the Council's industrial and commercial tenants to provide the opportunity for tenants to discuss all manner of property related issues.
- All tenants also said that in addition to the meetings they appreciated being able to discuss any concerns they had as and when with the Council's Estates Officer.
- The tenants of the George Holmes Industrial Estate have been consulted separately about security measures for the estate following several incidents.
- The tenants of the Boardman Industrial Estate have been consulted separately about access, circulation and parking issues.
- Users of the Town Hall were asked a number of questions, with the issue of maintenance standards being pertinent to the AMP. Of the 49% of respondents, all felt that maintenance standards were good or excellent.
- Eleven football clubs who use Sports Pavilions (changing rooms) and football pitches were also asked their views on a number of issues.
- Bus companies were sent a questionnaire to seek their views on bus shelters and the bus station. With regard to bus shelters, all respondents felt that there were insufficient number, were not well placed and were not particularly clean. The majority did feel, however, that they were in fairly good condition. With regard to the bus station, all respondents felt that there were sufficient bays, adequately placed, in good condition and clean.
- A survey of usage of Public Toilets has been undertaken - see details on attached sheet

As part of their Asset Management report in 2000, District Audit sent a questionnaire to a number of staff covering satisfaction with property services, access, IT, condition, toilets, parking and space issues. Most respondents commented on the office space which they occupy whilst others were able to comment on their experiences of managing other properties. The same questionnaire has now been rolled out to several occupants of the Council's depot.

- ***FRIENDS OF SWADLINCOTE WOODLANDS, EUREKA AND NEWHALL PARKS***

Building Maintenance

- with office staff for restructuring/office moves in June 1999.
- local disabled access groups when undertaking Citizens Charter Requirements for making public areas fully accessible to the Council's Public Buildings open to the public.

Legal

Recently consulted via an internal questionnaire. Many of the problems identified related to the availability of staff to respond to requests for advice.

13.3 Forums

- ***MARKET TRADERS LIAISON GROUP, LEISURE CENTRE USERS FORUM***

A Rosliston Liaison Group meet on a 6 monthly basis and is briefed on the development of the Forestry Centre site.

Monthly site meetings are also organised by Aurora Country Developments Limited to keep the site users involved in the site's development.

13.4 Accessibility of service

- ***accessibility of service – FULLY ACCESSIBLE***

14.0 CULTURAL VALUES

15.0 IMPLEMENTATION OF CORPORATE POLICIES

16.0 STAKEHOLDERS

17.0 LOCAL, REGIONAL AND NATIONAL CONTEXT OF SERVICE

	Support	Building Maintenance	Depot	Leisure	Facilities	Legal	Estates	Grand Totals
	Time	Time	Time	Time	Time	Time	Time	Time
	Cost	Cost	Cost	Cost	Cost	Cost	Cost	Cost
HGHB Managed Workspc	8.45	227.94						161.10
HARP Rental Prop	27.10	637.93						380.05
HARG Asset Register	31.30	794.78						1,195.35
HAOP Other Prop	14.50	399.77						186.50
HAEM General	32.15	1,025.03						467.20
FNFO Nat Forest Vis Cir	36.05	1,011.20		268.30				367.05
FVHA Village Halls	25.15	844.63						52.45
BCEM Cemeteries	9.10	163.10			441.07			450.17
BCPK Car Parks	16.20	654.16			100.15			116.35
FALL Allotments	5.30	109.18			89.15			94.45
FLCC Greenbank LC	23.15	666.70			199.54			223.09
FPRG Parks & Rec'n Grds	21.15	325.36			608.26	1,953.54		717.11
HMAR Markets	7.45	220.99			33.21			41.06
ISTH Town Hall	46.15	1,324.49			27.01			73.16
EBUS Bus Shelters	0.50	33.57	187.20					188.10
UTCF Build Maint		779.00						779.00
YTCL Monitor Clean		203.50						203.50
Q800 Civic Offices		651.45						651.45
Q804 Etwall Pool		8.00						8.00
Q833 Depot		32.30						32.30
HBUS Bus Station			37.10					37.10
BPCO Public Cons					277.20			277.20
CEWA Etwall Area					11.07			11.07
FPOS Pub Open Spc					162.29			162.29
FSWL Swad Woodlands					179.31			179.31
HINE Ind Estates						95.05	151.15	246.20
Total	306.10	8,438.83	224.30	268.30	2,129.46	1,155.10	1,592.00	7,376.41
FT Equivalent	0.1914	1.0629	0.1403	0.1678	1.3311	0.7220	1.4099	5.0254

INHOUSE

Annex B

<u>STRENGTHS</u>	<u>WEAKNESSES</u>
<ul style="list-style-type: none">• Greater control and immediate reaction to problems• Local knowledge• Historical awareness• Cost of service delivery (excluding central on-costs)• Service Focused• Have full information• Vested interest in ensuring ongoing quality• Sharing of expertise with other authorities / organisations• Continuity of long serving staff	<ul style="list-style-type: none">• Central on-costs• Complacency• Cynicism• Speed of decision making• Corporate guidance• Lack of resources<ul style="list-style-type: none">→ Capital→ Revenue→ Staff→ Skills• Lack of specialist ideas, 'fresh blood'• Lack of flexibility• Uncertainties as to who does what
<u>OPPORTUNITIES</u>	<u>THREATS</u>
<ul style="list-style-type: none">• Outside (Government) stimuli to effect cultural change• Improve understanding of Managers roles and Review• Access to community resources (ie. Friends of Park Groups)	<ul style="list-style-type: none">• Culture resistant to change• Government legislation

PARTNERSHIP OF AUTHORITIES

<p style="text-align: center;"><u>STRENGTHS</u></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none">• Economies of Scale• Ability to take strategic view of management• Ability to employ expertise• Authorities may experience 'Peaks' and Troughs – a partnership may assist in 'Trough' times	<p style="text-align: center;"><u>WEAKNESSES</u></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none">• Could only realistically be looked at for individual assets not for whole portfolio• Individual Authority only concerned with their own assets – possible Member pressure → prioritisation of work• Still need local expertise.• Authorities may experience 'Peaks' and 'Troughs' at the same time as each other• Management resource 'hungry'• Lengthy decision making process
<p style="text-align: center;"><u>OPPORTUNITIES</u></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none">• To have 'Win Win' situations• Outside stimuli to encourage partnership approach• Strategic Planning• To achieve wider aims• Streamline decision making	<p style="text-align: center;"><u>THREATS</u></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none">• Culture change• Legal clarity

PRIVATE SECTOR

<p style="text-align: center;"><u>STRENGTHS</u></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none">• Transfer of risk in certain areas• Greater expertise – probably!• Quicker decision making• Economies of Scale	<p style="text-align: center;"><u>WEAKNESSES</u></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none">• Council is still ultimately responsible• Lack of flexibility – over adherence to contract• Extreme difficulty to bring service back in-house• Profit led rather than service quality led
<p style="text-align: center;"><u>OPPORTUNITIES</u></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none">• Challenge certain working procedures• Ability to attract capital investment	<p style="text-align: center;"><u>THREATS</u></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none">• Possible job losses of council staff• Insufficiently qualified staff handling work• Insufficient understanding of the job required to the satisfaction of our customers• Lack of understanding of procedures• Unwillingness to seek alternative opportunities for the Portfolio because it will impact upon their return• Bankruptcy – New Ownership

Internal consultation questionnaire

Summary of responses

14 responses were received, mostly from Divisional Managers, but also from other staff directly involved in the management of assets.

General Issues

57% of responders were clear who manages the different land and property holdings owned by the Council, 43% were not. Particular confusion arises in relation to assets where a couple of different divisions have an input into the management, most notably village halls, pavilions, toilets, car parks etc. The service operated from certain assets may be managed by one division, but those staff do not necessarily have the expertise to deal with more technical issues.

Clarity is needed on the remit of the new corporate asset management work being undertaken by the Economic Development Manager, and how this inter-relates with the day to day responsibility for the use of the assets.

With regard to home working, whilst several responders said there was very limited opportunities in their divisions, a number said that there were opportunities subject to the appropriate technology being in place. Most divisions need to be available at short notice to deal with the public, members or other officers. Where staff are working on reports or particular projects then there is more scope. Environmental Health suggest that, subject to receiving the appropriate support, many of their staff could operate from home.

Hot desking already occurs to some extent in IT & Customer Services, Community & Leisure Development and Revenue. Most divisions have said that there is little scope for this.

Property Management Services

A number of responders did not complete this section as they do not use these services. Responders were asked their opinion on overall service provided; quality of instructions provided by them to enable you to service their needs; response time to requests and helpfulness of staff, with 1 being poor and 5 being excellent. Responders were asked to explain where they were dissatisfied about an issue, and to suggest how the service received could be improved.

Estate Management

7 of the responders completed this section. The majority were pleased with all aspects of the service, and two responders said that helpfulness of staff was excellent. None of the issues were said to be poor, but there was a single score of 2 against three of the issues.

Comments received suggested that Estates should have a wider appreciation of what other units do; that a detailed profile of the service would be helpful, and that additional valuation training was required, together with more co-ordination with in-house Building Surveyors/QS on valuation matters.

Building Maintenance

For this service the question on quality of instructions provided was replaced with two other questions, one on quality of repairs/maintenance and one on quality of technical support/advice.

9 of the responders answered most of the questions. A number of responders were unhappy with various issues and there were few scores of 4 or 5 recorded. Three of the nine felt that overall service was poor and another gave it a score of 2. Most responders said that quality of repairs and maintenance was satisfactory (3) but one said it was poor and another gave it a score of 2. Only seven responders answered the question about quality of technical support/advice, and three of these said it was poor. Three also said that response times were poor, whilst one gave this a score of 2. Finally two responders said that helpfulness of staff was poor and one gave it a score of 2, although four did give a score of 4 for this issue.

Those who were dissatisfied commented that response times and quality of service were poor compared to other internal services; that it took a very long time to get a response regarding a quote for some work; and that the response time for emergency repairs was better than that for less urgent ones. Also that the housing stock was given a higher priority than other buildings; that funding issues can cause problems; and that there is a lack of feedback provided on actions to be taken, timescales and the progress of identified work. Also that the customer receives a poor service and that others have to deal with the associated complaints.

Suggested improvements include clear objective setting for staff with performance monitoring and accountability; adopting a client/contractor culture i.e realising that they are providing a service to other departments and members of the public, sometimes advising those with little or no knowledge of the subject; a complete change of attitude and ethos.

Facilities & Development

Only five people provided responses to this section. There was a spread of scores, with one person saying they were poor for the quality of instructions provided, two giving them a score of 2 for response times, but all saying the staff were helpful (incl one score of excellent).

It was suggested that it may be better to have a centralised property department to deal with the management of all assets.

Community & Leisure Development

Only four people provided responses for this section. The majority were happy with all aspects of the service (including three scores of excellent). There were however two scores of 2 related to the quality of instructions provided.

No-one provided any comments.

Direct Services

Again only four people provided responses for this section. There single poor scores for overall service provided and response times, and three scores of 2. Most of the other scores were 4.

There was a comment that some staff are not especially helpful.

Supporting Services

The same questions were asked except the one related to quality of instructions provided.

Legal

7 people provided responses. Everyone was very happy with the service except for one score of 2 related to response times. Notably there were two scores of excellent against each of the questions.

No comments were made

Finance (Income/insurance)

Again, 7 people provided responses. The majority were happy although there were single scores of 2 against response times and helpfulness of staff. There were three scores of excellent, one for each question.

There was a comment that the income section's service could be improved by a greater understanding and appreciation of the requirements of service units.

Any other comments

- Raising standards to a level of good service across the Council should be the priority.
- Many services may not initially need to improve, they just need to communicate their function and service to users and potential users.
- More supporting info to expand on the roles of the various sections would be helpful, and a better understanding of who is responsible for what
- The Asset Management function of the Authority is advancing and improving considerably better than at any time in the past.

An additional comment recently made (not in relation to this questionnaire) was that it was their understanding that the new post of Estates Officer, when created 3 years ago was intended to deal with all property and valuation matters within the authority, including RTB's. This is the first time that such a comment has been heard by the Economic Development Manager. If this is a commonly held perception of that role, it raises a number of issues relating to staff resourcing and the understanding by staff within the authority of the volume and variety of work already undertaken by the Estates Officer.

David Soanes
Review Team Leader
10/9/01

Comparison questionnaire

Summary of responses

Consultation was undertaken by phone and by post.

Telephone canvass was made with the following:

Babergh DC
Hinckley & Bosworth BC
High Peak BC
Derbyshire Dales DC
NE Derbyshire DC
Amber Valley DC
Chesterfield BC
Erewash BC
Derbyshire CC
East Staffs BC
NW Leics DC
Suffolk CC
Severn Trent
Jones Lang LaSalle
Burton College
Southern Derbyshire Community & Mental Health NHS Trust

Written responses were received from:

Rushcliffe BC
North Warwickshire BC
Staffordshire Moorlands DC
Mid Beds DC
Forset of Dean DC
Dorset CC
Wrexham CBC
London Scottish Bank

1. Question 1 asked whether the organisation had undertaken a review of Asset Management (not necessarily a Best Value review).

Of those who responded, 71% had undertaken some sort of review, although in many cases authorities had classed the preparation of an annual Asset Management Plan as a review. 29% have completed no review, although many of these have a forthcoming Best Value Review.

They were then asked what the outcome was of the review.

- Several authorities are now looking at the structure of their organisation in respect of the way it deals with property issues, and moving to a more centralised system, especially for strategic matters
- Some are reviewing the viability of their land and property holdings and future options for service delivery. At least one has decided to retain most of its' industrial units, but sell or evaluate the possible sale of some of its' miscellaneous properties
- A number are adopting best practice guidance across their authorities
- Some have decided to outsource some of their work, but retain in-house staff for most of it

2. Question 2 asked whether properties were managed centrally or by a number of different departments?

Only 26% of the organisations currently manage property centrally. 74% have two or more different departments dealing with the management

One organisation explained that they have a central property team including a chartered surveyor, Building Maintenance Manager, Facilities Manager and 3 maintenance operatives. Others said that they were moving towards a more centralised approach

They were then asked whether they were happy with current management arrangements.

67% said that they were, 20% were not, and 13% added that they were not entirely happy

- One organisation said that a property officer would be very beneficial unfortunately they do not have the resources
- Several said that they would prefer properties to all be managed centrally as they find that people who don't have property expertise are dealing with issues, particularly repairs and maintenance, e.g using outside contractors when they don't have the expertise to monitor them.
- One said that there was confusion over roles and expertise of staff, and overlapping of responsibilities

3. Question 3 asked whether organisations had outsourced the management of any of their properties or explored the possibilities of doing so, and, if they had done so, were they satisfied with the arrangements?

56% had either outsourced work or explored doing so, whilst 43% had not.

- Many organisations said that they had explored this and subsequently decided not to outsource. Some said they provided a better service at lower cost, but it is unclear how rigorously this was tested. Many preferred to continue using in-house staff because of their knowledge and expertise.
- Of those that had outsourced work, there was mixed response to its success. Some felt it had been worthwhile, whilst others said that a lot of supervision was required and were less happy with the service received. One commented that it was important not to accept the cheapest option.
- Only one or two seem to have outsourced all or most of their property work. Most organisations that have outsourced have done so in respect of property or valuation advice or management of certain assets, particularly the commercial portfolio.

4. Question 4 asked organisations whether they would be happy to benchmark costs and processes with us.

80% said that they were happy to do.

5. The local authorities were asked an additional question - whether they would like to explore the possibility of several local authorities working together in partnership to either:

- a) deliver Asset Management services themselves; or
- b) outsource Asset Management services

50% responded positively to both these suggestions. 50% did not wish to work in partnership to outsource asset management services, whilst only 22% were not in favour of joint delivery of services, with the balance unsure.

6. Finally, organisations were asked if they wished to make any additional comments.

- Forest of Dean DC, who have undertaken a BV review, now realised that their review had been too narrow, and that all assets should be reviewed as part of the process.
- Southern Derbyshire NHS Trust said that they would be interested in “property swaps” or similar between our organisations
- Many other organisations would be keen to communicate further with us on these issues and follow our progress.

ASSET MANAGEMENT PLAN JULY 2002

ACTION PLAN

S = Start F = Finish

Action	Responsible officer	Date
1. Produce quarterly reports for Members and Chief Officers	CPO	Reports scheduled
2. Commence monitoring of high level and local PI's and active benchmarking	CPO/Service Managers/BM	S: August 2001
3. Undertake wider consultation with all asset users	CPO/Service Managers	S: September 2001
4. Continue process of validating statement of assets and Council's interest therein	EO	S: September 2001 F: February 2002
5. Cost repairs required to bring Category C properties to Category A standard and include within Capital Programme	BM	S: September 2001
6. Continue to review lettings for which no detailed records exist	EO	S: October 2001 F: June 2002
7. Review current management arrangements for property to ensure that duplication and lack of clarity is avoided	CPO	S: November 2001 F: February 2002
8. Examine options for providing incentives to occupiers to reduce running costs	CPO	S: November 2001 F: February 2002
9. Review space standards and utilisation	CPO	November 2001
10. Examine options for introducing alternative forms of working	CPO	November 2001
11. Progress assessment of disposal opportunities (through BV Review)	CPO/EO	S: January 2002
12. Progress proposals for property sharing (through BV Review)	CPO	S: January 2002

13. Develop Corporate Property Strategy including formal procedures for identifying surplus or under-used property.	CPO	January 2002
---	-----	--------------

THE Property PERFORMANCE INDICATORS (pPIs)

Progress on the development of these national indicators needs to be part of the Asset Management Planning document but information on backlog should form part of the statistical requirements for the 'context' sheet.

Definitions of Management Cost and Cost/Time Predictability are set out after the 5 pPIs.

NUMBER	1 A & B
OBJECTIVE	To measure the condition of the asset for its current use. To show the severity and extent to which maintenance problems affect the portfolio. To assist in development of detailed information on backlog relating to both revenue and capital expenditure.
INDICATOR A	% gross internal floor-space in condition categories A - D
B	Backlog of maintenance by cost expressed as a % in priority levels in 1 - 4 and by value
DEFINITION	All Freehold / Leases properties where the authority has a direct repairing obligation. To be set out by property category (including both Housing and the Schools Estate). Grade 1 & historic assets listed separately. Floor space to be calculated using the RICS means of calculating gross internal floor space For B. to show property as reasonably suitable for the purpose for which it is to be used. (For the schools estate use the classification of 'good' already required in the education AMP). For definition of condition categories and priority levels, see guidance on format of an AMP.

NUMBER	2 A, B & C
OBJECTIVE	To demonstrate the justification, in financial terms, for maintaining an investment portfolio. It will ensure accountability for investment decisions illustrating the financial advantages and disadvantages of holding/disposing of assets in the investment portfolio.
INDICATOR	Current internal rate of return (IRR) for the portfolio expressed as an average for (a) Industrial, (b) Retail and (c) Agricultural investment property.
DEFINITION	<p>IRR calculated in accordance with DCF techniques based upon a 20 year projected cash flow period or the remainder of the existing property interest, whichever is the shorter. It is recognised that property is held for social as well as investment use and these reasons can be set out within the AMP document.</p> <p>The information will enable continual review of appropriateness of retention, restructuring or disposal of investment asset through:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Monitoring of performance of investment portfolio within authority over time; • Comparison of the performance within the authority; • Comparison of the performance of investment with opportunity costs (e.g. PWLB loan rate) • Comparison of performance of investments against similar investments held by other authorities / organisations - public and private. <p>The Authority will need to show how it is using the IRR information as part of future AMP submissions. <u>A worked example will be placed on the DETR and FPS website on or before 13 April.</u></p>

NUMBER	3 A & B
OBJECTIVE	To measure the cost and efficiency of property services provision.
INDICATOR	Annual Management costs per sq. m. (a) Total for operational property (b) Total for non- operational property
DEFINITION	Management activity to cover management of strategic portfolio, landlord and tenant requirements, facilities management and organising work to existing assets. Costs should not include the procurement and construction of new assets. The definition of 'management costs' to be used (information provided by FPS) is included (page 14). Management costs to be reported for both property types on gross internal floor area.

NUMBER	4 A & B
OBJECTIVE	To encourage reduction of property revenue running costs over time and year on year energy efficiency.
INDICATOR A	Revenue running cost per sq. m.
B	To measure CO₂ emissions in tonnes of carbon dioxide per sq.m for operational property. Provide a baseline for July 2002.
DEFINITION A	To be reported for operational land and buildings (excluding Housing). The requirement for year on year measurement will enable authorities to assess year on year improvement. The costs to be included are: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • All repairs and maintenance • Energy (gas, electricity, oil) • Water • Rates

DEFINITION B	<p>This indicator will focus on energy consumption rather than spend. CO₂ emissions data will fit with the UK's Climate Change Programme targets.</p> <p>To be reported for operational land and buildings excluding Housing and Schools (which are subject to separate arrangements)</p> <p>Authorities should work towards providing a baseline for July 2002.</p> <p>For more information on the calculation and its purpose, see CONTACTS section at the end of this annex.</p>
---------------------	--

NUMBER	5 A & B
OBJECTIVE	<p>To measure improvement in the delivery of new capital projects against set time / budget targets. <u>For projects where the authority is both in sole charge and is the controlling partner.</u></p> <p>Indicator seeks to measure the timeliness and cost of each new capital project in terms of those originally set for the project. It will impact on the prioritising process for projects and the local performance measures and monitoring systems put in place such as the KPI's and other measures of best practice.</p>
INDICATOR A Cost Predictability	<p>% of projects costs where outturn falls within + 5% of the estimated outturn, expressed as a %age of the total projects completed in that financial year.</p> <p>(Comparison of estimated outturn project costs at "commit to invest" with actual outturn cost at practical completion)</p>
B Time Predictability	<p>% of projects falling within + 5% of the estimated timescale, expressed as a % of the total projects completed in that financial year.</p> <p>(Comparison of estimated timescale against actual timescale for projected design and construction).</p>
DEFINITION	<p>Applies to new capital projects over £50,000 for large asset base authorities -County, Metropolitan Boroughs and Unitary Authorities - and £25,000 for District / Borough Councils.</p>
A	<p>Cost Predictability</p> <p>"Outturn projected costs" = final cost of construction work (including value of contractual claims, inflation etc) + cost of professional fees and statutory costs</p> <p>"Commit to Invest" = as Construction Best Practice definition</p> <p>"The point at which the client decided in principle to invest in a project, sets out the requirements in business terms and authorises the project team to proceed with the design"</p> <p>(Commencement of RIBA work stage C</p>
B	<p>"Time Predictability" = measure difference between 'A' & 'B' where, 'A' = the Duration from "Commit to Invest" to practical completion on site as estimated at "Commit to Invest". 'B' = Actual duration from "Commit to Invest" to date of practical</p>