

FBC Submission

19 August 2011

E-ACT Leeds East Academy

BSF Wave 1, Phase 5

Final Business Case

Proposed Project Title:	E-ACT Leeds East Academy - BSF Phase 5
Directorate/Service:	Children's Services
Responsible Officer:	Stuart Gosney
Parent Programme:	BSF, Wave 1
Document Version and Status:	V0.03 DRAFT
Document File Path:	I:\proj-workings\ed14-bsf5\05-finclose\10 fbc fin comm close\fb\20110819 fbc (short) leeds east academy v0.03 draft.doc
Date:	19 August 2011
Contact:	Craig Taylor / Martine Maxwell, Public Private Partnerships Unit, Leeds City Council

Table of Contents

1.	Table 1	4
2.	Table 2	5
3.	Table 3	13

Note: References to the Stage 0 submission throughout refer to the “Confirmation of Procurement Approval for Subsequent Phases in a BSF Wave (Stage 0)” document submitted and approved by PfS on 30 June 2011.

1. Table 1

Table 1 - Summary Scope of Phase					
School	Phase	Planned school completion date	PFI Credits (£)	Design & Build (£)	ICT (£)
Funding Approval Sought (to be approved in the FBC)					
Leeds East Academy – PfS funding	5	February 2013	-	13,377,085	1,196,250
Leeds East Academy – LCC funding	5	February 2013	-	2,413,200	
Indicative Funding for future schools (not approved in this FBC)					
NA					
Total				15,790,285	1,196,250

2. Table 2

Table 2 - Documentation to be provided		Action
1.	Brief description of the project scope;	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>
	<p>Response: The scope is as follows:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • The Academy will be a 6 form entry, mixed Academy, with 200 post-16 places (1,100 total) based on the concept formulated for The Roundhouse at Derby College. • The Academy will be 100% new build D&B project constructed on the site of the former Parklands Girl's High School. • The new building consists of a steel trussed North Light frame on concrete pad foundations clad with steel panels set on a brick plinth at ground level. There will be large areas of powder coated aluminium curtain walling with some glass, particularly at low level but generally polycarbonate glazing. The roof will be a built-up system incorporating at least 10% North Lights with perforated finished liner deck. Internally there will be approximately 31 'pod rooms' of varying sizes which in the main will be teaching spaces. The pods consist of modular steel panels over clad with either glass or coated steel elevation. In addition there will be a number of open learning spaces with associated FF&E. Large internal spaces such as the Sports Hall, Hall, drama and activity studios will be built in a more traditional manner using blockwork for robustness. The teaching and administration rooms to the North of the building will be created using lightweight metal stud partitioning with painted plasterboard or glazing in the style of the pods. • External treatment consists of soft & hard landscape to the front of the building and to the teaching areas to the rear. The existing car park and entrances are to be retained and will be supplemented with a new vehicular access. The existing tennis courts will be resurfaced to provide hard play area. 	
2.a	For first FBCs a description of the procurement process for each element of the project (D&B, PFI, ICT) demonstrating that it followed EU Guidelines and that competition was appropriately maintained;	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>
	Response: This is not the first FBC for Wave 1.	
2.b	For 2 nd or subsequent FBCs a description of the evaluation process for each service elements (D&B, PFI, ICT) and confirmation that the NPAP was properly followed;	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>
	<p>Response: The design and construction of Leeds East Academy will be procured through the Leeds LEP which has sole</p>	

	<p>and exclusive right to construct the Academy under the Strategic Partnership Agreement (SPA) signed on the 3 April 2007 with Leeds City Council. The exclusivity afforded is dependent on the LEP successfully proceeding through two approval stages of the NPP process. This process requires the LEP to submit proposals in accordance with the submission requirements identified in the SPA and LCC to evaluate in accordance with agreed evaluation criteria as specified in NPP Guidance Volume 1.</p> <p>On 24 June 2011, the LEP submitted their NPP Stage 1 proposal which was evaluated and subsequently approved by the City Council. On the 07 July 2011 the City Council wrote to the LEP inviting them to enter into NPP Stage 2. The Stage 2 submission was received on the 19 August 2011 and is expected to be approved by 16 September 2011. Commercial and Financial close is planned for 13 October 2011.</p> <p>This FBC will confirm that the LEP's proposals have successfully proceeded through these stages.</p>															
3	An approved project budget demonstrating that the procurement and delivery phase are appropriately resourced;	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>														
	<p>Response: The construction budget for the project is £14,288,535 which excludes the ICT budget, Authority Works, Project Management Fee Account and the capital contribution held in the BSF Programme contingency fund. The overall budget is summarised below.</p> <table border="1" data-bbox="510 831 1538 1342"> <thead> <tr> <th>Project Budget</th> <th>£</th> </tr> </thead> <tbody> <tr> <td>Construction Budget</td> <td>14,288,535</td> </tr> <tr> <td>ICT Budget</td> <td>880,000</td> </tr> <tr> <td>LCC Authority Works</td> <td>226,000</td> </tr> <tr> <td>Project Management (PM) Fee Account *</td> <td>565,000</td> </tr> <tr> <td>LCC Capital Contribution held in BSF Programme Contingency fund</td> <td>1,027,000</td> </tr> <tr> <td>TOTAL Budget</td> <td>16,986,535</td> </tr> </tbody> </table>	Project Budget	£	Construction Budget	14,288,535	ICT Budget	880,000	LCC Authority Works	226,000	Project Management (PM) Fee Account *	565,000	LCC Capital Contribution held in BSF Programme Contingency fund	1,027,000	TOTAL Budget	16,986,535	
Project Budget	£															
Construction Budget	14,288,535															
ICT Budget	880,000															
LCC Authority Works	226,000															
Project Management (PM) Fee Account *	565,000															
LCC Capital Contribution held in BSF Programme Contingency fund	1,027,000															
TOTAL Budget	16,986,535															

	<p>*The PM fee account covers costs for Procurement, Survey and Planning fees</p> <p>Procurement costs for this project and for the academy transfer will be met from the project. The Project management fee account has been allocated for this purpose. These costs include PPPU, external and internal advisors costs but not Children's Services costs which will be met by the department. The procurement cost projections reflect the City Council's experience of delivering Phase 1-4 of the Programme and previous schools PFI projects.</p> <p>The project budget was approved by the Executive Board on 22 June 2011. Please refer to Appendix 7a and 7b of the Stage 0 submission for the report and minutes.</p>	
4.	Project Risk Register for the delivery of this Phase;	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>
	Response: Please refer to Table 2, section 1 of the Stage 0 submission for Risk Register. An updated Risk Register has been included as Appendix 1 .	
5.	Derogations List applicable to this Phase and comment from Commercial Manager as to how and when these are expected to be resolved;	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>
	Response: Please refer to Table 2, section 2 of Stage 0 submission for agreement that Leeds West Academy will be used as baselines for derogations. Discussions are well advanced between all parties and the final derogation tables (Development Agreement and D&B Contract) are expected to be agreed by 19 September 2011. The derogation tables will be included as Appendix 2a Development Agreement and Appendix 2b D&B Contract. Derogation tables to follow 19 September 2011.	JAS/PS
6.	Programme for the Delivery of this Phase in the context of the whole LA BSF project;	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>
	Response: Please refer to Table 2, section 3 of Stage 0 submission for Programmes. Some minor changes have occurred therefore an amended BSF programme and E-ACT Leeds East Academy Programme have been included as Appendices 3a & 3b respectively.	
7	The approved Funding Allocation Model;	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>
	Response: Please refer to Table 2, section 4 of Stage 0 submission for the Funding Allocation Model	
8.	Section 151 Letter underwriting all LA programme and delivery costs for this phase (See Guidance) and confirming that the remainder of the Wave remains affordable;	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>

	Response: Please refer to Table 2, section 5 of Stage 0 submission fro the Section 151 letter.									
9.	School and / or other Stakeholder Commitment Letters relating to ICT, FM, Lifecycle and any Capital Contributions that may be required to deliver this project. Stakeholders to include: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Diocesan bodies • Foundations & Trusts • LSC • Any other stakeholders identified in the SBC/OBC/FBC (See Guidance);	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>								
	Response: Please refer to Table 2, section 6 of Stage 0 submission for commitment letters.									
10.	Cabinet / Member Commitment for the resourcing, affordability and approval of this proposal;	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>								
	Response: Please refer to Table 2, section 7 of Stage 0 submission for the Executive Board report and minutes of 22 June 2011. This has been reconfirmed by the Executive Board report and minutes of 7 September 2011 included as Appendices 4a & 4b respectively. Appendix 4b to follow after Executive Board 7 September 2011.	CT/MM								
11	Completed versions of the financial and technical proformas to enable capture of KPI and benchmarking data;	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>								
	<p>Response: The Proforma 4d at present reflects the original construction budget of £13,693,335 prior to the injection of the additional funding of £595,200. The attached costed opportunities log in Appendix 5b details the spend of the additional funding. The Proforma 4d will be revised on agreement of the opportunities log and resubmitted on 19 September 2011. A breakdown of the construction budget is shown below:</p> <table border="1" data-bbox="510 1034 1538 1329"> <tr> <td>4d Proforma</td> <td>13,693,335</td> </tr> <tr> <td>Opportunities Log</td> <td>400,000</td> </tr> <tr> <td>Contingency</td> <td>195,200</td> </tr> <tr> <td>TOTAL Construction Budget</td> <td>14,288,535</td> </tr> </table>	4d Proforma	13,693,335	Opportunities Log	400,000	Contingency	195,200	TOTAL Construction Budget	14,288,535	
4d Proforma	13,693,335									
Opportunities Log	400,000									
Contingency	195,200									
TOTAL Construction Budget	14,288,535									

	<p>Please refer to Appendices: Appendix 5a - Financial & Technical Proformas Appendix 5b - Opportunities Log</p>	
12	Evidence of an Approved Planning Brief, Outline Planning Permission or Full Planning Permission.;	☑
	<p>Response:</p> <p>It is accepted that approval of the FBC is conditional on full planning permission being achieved.</p> <p>Planning permission will be determined at the 06 October Leeds (East) Plans Panel.</p> <p>The LA and LEP have determined where the planning risk lies as follows, which is in line with the standard form New Project Approval Process. Transfer of risk back to the LA from the LEP will be avoided.</p> <p>The SPA (para 2.3.7.1) requires the City Council for all projects over £2 million to obtain outline planning permission. For this project it has been agreed with the Leeds LEP that this is not necessary as the procurement programme would have been increased and outline planning approval had already been approved when the project was in Phase 3 of Leeds' BSF programme (although this has now lapsed and was for a refurbishment and new build scheme it approved the principle of a school on this site). Therefore, it was agreed with the Leeds LEP that only detailed planning approval should be applied for.</p> <p>The SPA (para 4.3.7) requires the Leeds LEP to have obtained detailed planning permission before the City Council can approve the New Project Final Submission (NPP2). Although this places the planning risk with the Leeds LEP, paragraph 4.3A.3 of the SPA requires the City Council to give reasonable assistance to the LEP in relation to procurement by the LEP of all relevant consents. Therefore, it is the intent of the City Council to work with the LEP to ensure that the planning risk is mitigated as far as possible, as evidenced below.</p> <p>Furthermore, the City Council has injected further funding into the scheme. to be partly used as a contingency fund within the control of the Local Authority to mitigate the risks arising to the project from the planning process and give us the comfort that we can meet requests for external material changes and landscaping etc without requiring any further approvals to access the wider programme level contingency. The Children's Services Project Board are satisfied with this position.</p> <p>As is usual with Leeds BSF projects the City Council will take risk of planning challenge via Judicial Review. The judicial review period will end on the 13 January 2012.</p> <p>The following provides details of how planning, urban design and consultation have been considered during</p>	

development of the scheme:

In accordance with the Council's Planning Guidance and key planning policies (e.g. Pre-application Consultation Protocol, Pre-application Advise Charter etc.), consideration has been given to a number of options in terms of building type and site placement, consultation has taken place with relevant parties and pre-application information has been presented to the Plans Panel on 14 April 2011 and again on 16 June. The Full Planning Application was submitted on 18 July. These processes have allowed time for views and concerns to be considered and fed back into the design review process where appropriate. For information relating to the 1st Plans Panel Pre-application, refer to the following Appendices from the **Stage 0 submission**:

- Appendix 8a – Report of the Chief Planning Officer to Plans Panel East – Pre Application Presentation (14 April 2011)
- Appendix 8b – Notes of Plans Panel East (14 April 2011)
- Appendix 8c - LCC Response to Comments / Concerns from Pre-application presentation for Proposed East Leeds Academy on 14 April 2011.

A programme has been provided showing how the planning consultation process has been carried out in the context of the NPP process including liaison with the planning officer, urban design, the Executive Member for Education, local ward members and the public, staff and pupils to gain support and mitigate risks. The consultation programme was included as Appendix 8h of the Stage 0 submission. For an updated version of this document, please refer to **Appendix 6a** of this FBC.

In relation to this programme, the following reports and notes are also included:

- **Appendix 6b** – Report of the Chief Planning Officer to Plans Panel East – Pre Application Presentation (16 June 2011)
- **Appendix 6c** – Notes from the members briefing (10 June 2011)
- **Appendix 6d** – Notes from the Design and Landscape meeting (26 June 2011)
- **Appendix 6e** – Report of Director of Children's Services to Area Committees (Inner and outer East)

	<p>A further update has also been arranged in the form of a position statement to the Plans Panel (East) on 8 September 2011. Please refer to Appendix 7a for details. To follow after the Plans Panel (East) 8 Sept 2011.</p> <p>The Planning Decision notice is attached as Appendix 7b. To follow after the Plans Panel (East) 6 October 2011.</p>	
13	Evidence of approval of other statutory proposals;	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>
	<p>Response: Executive Board have approved the following statutory proposals relating to the closure of the school and establishment of an academy:</p> <p>On 07 April 2010, Members of Executive Board approved the publication of a statutory notice to close Parklands Girls' High School on 31 August 2011 conditional upon the Department for Children, Schools and Families (DCSF) approval to open an academy on that site opening 01 September 2011. Please refer to Appendix 8 for minutes of this meeting.</p> <p>In October 2010, the Department for Education (formerly DCSF) approved the Expression of Interest for an Academy sponsored by E-ACT. The Academy will open in the existing building on the site of the former Parklands Girl's High School on 01 September 2011.</p>	
14.	Responses to questions in Table 3 with additional provided where required;	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>
	Response: Please refer to Table 3	
15	<p>A letter from the DCS:</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1) confirming the authority's continued commitment to its educational transformation strategy originally described in the Education Vision / Strategy for Change; 2) highlighting substantive changes to the authority's education strategy in response to national policy, local priorities or challenges subsequent to the original submission (i.e. aspects of the LA's or individual schools' Strategies for Change which have been refreshed); 3) Updating PfS on the development and delivery of educational KPIs and the change management plan. 	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>
	Response: Please refer to Table 2, section 10 of the Stage 0 submission for E-ACT commitment letter and associated documents.	
16	Confirmation from PfS of the number of bidders who have expressed their intentions to bid this project, in writing,	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>

	to PfS. Note that a market must be confirmed before the project will be allowed to OJEU.	
	Response: As this is a subsequent Phase of BSF Wave 1 in Leeds delivered through the Leeds LEP, bidders are not applicable.	

3. Table 3

Table 3 - Key Questions and Further Information Required		
1	Are there any changes in the scope of this phase/school from the original OBC/Stage 1 Approval? Please provide details;	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>
	Response: No, please refer to Table 3, section 1 of Stage 0 submission for details of scope/funding which remains the same.	
2	Has the authority set an approved and realistic budget for the delivery of the whole Wave including this phase/school (and including advisory fees) to cover the whole development and delivery period? Please provide details;	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>
	Response: Yes, please refer to Table 3, section 2 of Stage 0 submission for details.	
3	Has a contingency been allocated commensurate with the risk profile? Is this reasonable and how is it funded? Does the 151 Letter commit to returning any unspent elements of the BSF funding allocation at the end of the whole Wave procurement?	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>
	Response: Yes, please refer to Table 3, section 3 of Stage 0 submission for details	
4.	Has the LA put arrangements in place for the client/delivery phases of this part of the project Are these sufficient? Please provide details;	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>
	Response: Yes, please refer to Table 3, section 4 of Stage 0 submission for details	
5.	Has VfM been demonstrated for the whole BSF project (including the application of HMT guidance for PFI elements)? Please provide details	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>
	Response: There are no PFI elements applicable to the Leeds BSF Phase 5 scheme covered by this FBC. For conventionally funded elements of this scheme, please refer to table in section 6 below.	
6	Have the costs of the conventionally funded elements of the project, including ICT been compared to the OBC estimates? Does this demonstrate that the deal is 'on market'? Please provide details	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>
	Response: The following comparison table shows funding from the original OBC, at Stage 0 submission and for this FBC. There have been no variations to the funding and scope between the approved Stage 0 submission and this FBC.	

Funding Source	Original OBC Allocation	Revised Allocation (change to Academy)	Stage 0 Allocation (BSF Efficiencies)	FBC Allocation
PfS funding	8,194,339	18,194,339	13,377,085	13,377,085
PfS ICT funding	1,276,000	1,595,000	1,196,250	1,196,250
SUB TOTAL (PfS Funding)	9,470,339	19,789,339	14,573,335	14,573,335
LCC Capital Contribution (against scheme)	595,200	595,200	595,200	595,200
LCC Capital Contribution held in BSF Programme Contingency fund (previously allocated to scheme)	1,027,000	1,027,000	1,027,000	1,027,000
LCC Authority Works	226,000	226,000	226,000	226,000
Project Management Fee account			565,000	565,000
SUB TOTAL (LCC Funding)	1,848,200	1,848,200	2,413,200	2,413,200
TOTAL	11,318,539	21,637,539	16,986,535	16,986,535

This FBC and appendices confirm that the price submitted by the LEP is affordable to the City Council and remains good value for money for the City Council.

A Market Testing Strategy which takes into account the accelerated NPP process has been developed and agreed between the City Council, the LEP and Interserve for Leeds East Academy.

- During NPP1, the contractor has committed to developing and reviewing the Stage 0 cost plan as the design develops and has engaged a number of strategic partners with experience of delivering similar education projects.
- The high level cost plan received at NPP1 has been monitored, checked and agreed with the City Council and it's financial advisors.
- During NPP2, the contractor has committed to developing the NPP1 cost plan into a detailed cost plan. The process has been monitored and reviewed by the Market Testing Team which includes the LEP and City Council representatives. Some targeted Market Testing has been undertaken using the principles of Schedule 4A of the Strategic Partnering Agreement.

	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> The NPP2 cost plan has been benchmarked against data available from other similar schemes and verified using quotations from supply chain partners for key subcontract packages. Detailed costs have also been developed with strategic partners for specific areas of the scheme such as the “Pods”. All information has been made available for the City Council to review. The costs plan has also been benchmarked against the revised PfS Academy Framework rates. <p>Leeds City Council can confirm that their Technical Advisors (EC Harris) have checked the LEP’s cost against the Funding Allocation Model (FAM) and the estimates provided at Stage 0 and can confirm that the overall solution is ‘on market’.</p> <p>E-ACT’s ICT team and RM have been involved in the design process and have attended Design Development Meetings. E-ACT also issued the design and build team high level guidelines for the impact of ICT upon the construction, based upon previous experience of building an academy.</p> <p>The ICT budget for hardware and infrastructure capital budget (£880k) is to be delivered to E-ACT via the existing ICT Strategic Partner arrangement.</p> <p>The costs from the implementation will be met fully by the ICT Capital Grant.</p>	
7	<p>Has the LA demonstrated that the project is affordable in respect of:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> PFI; Conventionally funded D&B;– capital build and annual FM and LCC; ICT– capital and refresh/ annual managed services; Equity investment in the LEP& PFI SPVs. <p>Please provide details</p>	☑
	<p>Response: This is a conventionally funded D&B project with ICT funding. PFI does not apply. Please refer to Table 3, section 10 of Stage 0 submission for affordability of the D&B element Please refer to Table 3, section 11 of Stage 0 submission for affordability of D&B FM strategy Please refer to Table 3, section 12 of Stage 0 submission for affordability of ICT strategy and solution</p>	
8	<p>Does the overall BSF affordability model correctly represent:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> For PFI: the Unitary Payments, School Governing Body contributions and PFI Credits allocated, For D&B schemes and ICT: the payments to the LEP, the capital (either grant or supported borrowing) 	☑

	<p>approvals made available through BSF and School Governing Body contributions;</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> For all investment: other resources available to fund the project set out in the FBC (including TPI)? <p>Please provide details</p>	
	<p>Response: Please refer to Table 3, section 6 above which demonstrates the overall BSF affordability of the D&B and ICT through BSF funding and capital contributions from the City Council. There are no Governing Body contributions, other resources or PFI elements.</p> <p>As previously mentioned in Table 2, section 3, the Authority's contributions (including Authority Works) for this scheme have been approved by the Executive Board on 22 June 2011 (see Appendix 7a and 7b of the Stage 0 submission for the report and minutes).</p>	
9	<p>On Capital Contributions:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Is there any form of land sale capital receipt during the project life? If yes, does the risk assessment include the risk of delay of sale of land by the LA? If the contribution is being made to a PFI scheme does the form and timing satisfy the requirements of SOPC4? Have the proceeds of any capital receipts been shared with the BSF programme funding in accordance with BSF Funding guidance? Has the Authority secured other capital sources? Is the affordability of the schemes dependant on it being secured? Please provide details 	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>
	<p>Response:</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> There is no form of land sale, please refer to Table 3, section 8 of Stage 0 submission Other capital sources have already been secured. 	
10	<p>Confirmation that Risk Allocation is appropriate for PFI Projects and has not changed since OBC.</p>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>
	<p>Response: Not applicable to this FBC as no PFI element applies.</p>	
11.	<p>Confirmation that the contractual documents comply with the latest published versions of the PfS standard documents?</p>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>
	<p>Response: The City Council has used the contract documentation agreed for Leeds West Academy (BSF Phase 4), as the template for the contracts for E-ACT Leeds East Academy, namely:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> The 2006 Design and Build contract (based on PfS standard form) The Development Agreement (based on PfS standard form) Arrangements to appoint an independent certifier to assess the quality of Interserve's work and who 	

	<p>will confirm compliance to the City Council's requirements as well as relevant legislation</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Appropriate collateral warranties to the City Council and where relevant to E-ACT <p>These documents will contain Project specific amendments agreed with all parties including PfS.</p>	
12	<p>Is ICT being procured as part of the LEP, or as a separate contract? If the latter, has the LA demonstrated how ICT will be fully integrated into the overall BSF project? Are these mechanisms robust and functional?</p>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>
	<p>Response: As part of BSF Phase I, Leeds City Council procured a Strategic Partner for ICT, RM Education, in order to gain benefits across all schools through economies of scale. The scope of the proposed procurement was set out in the Final Business Case for the ICT Strategic Partner Contract approved by PfS in 2007.</p> <p>RM's involvement in Leeds is much more than hardware and software supply and maintenance. It is about providing strategic support to schools, professional development for all staff and ensuring that the technology in schools is relevant and robust to deliver E-ACT's ICT vision for learning environments.</p> <p>E-ACT will "opt-in" and work with the Council and its ICT Strategic Partner to define and agree the nature and delivery of the ICT and related managed services.</p> <p>RM will provide a managed ICT service comprising the following elements:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Strategic Services • Operational Services • Continuing Professional Development services <p>RM will continue to work with E-ACT and Interserve throughout the following programme stages to ensure ICT is fully integrated into the scheme:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Pre-financial close to support and give input to issues relating to design and the curriculum • In the build-up to construction, to give input and advice to succession of room and building designs • During construction works period to develop and agree entry and exit points for ICT installation and ensure that the building is ICT-ready • During handover/implementation to ensure a smooth transition 	

	There is a defined project manager and team within E-ACT and RM to scope, agree and implement the ICT solutions. Regular reviews have been held and will continue between these teams, Interserve and their supply chain partners.																																									
13	Has the LA detailed their Project Management Structure to be used beyond financial close and is it appropriately structured and resourced?	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>																																								
<p>Response: The following Project Team have been resourced to work on the project after financial close:</p> <table border="1"> <thead> <tr> <th>Role on Project</th> <th>Position</th> <th>Name</th> <th>Time Commitment</th> </tr> </thead> <tbody> <tr> <td>Owner</td> <td>Deputy Director of Children's Services (Commissioning) (LCC)</td> <td>Sarah Sinclair</td> <td>P/T</td> </tr> <tr> <td>Project Director</td> <td>Director of Planning and Learning Environments (Children's Services, LCC)</td> <td>Jackie Green</td> <td>P/T</td> </tr> <tr> <td>Project Team Lead</td> <td>Head of BSF and Academies (Children's Services, LCC)</td> <td>Stuart Gosney</td> <td>P/T</td> </tr> <tr> <td>Project Co-ordinator</td> <td>Project Co-ordinator (Children's Services, LCC)</td> <td>Amanda Jahdi</td> <td>P/T</td> </tr> <tr> <td>Technical Adviser</td> <td>Senior Technical Manager (PPPU, LCC)</td> <td>Jay Patel</td> <td>P/T</td> </tr> <tr> <td>Construction Monitor</td> <td>Technical Manager (PPPU, LCC)</td> <td>Terry White</td> <td>P/T</td> </tr> <tr> <td>FM Adviser</td> <td>Technical Officer (PPPU, LCC)</td> <td>Phil Andrews</td> <td>P/T</td> </tr> <tr> <td>Project Management</td> <td>Project Manager (PPPU, LCC)</td> <td>Craig Taylor</td> <td>P/T</td> </tr> <tr> <td>Project Management</td> <td>Project Assistant (PPPU, LCC)</td> <td>Martine Maxwell</td> <td>P/T</td> </tr> </tbody> </table>			Role on Project	Position	Name	Time Commitment	Owner	Deputy Director of Children's Services (Commissioning) (LCC)	Sarah Sinclair	P/T	Project Director	Director of Planning and Learning Environments (Children's Services, LCC)	Jackie Green	P/T	Project Team Lead	Head of BSF and Academies (Children's Services, LCC)	Stuart Gosney	P/T	Project Co-ordinator	Project Co-ordinator (Children's Services, LCC)	Amanda Jahdi	P/T	Technical Adviser	Senior Technical Manager (PPPU, LCC)	Jay Patel	P/T	Construction Monitor	Technical Manager (PPPU, LCC)	Terry White	P/T	FM Adviser	Technical Officer (PPPU, LCC)	Phil Andrews	P/T	Project Management	Project Manager (PPPU, LCC)	Craig Taylor	P/T	Project Management	Project Assistant (PPPU, LCC)	Martine Maxwell	P/T
Role on Project	Position	Name	Time Commitment																																							
Owner	Deputy Director of Children's Services (Commissioning) (LCC)	Sarah Sinclair	P/T																																							
Project Director	Director of Planning and Learning Environments (Children's Services, LCC)	Jackie Green	P/T																																							
Project Team Lead	Head of BSF and Academies (Children's Services, LCC)	Stuart Gosney	P/T																																							
Project Co-ordinator	Project Co-ordinator (Children's Services, LCC)	Amanda Jahdi	P/T																																							
Technical Adviser	Senior Technical Manager (PPPU, LCC)	Jay Patel	P/T																																							
Construction Monitor	Technical Manager (PPPU, LCC)	Terry White	P/T																																							
FM Adviser	Technical Officer (PPPU, LCC)	Phil Andrews	P/T																																							
Project Management	Project Manager (PPPU, LCC)	Craig Taylor	P/T																																							
Project Management	Project Assistant (PPPU, LCC)	Martine Maxwell	P/T																																							

	<table border="1"> <tr> <td>ICT Adviser</td> <td>Director of ICT (E-ACT)</td> <td>Chris Meaney</td> <td>P/T</td> </tr> <tr> <td>ICT Adviser</td> <td>Project Manager (RM)</td> <td>Tony Bennett</td> <td>P/T</td> </tr> <tr> <td>Financial Adviser</td> <td>Project Accountant (PPPU, LCC)</td> <td>Matthew Cooper</td> <td>P/T</td> </tr> <tr> <td>Technical Adviser</td> <td>Technical Cost Adviser (EC Harris)</td> <td>Dan Gaunt</td> <td>P/T</td> </tr> <tr> <td>Legal Adviser</td> <td>Project Solicitor (PPPU, LCC)</td> <td>Jacqueline Ainsley-Stringer</td> <td>P/T</td> </tr> </table>	ICT Adviser	Director of ICT (E-ACT)	Chris Meaney	P/T	ICT Adviser	Project Manager (RM)	Tony Bennett	P/T	Financial Adviser	Project Accountant (PPPU, LCC)	Matthew Cooper	P/T	Technical Adviser	Technical Cost Adviser (EC Harris)	Dan Gaunt	P/T	Legal Adviser	Project Solicitor (PPPU, LCC)	Jacqueline Ainsley-Stringer	P/T	
ICT Adviser	Director of ICT (E-ACT)	Chris Meaney	P/T																			
ICT Adviser	Project Manager (RM)	Tony Bennett	P/T																			
Financial Adviser	Project Accountant (PPPU, LCC)	Matthew Cooper	P/T																			
Technical Adviser	Technical Cost Adviser (EC Harris)	Dan Gaunt	P/T																			
Legal Adviser	Project Solicitor (PPPU, LCC)	Jacqueline Ainsley-Stringer	P/T																			
	Children's Services Project Board will also continue to monitor the progress of the scheme through construction until project closure.																					
14	Has Section 77 Approval been gained in respect of sites for disposal in relation to this phase?	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>																				
	Response: Not applicable as stated previously – refer to Table 3, section 5 of Stage 0 submission																					
15	<p>Are any other statutory processes outstanding? (e.g.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • public enquiries, • public consultations, • CPOs, • School closures, • amalgamations or change of status, • agreement from Sport England concerning school playing fields) • Learning and Skills Act 2000 • Disposal of land below market value • Listing • Environmental issues <p>If so, have all the material issues been resolved? Note that the Phase cannot be approved until these are complete.</p>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>																				
	Response: None outstanding as stated previously - refer to Table 3, section 6 of Stage 0 submission																					
16	Has the change management strategy and plan been updated as a result of analysis of the effectiveness and impact	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>																				

	of earlier waves?	
	Response: Please refer to Table 3, section 13 of Stage 0 submission	
17	Are the school strategies for change in this phase/wave properly reflected in the design options proposed?	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>
	Response: Please refer to Table 3, section 14 of Stage 0 submission	
18	Are the educational KPIs proposed for this phase: i) a good match with the principal intents of the refreshed education vision and strategy? ii) informed by evaluation of progress towards KPI outcomes in earlier waves/phases?	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>
	Response: Please refer to Table 3, section 15 of Stage 0 submission	