

**To: City Executive Board**

**Date: 14 May 2015**

**Report of: Finance Panel (Panel of the Scrutiny Committee)**

**Title of Report: Capital Strategy**

## **Summary and Recommendations**

**Purpose of report:** To present recommendations from the Scrutiny Committee on the Capital Strategy

**Key decision?** No

**Scrutiny Lead Member:** Councillor Simmons

**Executive lead member:** Councillor Ed Turner, Executive Member for Finance, Asset Management and Public Health

**Policy Framework:** Improving value for money and service performance

**Recommendation** of the Scrutiny Committee to the City Executive Board:

We recommend that the City Executive Board approve the Capital Strategy subject to the following suggestions:

- a) To enable more accurate and consistent ratings, Key Outcomes in the Capital Project Scoring Guidance should be more clearly defined and explicitly aligned to the Council's corporate objectives (Appendix B).
- b) The Project Delivery Process and the Gateway Process should be better integrated and provide similar levels of detail at each stage (Appendix F, pages 1 and 2).
- c) A member briefing on the capital process should be offered to all City Councillors.
- d) The City Council should look to improve its project management function by exploring what can be learnt from Royal Institute of British Architects (RIBA) guidance and from partners who do project management successfully, such as the University of Oxford.

## **Appendices**

### *Appendix 1 – Executive response to recommendation*

#### **Introduction**

1. The Finance Panel pre-scrutinised the Capital Strategy at its meeting on 28 April. The Panel would like to thank Nigel Kennedy for introducing this item and answering questions.

#### **Summary of recommendations**

2. The Finance Panel endorse the Capital Strategy.
3. The Panel considered how capital schemes were evaluated against corporate priorities, and suggest that the Key Outcomes mentioned in the guidance need to be unpacked and linked to corporate priorities.
4. The Panel identified that the Project Delivery Process and the Gateway Process – Capital Projects contain different levels of detail and look like they were produced at different times. The Panel suggest that these should be better integrated and that more detail should be included for the early stages in the Project Delivery Process.
5. The Panel noted that the Corporate Asset Management and Capital (CAMAC) Programme Board is an officer board and does not provide member oversight. The Panel heard that this board has no powers. The Panel suggest that all members should be offered a briefing on the new process.
6. The Panel recognised that the City Council had previously experienced issues with the project management of major schemes. The Panel note that the University of Oxford do project management very successfully and that RIBA provide guidance, which includes the ideal skill mix required to deliver projects. The Panel suggest that the City Council should look to learn from such best practice.

***We recommend that the City Executive Board approve the Capital Strategy subject to the following suggestions:***

- a) To enable more accurate and consistent ratings, Key Outcomes in the Capital Project Scoring Guidance should be more clearly defined and explicitly aligned to the Council's corporate objectives (Appendix B).***
- b) The Project Delivery Process and the Gateway Process should be better integrated and provide similar levels of detail at each stage (Appendix F, pages 1 and 2).***
- c) A member briefing on the capital process should be offered to all City Councillors.***
- d) The City Council should look to improve its project management function by exploring what can be learnt from***

***best practice, including Royal Institute of British Architects (RIBA) guidance and partners who do project management successfully, such as the University of Oxford.***

**Name and contact details of author:-**

Andrew Brown on behalf of the Scrutiny Committee  
Scrutiny Officer  
Law and Governance  
Tel: 01865 252230 e-mail: [abrown2@oxford.gov.uk](mailto:abrown2@oxford.gov.uk)

**List of background papers: None**

**Version number: 0.1**

## Appendix 1 - Executive response to recommendation

<b>Recommendation</b>	<b>Agreed? (Y / N / In part)</b>	<b>Comment</b>	<b>Board Member / Lead Officer</b>
<p>We recommend that the City Executive Board approve the Capital Strategy subject to the following suggestions:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>a) To enable more accurate and consistent ratings, Key Outcomes in the Capital Project Scoring Guidance should be more clearly defined and explicitly aligned to the Council’s corporate objectives (Appendix B)</li> <li>b) The Project Delivery Process and the Gateway Process should be better integrated and provide similar levels of detail at each stage (Appendix F, pages 1 and 2).</li> <li>c) A member briefing on the capital process should be offered to all City Councillors.</li> <li>d) The City Council should look to improve its project management function by exploring what can be learnt from best practice, including Royal Institute of British Architects (RIBA) guidance and partners who do project management successfully, such as the University of Oxford.</li> </ul>			