BOROUGH COUNCIL OF KING'S LYNN & WEST NORFOLK

MEMBER MAJOR PROJECTS BOARD

Minutes from the Meeting of the Member Major Projects Board held on Friday, 7th October, 2022 at 10.00 am in the Council Chamber, Town Hall, Saturday Market Place, King's Lynn PE30 5DQ

PRESENT: Councillors R Blunt, S Dark, A Dickinson, A Kemp, G Middleton and C Morley (substitute for A Ryves).

PRESENT UNDER STANDING ORDER 34: Councillor de Whalley

OFFICERS:
Vanessa Dunmall – Corporate Projects Programme Manager
Chris Upton – Project Accountant
Russel Eacott – Interim Technical and Delivery Advisor
Matthew Henry – Assistant Director, Property and Projects
Lorraine Gore – Chief Executive

1 **APPOINTMENT OF CHAIR FOR THE MUNICIPAL YEAR 2022/2023**

Click here to view the recording of this item on You Tube

RESOLVED: That Councillor Blunt be appointed Chair for the Municipal Year.

2 **APPOINTMENT OF VICE CHAIR FOR THE MUNICIPAL YEAR 2022/2023**

Click here to view a recording of this item on You Tube.

RESOLVED: That Councillor Dickinson be appointed Vice Chair for the Municipal Year.

3 **INTRODUCTIONS**

Click here to view the recording of this item on You Tube.

The Chair welcomed Russell Eacott to the meeting who was the Interim Technical and Delivery Advisor.

4 **APOLOGIES FOR ABSENCE**

Apologies for absence were received from Councillor Ryves.

5   **MINUTES FROM THE PREVIOUS MEETING**

         RESOLVED: The Minutes of the previous meeting were agreed as a
         correct record.

6   **DECLARATIONS OF INTEREST**

         There was none.

7   **URGENT BUSINESS UNDER STANDING ORDER 7**

         There was none.

8   **MEMBERS PRESENT PURSUANT TO STANDING ORDER 34**

         Councillor de Whalley.

9   **CHAIR'S CORRESPONDENCE (IF ANY)**

         There was none.

10   **PRESENTATION ON RAG MONITORING DEFINITIONS**

         Click here to view the recording of this item on You Tube.

         Members were presented with information on RAG Monitoring
         Definitions. A copy of the presentation is attached.

         The Board were asked to consider the proposed split into Delivery,
         Spend and Risk, whether the overall RAG was useful and any changes
         they would like to see.

         The Chair thanked officers for the information and invited questions
         and comments from the Panel, as summarised below.

         Comments were made that categories were important to highlight what
         had been designated a Major Project by Cabinet and what was not yet
         at that stage. It was noted that the delivery of Business Cases was
         considered as a separate project to the actual delivery of the project,
         and this needed to be highlighted.

         The definition of a Major Project, in accordance with the Board's
         current Terms of Reference was a project that had been designated
         such by the Cabinet and the Board was reminded that any change to
         this approach would require a change to the Board's Terms of
         Reference. Councillor Dickinson suggested that it be changed to all
         projects over 1/4million and that took over 12 months to complete.

The Chair commented that if the Member Major Project Board felt a project did warrant consideration by the Board, but had not been designated a Major Project by Cabinet, it should come to the Board as a specific request/proposal.

Councillor Kemp commented that there was no process for post evaluation, and it was explained that this was part of the role of the Panels. She was also reminded that the Queen Elizabeth Hospital was not a project in the Council's control, although the Council would support where possible.

Councillor Morley made comments on the schedule and suggested that ongoing and un-started projects be separated out into two different schedules, bid phases and delivery phases also be separated out and additional columns be added for time, cost, scope and risk.

Councillor Middleton commented that the colour coding was required, and it should also be used to show what had been successful and celebrate the positives that the Council had achieved.

Councillor de Whalley addressed the Board under Standing Order 34. He agreed with comments made by Councillor Morley in that there should be a separate schedule for the bid phase and the delivery phase of projects. He commented that consideration needed to be given to post delivery evaluation and lessons learned. The Board was reminded that their role was not post evaluation of projects as this was a scrutiny function and would be undertaken by the relevant Panel.

Councillor Morley suggested that the Terms of Reference be brought to the Board for review.

The Assistant Director, Property and Projects commented that the Board could ask for a deeper dive of projects upon receipt of the schedule and then information could be presented to the Board.

The Chief Executive reminded the Board that only projects which had been determined as Major Projects by Cabinet were presented to the Member Major Projects Board. All others were included in the Capital Programme which fell under the remit of the Panels to monitor.

The Vice Chair, Councillor Dickinson felt that there was some information missing in the schedule to enable the Board to fulfil its role and suggested the following be included:

- Timeline for each project
- Information on any delays or project creep and impacts this had on costs.
- Delivery issues
- Risk specific to each project
- Costs and funding
- Ongoing implications e.g., resourcing issues and revenue costs.

AGREED: 1. The Chair and Vice Chair to discuss the contents and coding of the schedule, taking into consideration the comments above. 2. The Assistant Director Property and Projects to look at a system for flagging up projects for which the Board want to look at in more detail and how they are brought back to the Board in a timely manner.

11   **MONITORING REPORT**

Click here to view a recording of this item on You Tube.

Officers presented the Monitoring Report which had been updated with comments as up to the end of August.

The Chair commented that it was difficult to see the detail and asked if links could be added to the spreadsheet so that Members could drill down into more detail.

Councillor Morley referred to the NORA Enterprise Zone Road Infrastructure Project which was currently rated Amber. The Assistant Director Property and Projects explained that this had now been tendered, contractors were in place and work was ready to commence on site and this rating could be changed to green.

Councillor Kemp referred to the Library and the Multi User Community Hub and was reminded that this was a Norfolk County Council Project, but was included in the schedule as the Council was the accountable body. It was confirmed that the project was Treasury Green Book compliant and had been subject to assessment.

12   **WORK PROGRAMME**

Click here to view the recording of this item on You Tube.

The following were suggested for addition to the Work Programme:

- Guildhall Project to be added to 9th December 2022.
- Hunstanton Bus Station and Library had been previously identified for consideration at the meeting on 9th December 2022.
- Schedule of Meetings for 2023.

RESOLVED: The Work Programme was noted.

13   **MINUTES OF THE OFFICER MAJOR PROJECTS BOARD HELD ON 13 JULY 2022**

Click here to view the recording of this item on You Tube.

The Board reviewed the minutes of the Officer Major Projects Board held on 13 July 2022.

Councillor Kemp raised concerns relating to matters discussed relating to Hardings Way. The Chief Executive referred Councillor Kempt to the minutes and confirmed that this was part of an officer discussion and that in looking at the agreement in the minutes it was not one of the options which was taken forward.

Councillor Dark reminded the Board that the Officer Board was a forum for looking at a wide range of options and opportunities.

Councillor Morley asked why there had not been a meeting of the Officer Major Projects Board since July and was informed that the last meeting had been cancelled as it was during the National Mourning Period.

14   **DATE OF NEXT MEETING**

The next meeting was scheduled to take place on 9 December 2022 at 10.00am in the Town Hall, King's Lynn.

The meeting closed at 11.25 am

RAG monitoring definitions

6

Member Major Projects Board

7th October 2022

Borough Council of
**King's Lynn &
West Norfolk**

Introduction

At the MMPB meeting of 26 July an overview of the RAG ratings used on the monitoring report was requested

Today will cover

- Background to previous RAG definitions used
- Overview of those now in use
- Feedback from MMPB

Borough Council of
**King's Lynn &
West Norfolk**

Background

- When the MMPB was first in place, a simpler RAG system was proposed*:

RED	AMBER	GREEN	BLUE	WHITE
Significant issues exist requiring consideration by Project or Programme Board and immediate action to be taken. Benefits – it is probable that the intended benefit will not be achieved	Some (actual or anticipated) variation from the project plan but actions in hand to maintain progress. Benefits - some of the intended benefit may not be achieved	On schedule – progress in line with agreed project plan Benefits – it is forecast that this benefit will be achieved	Project / Work Package / Benefit completed	Being developed - Project has been approved but is in Initiation Stage

8

* Cabinet report June 2019

Borough Council of
King's Lynn &
West Norfolk

Background

- Monitoring didn't effectively 'get off the ground' in 2019

- 2020-late 2021 Impact of Covid-19 pandemic

- November 2021 – update to Terms of Reference, brought in the definition that MMPB would review projects that Cabinet decided – ie the list of Major Projects

- Early 2022 – Project Accountant role in place, Corporate Projects Programme role updated – increased capacity to work on a monitoring report

Borough Council of
King's Lynn &
West Norfolk

Monitoring Report – work in progress

- The monitoring report brought to MMPB is work in progress and is being developed following feedback received at each MMPB meeting

- Following the list of defined projects, RAG definitions used have been reviewed

- More detailed ones proposed to assist the Board, the blue and white ratings not considered so relevant – for discussion today

BLUE	WHITE
Project / Work Package / Benefit completed	Being developed - Project has been approved but is in Initiation Stage

RAG definitions

Borough Council of
**King's Lynn &
West Norfolk**

RAG definitions currently in use

- Taken from a government monitoring return – didn't want to 'reinvent the wheel' – BUT – if not what MMPB want, can adjust / change
- This is how the information is currently presented for each Major Project:

Overall RAG rating		
Amber		
Delivery	Spend	Risk
3	4	2

- Ratings are given by the project lead

Borough Council of
King's Lynn &
West Norfolk

RAG Definitions					
Delivery	Score	**Spend**	Score	**Risks**	Score
Major issues causing significant delays (**more than 6 months**); processes interrupted or not carried out as planned (e.g. planning permission not secured); or significant changes to project. Project likely to under-deliver on forecast outputs.	5	A variance of **over 50%** against profiled financial forecast (total expenditure) or significant changes to project finances required (increases or decreases) due to poor or delayed delivery.	5	Programme includes projects with significant risks that are both high impact and high likelihood. Risk response not yet planned.	5
Issues arising causing long delays to the timetable (**3 to 6 months**) but no significant changes required to overall project. Outputs may still be deliverable but challenging.	4	A variance of between **30% & 50%** against profiled financial forecast (total expenditure). Budget changes have been required due to issues with project delivery.	4	Programme includes projects with significant risks that are either high impact or high likelihood. Risk responses planned but not implemented.	4
Issues arising causing some short delays to the timetable (**less than 3 months**). Outputs still deliverable but require re-scheduling.	3	A variance of between **15% & 30%** against profiled financial forecast Some budget changes have been required.	3	Programme includes projects with some risks that have medium impact and/or medium likelihood. Risk responses planned and implemented.	3
Minor issues have arisen causing only small delays. Project is on track to deliver outputs.	2	A variance of between **5% & 15%** Small re-profiling changes to budget required.	2	Programme includes projects with some risks that have medium impact but low likelihood. Risk responses planned and implemented.	2
No problems. Project is on track to deliver outputs and keeping to schedule.	1	A variance of **up to 5%**. Spend is largely on track with any minor slippage expected to be picked up by end of next quarter.	1	All risks are tolerable with low impact and likelihood and do not require a response.	1

RAG definitions – questions to the Board

- Are you happy with the split into Delivery, Spend, Risk?

- Is the 'overall RAG' useful or should this be dispensed with?

- What changes (if any) would you like to see?

Borough Council of
King's Lynn &
West Norfolk