

EAST RENFREWSHIRE COUNCIL  
AUDIT AND SCRUTINY COMMITTEE  
24 January 2019  
Report by Clerk  
CONSULTANCY EXPENDITURE

**PURPOSE OF REPORT**

1. Further to discussions at the meeting of the committee that took place in November 2018 on work it would like to progress on consultancy expenditure, in the first instance this report provides information requested by the committee during the last Administration on expenditure incurred on consultants during 2013/14 and 2014/15 and related issues.

**RECOMMENDATION**

2. It is recommended that the committee considers the report and how it wishes to progress further work on consultancy expenditure.

**BACKGROUND**

3. At the meeting of the committee that took place in November, the Chair referred to concerns he had expressed at the meeting of the Council in October 2018 regarding the extent to which external consultants were being used by the authority. Having heard him suggest it would be useful for the Audit and Scrutiny Committee to investigate this matter further, the committee agreed to progress some work on the extent of departmental expenditure on external consultants and feasibility studies and possibly legal advice; the reasons for doing so; and which consultants had been used.

4. Having noted that during the last Administration the committee had progressed work on expenditure incurred on consultants during 2013/14 and 2014/15 and related issues, it was agreed that, in the first instance, the Clerk would submit a report to this meeting on that work in advance of further discussion taking place on how the committee might wish to progress work now.

**COMMITTEE'S PREVIOUS WORK**

5 In February 2014 the committee considered a report associated with the publication of a national Audit Scotland report on *Scotland's Public Sector Workforce* ([http://www.auditscotland.gov.uk/uploads/docs/report/2013/nr\\_131128\\_public\\_sector\\_workforce.pdf](http://www.auditscotland.gov.uk/uploads/docs/report/2013/nr_131128_public_sector_workforce.pdf)). The national report had assessed if public bodies were effectively planning and managing workforce changes and focussed on approaches to this used by councils between April 2009 to March 2013. The elected Members who led the review of this particular report at the time, under the committee's specialisation arrangements, were Councillor Wallace and Councillor Grant, the then Chair and Vice Chair respectively.

6. At that time feedback on the local position on changes to staff numbers and costs; the implementation of workforce changes; and planning for such changes for the future was provided by the Deputy Chief Executive (<http://www.eastrenfrewshire.gov.uk/CHttpHandler.ashx?id=11197&p=0>). The report concluded that the council was well positioned relative to the national report, as it closely reflected trends within it for changes to staff numbers and costs. The local feedback also explained that the principles of good practice specified were supported locally, focusing on both workforce and budget planning to match the authority's needs whilst ensuring that skills and expertise were maintained and developed and that good value for money was provided. It was also reported then that consultation was taking place with staff and trade unions on an ongoing basis and that current workforce planning was continuing to be developed to include a longer-term approach to support skills development and training and succession planning more proactively. It was clarified that the council was also seeking opportunities to think differently about how it delivered services, such as by prioritising and redesigning services and increasing joint working and collaboration.

7. Issues discussed at the committee's meeting in February 2014 and subsequently included concerns held by some Members on the number of experienced officers leaving the Council and the subsequent loss of expertise. More specifically, one of the actions agreed was to seek clarification on whether or not the Council was making greater use of consultants than compared to the period before the time covered by the national report and the related local feedback.

#### **FEEDBACK PROVIDED ON CONSULTANT EXPENDITURE FOR 2013/14 AND 2014/15**

8. Following the meeting referred to above, an approach was made to the Accountancy Service in the first instance seeking feedback on consultancy costs, through which it became clear that there was not an easy answer to the question posed. It was clarified that Finance Business Partners could provide information on what had been coded to the "consultants" line in the ledger, but that services also charged consultancy costs to different codes, such as "payment to other bodies" or "other admin costs". In summary, Finance Business Partners alone could not identify and provide the information requested.

9. Before further work was pursued, the then Chair referred to the coding complications at the committee's meeting in April 2014 and also to the importance of departments knowing what consultant expenditure had been incurred, particularly in the context of the loss of experienced officers. Following related discussion on the potential scale and cost of work required to determine the feedback sought originally covering several years, it was agreed that members of the committee would reflect further on and agree the precise definition of "consultant" they wished to use; that retrospective costs for the financial year 2013/14 only would be requested which was considered reasonable; and that departments also be asked to record consultant expenditure incurred during 2014/15 and provide this in due course with a view to all of the feedback being collated and submitted to the committee at a later stage.

10. Following considerable discussion over an extended period of time, the committee ultimately agreed to request first a simple list of information on:-

*Any paid consultancy or advice commissioned directly by the council from an external individual, company or organisation for a fixed period of time to assist the council progress an issue, including in respect of the provision of legal services*

It was also agreed that it would only be when the feedback on this for the two financial years in question was received, that the committee would decide whether or not it wanted to follow up any specific aspects of this further. In short a two stage approach was therefore taken.

## **STAGE 1 - INITIAL FEEDBACK**

11. Initially four specific pieces of information were sought from departments as follows:-

- The names and designations of individual advisors or consultants, or the names of the companies or organisations providing the services
- The nature of the services provided
- The periods of time the consultants, advisors, companies or organisations were employed
- The total costs of the services provided

12. Following receipt and collation of all the feedback requested over a period of time, the information provided for 2013/14, itemised by department, was submitted to the committee in August 2015, as was that collated for 2014/15. It was clarified that because the Council was able to claim back VAT on such expenditure, net costs (*excluding* VAT) had been listed.

13. Legal services costs were itemised under feedback for the Chief Executive's Office but, as the information submitted then reflected, the expenditure did not relate solely to that Office. The basis for the allocation of costs to departments was explained in the sections of the feedback that related to legal services.

14. At the August 2015 meeting of the committee, when it considered the feedback provided, during related discussion on the costs incurred which the committee considered significant, reference was made to the level of expenditure on legal consultancy from a range of providers and possible reasons for this. It was acknowledged that this could include needing to secure particular expertise on an issue. Some Members queried if a different arrangement could be made to secure the legal services required through a different contractual arrangement.

15. Discussion also took place on whether or not the work commissioned from various consultants, including for legal services, could or should have been provided in-house. Following consideration it was proposed and agreed that further supplementary feedback was required from departments, including on:-

- why the consultants had been considered required and engaged;
- the extent to which such expenditure was linked to spend to save initiatives; and
- what was considered to have been one-off or, alternatively, recurring expenditure to some degree.

16. At the same meeting comments made by the Head of Accountancy were noted on coding of expenditure, regarding which it was clarified that departments were encouraged to code consultancy expenditure to a single code, for both on-going and one-off expenditure. It was suggested that it would be helpful if the committee could help reinforce this message.

## **STAGE 2 - SUPPLEMENTARY INFORMATION**

17. As submitted to the Audit and Scrutiny Committee in January 2016, the collated supplementary information requested and provided for 2013/14 and 2014/15, itemised by department, is attached (see Appendices 1 and 2). The initial information provided by

departments, which had been submitted to the committee at a prior stage as reported above, was also included for ease of reference, as it is now. What is therefore attached to this report is the fully collated information gathered during both stages of the committee's previous work.

## **LEGAL SERVICES**

18. Regarding the feedback on Legal Services, it was clarified that in all cases the legal work referred to was outsourced to firms under a framework contract put in place by the Council, this having been the subject of a full procurement process. It was explained further at the time that none of the successful firms on that list had ex-employees of the Council as major partners and, in any event, the firms choose the particular solicitors to provide services in each case. The Chief Officer (Legal and Procurement) also clarified that most of the work referred to was of a type that is generally done internally, but occasionally required to be done by an external provider due to internal resource pressures linked to issues such as absence, workload and competing demands, particularly in circumstances where there was time pressure to have work completed. It was reported then that the majority of instructions were handed down through Legal Services after discussion between Legal Services and the client department regarding resource availability, taking account of urgency, length of project or specialist nature etc.

19. The Chief Officer (Legal and Procurement) had confirmed at the time that none of the items listed could be said to be *spend to save* related, although he commented that the very nature of much of the legal work involved was to avoid a financial liability arising against the Council. Some of the costs were for one off projects or pieces of work which straddled both years the Committee looked at. It was also clarified that some of the generic planning advice was for issues incidental to these projects obtained from external firms because of their particular knowledge of the matter in hand.

20. Reflecting the interest the committee took in legal costs, the Chief Officer (Legal and Procurement) was asked to, and attended, the meeting of the committee held in March 2016. This was to allow him to comment further on consultancy costs linked to Legal Services, such as whether or not the feedback suggested further internal staff resource was required in the interests of Best Value rather than some work being outsourced. The challenge of addressing needs when the staffing complement of services such as Legal Services reduced and shared services were amongst issues commented on at the time.

21. In response to questions at the meeting in March 2016, the Chief Officer (Legal and Procurement) explained that at that time staff levels within Legal Services had reduced by 27% since 2009, with many of those who had left the Council having had many years of experience. Amongst other things he referred to the need for his service to be responsive; the need for it to adhere to deadlines often outwith the Council's control such as for court and tribunal work; and how workload had increased at least in part due to the loss of expertise of officers in other departments who approached Legal Services for advice and support, and also in part due to the scale of legislation developed at the same time as the number in the Legal team had reduced. He acknowledged the need for some legal work to be outsourced given the nature of it, referred to difficulties of anticipating workload requirements to a degree as some issues that arose could not be foreseen, and cited examples of work required at specific times of the year, such as on placing requests and relate challenges.

22. In March 2016, having also referred to the scale of legal work associated with the Integrated Joint Board, Health and Social Care Partnership and City Deal amongst other things, more generally the Chief Officer (Legal and Procurement) clarified that a shared service model for legal work had been considered, but referred also to demands and

pressures experienced elsewhere as well as locally, potential conflicts of interest, and matters linked to Law Society accreditation. It was clarified at the same time that in recent years two legal trainees had been employed, one of whom had become a permanent staff member but at the same time as an experienced member of his team had retired. It was reported that the Environment Department had also funded a temporary legal post to provide advice they required. The position in March 2016 was that the end of that two year appointment was approaching.

23. It was also clarified in March 2016 that there were challenges linked to addressing loss of knowledge when experienced legal staff left and that resources were the subject of discussions between the Chief Officer (Legal and Procurement) and the Chief Executive. Reference was made to the professionalism of those in Legal Services, and the workload of and efforts made by the section to ensure that the needs of the Council were met. At the time former Councillor Robertson commented more generally that when reports on savings were discussed, reference to the potential need to employ consultants was rarely, if ever, mentioned.

24. During further discussion, Councillor O’Kane referred to challenges linked to the current financial situation, commented that Directors had to and did consider carefully when consultants were required, and that there were times when engaging an external party, such as a QC in the case of Legal Services, was unavoidable.

25. It was commented that some external appointments could be coded in different ways, such as consultancy, under training or as agency staff for example, which could create issues when trying to work on the type of exercise the committee had progressed.

## **CONCLUSIONS DRAWN AT THE TIME**

26. Members of the committee commented that they considered the exercise they had progressed useful and referred to the importance of departments analysing such costs similarly on an ongoing basis. More specifically it was suggested that the Chief Executive be advised of the committee’s view that it was important for departments to conduct such exercises to identify and scrutinise trends and inform discussions and analysis on whether the use of externally engaged staff, including consultants, trainers and agency staff for example, continued to deliver Best Value. The need to encourage departments to code consultancy work to the appropriate code, as commented on by the Head of Accountancy, was also highlighted.

27. As the Committee focussed on an issue of an operational nature, the Committee did not consider the submission of a report to the Cabinet appropriate. Ultimately it agreed that a copy of the feedback collated be passed to the Chief Executive for her review and interest, together with a note of the observations made by the Committee on the value of such analysis by departments on an ongoing basis to ensure Best Value is always secured.

28. It was also agreed that Directors be asked to remind all appropriate employees of the importance of coding consultancy related expenditure appropriately to assist with such analysis which was done through the Action Note issued to departments following the meeting.

## **RECOMMENDATION**

29. It is recommended that the committee considers the report and how it wishes to progress further work on consultancy expenditure.

Local Government Access to Information Act 1985

Report Author: Linda Hutchison, Clerk to the Committee (Tel No. 0141 577 8388)  
e-mail: [linda.hutchison@eastrenfrewshire.gov.uk](mailto:linda.hutchison@eastrenfrewshire.gov.uk)

Background Papers:-

1. External Audit reports on *Scotland's Public Sector Workforce*
2. Information provided by departments on the use and costs of consultants in accordance with the definition agreed by the committee
3. Reports submitted to the Committee on its previous work on consultants, including the meeting of the Committee held on March 2016

**AUDIT AND SCRUTINY COMMITTEE**

**FEEDBACK PROVIDED ON CONSULTANCY EXPENDITURE FOR 2013/14**

Feedback was initially requested on:-

*Any paid consultancy or advice commissioned directly by the council from an external individual, company or organisation for a fixed period of time to assist the council progress an issue, including in respect of the provision of legal services.*

The Audit and Scrutiny Committee subsequently sought the following information on each of the items of feedback provided before:-

*Question 1: Why were the consultants considered necessary and therefore engaged?*

*Question 2: Was there any prospect of the work being done in-house and, if not, why?*

*Question 3: Was the work in question done in-house previously?*

*Question 4: Is it considered likely or not that the consultant expenditure on the issue in question will increase in future and, if so, why?*

*Question 5: Was the work undertaken by someone who had previously left the council's employment and, if so, why?*

*Question 6: To what extent, if at all, was the expenditure linked to any spend to save initiative?*

*Question 7: Was the expenditure in question considered to have been one-off or, alternatively, was it recurring expenditure for more on-going/repeat work to some degree?*

The feedback provided is listed below by question.

## CHIEF EXECUTIVE'S OFFICE 2013/14

### Accountancy Service

Name & Designation of Individual Advisor or Consultant; <u>or</u> Name of Company or Organisation	Nature of Service Provided	Period of Time the Consultant, Advisor, Company or Organisation was Employed	Total Cost of Service Provided (Excl VAT)
<b>Sector</b>	<b>Treasury Service</b>	Annual Contract for 2013-14	£10,916
<p>Q1. This is a high risk, specialist area which we do not have the in-house expertise to provide.</p> <p>Q2. This could not be done in-house because this is a specialised area. Only large authorities would provide this service in-house.</p> <p>Q3. Not done in-house previously (to officers' knowledge, outside consultants used for this for at least the past 30 years).</p> <p>Q4. On basis of previous trends, costs only likely to increase by inflation.</p> <p>Q5. Not done by someone who had previously left the council's employment.</p> <p>Q6. Expenditure not linked to any spend to save initiative.</p> <p>Q7. This is recurring expenditure.</p>			
<b>Sector</b>	<b>Investment Benchmarking</b>	Annual Contract for 2013-14	£485
<p>Q1. This allows benchmarking with other authorities (it is debatable whether this should be classified as a consultancy cost rather than a benchmarking club).</p> <p>Q2. This would be a time consuming exercise and current workloads prohibit it being done in-house.</p> <p>Q3. Not done in-house previously (the service is a member of several benchmarking clubs).</p> <p>Q4. On basis of previous trends, costs only likely to increase by inflation.</p> <p>Q5. Not done by someone who had previously left the council's employment.</p> <p>Q6. Expenditure not linked to any spend to save initiative, but the output shows where other authorities are investing surplus funds which could lead to financial benefits for the council.</p> <p>Q7. This is recurring expenditure.</p>			



<b>KPMG</b>	<b>Fee for VAT Reclaim on Trade Waste (Trade Waste %)</b>	Not Applicable	£2,000
<p>Q1. This is a specialist area in which the council does not have in-house expertise.  Q2. This could not be done in-house as we do not have the expertise.  Q3. Not done in-house previously.  Q4. The expenditure will not rise. This was a one off project.  Q5. Not done by someone who had previously left the council's employment.  Q6. Expenditure not linked to any spend to save initiative, but the council has benefited financially from the outcome of the work completed.  Q7. This was one off expenditure for this particular project.</p>			
		<b>TOTAL</b>	<b>£13,401</b>

**Internal Audit**

**Nil Return**

**Miscellaneous Services**

<b>Name &amp; Designation of Individual Advisor or Consultant; <u>or</u> Name of Company or Organisation</b>	<b>Nature of Service Provided</b>	<b>Period of Time the Consultant, Advisor, Company or Organisation was Employed</b>	<b>Total Cost of Service Provided (Excl VAT)</b>
<b>West Lothian Council</b>	<b>On Behalf of Improvement Service, to Support Delivery of Benchmarking Programme</b>	Programme Runs for 3 Years From March 2014 – March 2016 (Total Cost Over 3 Years £4,838.40)	£168

The additional departmental feedback was that this is not consultancy; it is a service to collate and promote use of national benchmarking data.

<b>Castlerigg Consulting</b>	<b>ICT Shared Services Project with Renfrewshire and Inverclyde Councils</b> <i>(Prior to Restructuring, IT Services part of Finance Service)</i>	April 2013 - March 2014	£88,375
<p>Q1. In response to a business need to ensure that ICT can deliver to the digital aspirations of the council, consultants were engaged to undertake work on behalf of the 3 councils to identify improvements to the operation of ICT in all 3 and identify opportunities where joint working would be beneficial.</p> <p>Q2. The work had to be independent of the 3 councils, identify the opportunities for improvements and could not be done within existing resources.</p> <p>Q3. Not done in-house previously.</p> <p>Q4. Regarding future expenditure, the work continued into the following year (See 2014/15 feedback).</p> <p>Q5. Not done by someone who had previously left the council's employment.</p> <p>Q6. Regarding spend to save, the expenditure was linked to a potential saving equivalent to the cost of the consultancy plus improvements in operations.</p> <p>Q7. The work was one off and was expected to build up the skills of the existing ICT teams across the 3 councils. The consultants focused on areas where they could add most value, with the existing ICT teams carrying out the implementation.</p>			
		<b>TOTAL</b>	<b>£88,543</b>

## **Legal Services**

The expenditure does not relate solely to the Chief Executive's Office. Expenditure on legal consultancy work (put out to private firms via a framework tender) is taken from client departments' revenue or capital budgets. The information below therefore incorporates legal costs invoiced in 2013/14 for capital and revenue expenditure. On that basis, Legal Services had minimal consultancy expenditure itself. The department to which the expenditure relates is part of the information specified in Column 2 below. Depending on the nature of tasks, the firms were engaged to complete specific tasks rather than for a fixed period. Work relating to the Court of Session requires staff with rights of audience, Counsel or legal firms with Advocates. For comments on Questions 5 and 6, see covering report.

<b>Name &amp; Designation of Individual Advisor or Consultant; <u>or</u> Name of Company or Organisation</b>	<b>Nature of Service Provided</b> <i>(Department to Which Attributable)</i>	<b>Period of Time the Consultant, Advisor, Company or Organisation was Employed</b>	<b>Total Cost of Service Provided</b> <i>(Excl VAT)</i>
<b>Maclay, Murray &amp; Spens</b>	<b>Employment Equal Pay/Tribunal Advice</b> <i>(Corporate and Community Services)</i>	Costs Invoiced for 2013-14	£6,841
<p>Q1. The scale of equal pay settlements and likely duration of the settlement process prompted use of external advisers. They have been involved, on behalf of the council, since 2008 in this capacity.</p> <p>Q2. There is technical capability to do this in-house, but the work is resource intensive to the point of impacting detrimentally on Legal Service's ability to fulfil other requirements of the council regarding legal advice/representation.</p> <p>Q3. Work regarding the equal pay settlement has always been outsourced and has not been handled directly by Legal Services, although the Chief Officer (Legal and Procurement) retains oversight of the firm's work in this regard.</p> <p>Q4. The work is designed to settle/defend the council's position regarding equal pay claims (raised by individuals historically affected by inequalities of pay based on gender), with a view to minimising council's ultimate liability, and is therefore reactive to claims being made. Expenditure will continue until all these claims are resolved, but will be likely to reduce due to diminishing numbers of current claims.</p> <p>Q7. Regarding recurring expenditure, see Q1 and Q4.</p>			

<b>Dundas and Wilson/CMS</b>	<b>Advice on Blacklisting Issues</b> <i>(Chief Executive's Office)</i>	Costs Invoiced for 2013-14	£510
<p>Q1. This was a one-off issue of national significance. External advice was sought due to technicalities of the matter and known expertise of the firm concerned.</p> <p>Q2&amp;3. Technically this could have been researched in-house, but urgency and resource issues prompted the decision to outsource the work.</p> <p>Q4&amp;7. One-off expenditure, so not expected to rise.</p>			
<b>Brodies LLP</b>	<p>(1) <b>Advice Regarding Political Activity and Referendum (£1,150)</b> <i>(Chief Executive's Office)</i></p> <p>(2) <b>Barrhead Strategic Development (£2,000)</b> <i>(Environment)</i></p> <p>(3) <b>Shanks Park Strategy (£770)</b> <i>(Environment)</i></p>	Costs Invoiced for 2013-14	£3,920
<p>(1) <b><u>Advice Regarding Political Activity and Referendum</u></b></p> <p>Q1. External opinion taken from Solicitor advocate (akin to Counsel's opinion) to supplement internal advice on a unique issue arising from the Independence Referendum.</p> <p>Q2&amp;3. The external advice supplemented internal advice (see Q1). The opinion taken was considered appropriate given significance of the issue in a political context.</p> <p>Q4&amp;7. One-off expenditure, so not expected to rise.</p> <p>(2) <b><u>Barrhead Strategic Development</u></b></p> <p>Q1. Barrhead South advice sought relating to consortia membership and collaboration agreement.</p> <p>Q2&amp;3. The work was outsourced due to the particular expertise required and internal resource capability.</p> <p>(3) <b><u>Shanks Park Strategy</u></b></p> <p>Q1. For this one off piece of work, initial consultation undertaken internally, but further work carried out externally taking account of scale of work and internal resource/ pressure of work at the time (carried over into 2014/15).</p> <p>Q2&amp;3. Internal resource / pressure of work at the time was one reason this was done externally.</p> <p>Q4&amp;7. The work and expenditure carried over into 2014/15.</p>			

Anderson Strathern	<p>(1) <b>Consumer Rights Advice re Spanish Law Transaction (£1,313)</b> <i>(Environment)</i></p> <p>(2) <b>Employment and Equalities Training (£240)</b> <i>(Corporate and Community Services)</i></p>	Costs Invoiced for 2013-14	£1,553
<p><b>(1) <u>Consumer Rights Advice re Spanish Law Transaction</u></b></p> <p>Q1. This one off piece of work was on a novel trading standards issue requiring expertise in Spanish Law.  Q2&amp;3. The required expertise was not available within the in-house team.  Q4&amp;7. One-off expenditure; no further costs attributable in future.</p> <p><b>(2) <u>Employment and Equalities Training</u></b></p> <p>Q1. This was to purchase off-the-shelf training.  Q2&amp;3. Whilst a variety of training is provided by the in-house team, both generally and on-demand, this is supplemented by external provision if courses are known to be advantageous/of good quality etc.  Q7. There may be further expenditure of this type in future across departments and suppliers.</p>			
Pinsent Masons	<b>Joint Schools Project</b> <i>(Education)</i>	Costs Invoiced for 2013-14	£2,900
<p><b><u>Additional Comments Requested by Committee</u></b></p> <p>Q1. Outsourced due to scale of project and internal workload demands at the time.  Q2&amp;3. Regarding in-house work, see comments at Q1.  Q4. The £2900 was the last cost attributed to this account as the school was completed.</p>			

<b>Shepherd &amp; Wedderburn</b>	<p>(1) <b>Eastwood Health Centre (£29,660)</b> <i>(Community Health and Care Partnership)</i></p> <p>(2) <b>Barrhead High School (£26,383)</b> <i>(Environment and Education)</i></p> <p>(3) <b>St Ninian's Remediation Contract (£1,304)</b> <i>(Education/Environment)</i></p> <p>(4) <b>Newton Mearns Flood Prevention Group Judicial Review (£41,406)</b> <i>(Environment)</i></p> <p>(5) <b>Barrhead Supermarket (£9,920)</b> <i>(Environment)</i></p> <p>(6) <b>Miscellaneous Property Transactions (£16,086)</b> <i>(Environment/Miscellaneous)</i></p> <p>(7) <b>Barr Judicial Review (£8,930)</b> <i>(Environment)</i></p> <p>(8) <b>Various Planning Advice (£15,217)</b> <i>(Environment)</i></p> <p>(9) <b>Caveats (£240)</b> <i>(Chief Executive's Office)</i></p>	Costs Invoiced for 2013-14	£149,146
----------------------------------	---	----------------------------	----------

**(1) Eastwood Health Centre**

- Q1. This one off piece of work was outsourced due to pressure of work on internal legal service at particular time.
- Q2. Pressure on in-house team was reason work was out-sourced.
- Q3. Work of this nature is generally handled in-house.
- Q4&7. Further costs of this sort may arise due to ongoing pressure of work, time demands and internal resource limitations.

**(2) Barrhead High School**

Q1. The matter involved Court of Session litigation and engagement of Counsel so the work required to be outsourced as internal service has no rights of audience in Court of Session.

Q2&3. Could not be done in-house.

Q4&7. Litigation now concluded so no further costs.

**(3) St Ninian's Remediation Contract**

Q1. The work was outsourced to the firm involved in the original preparation of PFI documentation for the school extension who retained intimate knowledge of contract provisions relevant to efficient handling of remediation issues. This was a more efficient use of resources than dealing with matter in-house.

Q2&3. It was more efficient to outsource the work (see Q1).

**(4) Newton Mearns Flood Prevention Group Judicial Review**

Q1. The matter involved Court of Session litigation and engagement of Counsel so the work required to be outsourced as internal service has no rights of audience in Court of Session.

Q2&3. Could not be done in-house.

Q4&7. Litigation now concluded so no further costs.

**(5) Barrhead Supermarket**

Q1. This one off piece of work was outsourced due to pressure of work on internal legal service at particular time.

Q2. Pressure on in-house team was reason work was out-sourced.

Q3. Work of this nature is generally handled in-house.

Q4&7. Further costs of this sort may arise due to ongoing pressure of work, time demands and internal resource limitations.

**(6) Miscellaneous Property Transactions**

Q1. This one off piece of work was outsourced due to pressure of work on internal legal service at particular time.

Q2. Pressure on in-house team was reason work was out-sourced.

Q3. Work of this nature is generally handled in-house.

Q4&7. Further costs of this sort may arise due to ongoing pressure of work, time demands and internal resource limitations.

**(7) Barr Judicial Review**

- Q1. The matter involved Court of Session litigation and engagement of Counsel so the work required to be outsourced as internal service has no rights of audience in Court of Session.  
Q2&3. Could not be done in-house.  
Q4&7. Litigation now concluded so no further costs.

**(8) Various Planning Advice**

- Q1. This one off piece of work was outsourced due to pressure of work on internal legal service at particular time.  
Q2. Pressure on in-house team was reason work was out-sourced.  
Q3. Work of this nature is generally handled in-house.  
Q4&7. Further costs of this sort may arise due to ongoing pressure of work, time demands and internal resource limitations.

**(9) Caveats**

- Q1. This is the lodging of Court of Session caveats by Edinburgh agents.  
Q4&7 This is an annual process.

		<b>TOTAL</b>	<b>£164,870</b>
--	--	--------------	-----------------



## CORPORATE AND COMMUNITY SERVICES DEPARTMENT 2013/14

Name & Designation of Individual Advisor or Consultant; <u>or</u> Name of Company or Organisation	Nature of Service Provided	Period of Time the Consultant, Advisor, Company or Organisation was Employed	Total Cost of Service Provided (Excl VAT)
<b>Total People Solutions</b>	<b>Absence Audit (Part of Framework Agreement and Included Follow up Discussion on Report Produced)</b>	14 -17 January 2014	£3,000
<p>Q1. The consultants were considered necessary to take an unbiased look at the council's absence policies and practices on paper and in practice from both management and support service perspectives.</p> <p>Q2. This was completed by a consultant due to lack of resource internally and to ensure the feedback was free from bias.</p> <p>Q3. This was a one off exercise.</p> <p>Q4. There is no plan to repeat this work.</p> <p>Q5. Not done by someone who had previously left the council's employment.</p> <p>Q6. The expenditure was linked to improving maximising attendance processes and communication to improve absence within the council. Some of the outputs of the audit have been taken forward to improve our position.</p> <p>Q7. This was one off expenditure.</p>			
<b>Catch the Light</b>	<b>Research and Capacity Building Support to Equality Groups</b>	August – December 2013	£3,000
<p>Q1. Consultants were necessary for the project to pilot the application of the relatively new concept of "<i>Appreciating Assets</i>" to community development for equality groups. This required, among others things, drawing on practice elsewhere; an independent mediator and facilitator between equality groups and the council; and expertise in CLD.</p> <p>Q2. Aspects of the work done in-house have included identifying relevant officers, elected Members and community representatives for interviewing and consultation sessions facilitated by the Consultants; ongoing support to equality community groups to explain new concepts; and undertaking follow-up actions, such as completing community development forward plans.</p> <p>Q3. <i>Appreciating Assets</i> is a relatively new concept which required external expertise.</p> <p>Q4. The expenditure was fixed and is not likely to increase in the future.</p> <p>Q5. One of the <i>Catch the Light</i> team left the council's employment at least 8 years ago to help set up Voluntary Action in East Renfrewshire.</p> <p>Q6. Expenditure not linked to any spend to save initiative.</p> <p>Q7. This was one off expenditure linked to a 3 year fixed cost programme.</p>			

<b>ODS Services</b>	<b>Research and Capacity Building Support to Equality Groups</b>	1 – 31 March 2014	£4,000
<p>Q1. Consultants were necessary for the project to pilot the application of the relatively new concept of “Appreciating Assets” to community development for equality groups. This required, among others, drawing on practice elsewhere, an independent mediator and facilitator between equality groups and the council; and expertise in CLD.</p> <p>Q2. Aspects of the work being done in-house have included identifying relevant officers, elected members and community representatives for interviewing and consultation sessions facilitated by the Consultants; ongoing support to equality community groups to explain new concepts; and undertaking follow-up actions, such as completing community development forward plans.</p> <p>Q3. Appreciating Assets is a relatively new concept which required external expertise.</p> <p>Q4. The expenditure was fixed and is not likely to increase in the future.</p> <p>Q5. Not done by someone who had previously left the council’s employment.</p> <p>Q6. Expenditure not linked to any spend to save initiative.</p> <p>Q7. This was one off expenditure linked to a 3 year fixed cost programme.</p>			
<b>ODS Services</b>	<b>Social Research Project (Survey of 1,000 Local People as Part of Review of Scheme of Establishment for Community Councils)</b>	18 February – 31 March 2014	£15,033
<p>Q1. We wanted independent social research on the view of ordinary people in relation to community councils. ODS had the skills and experience to fulfil the brief.</p> <p>Q2. The work could not be done in-house. The research involved around 1000 door to door interviews to secure accurate feedback and we did not have the staffing and skills to undertake this work.</p> <p>Q3. The work was not done in-house previously.</p> <p>Q4. It is not considered likely that this expenditure will increase in future. This was for a specific piece of work.</p> <p>Q5. Not done by someone who had previously left the council’s employment.</p> <p>Q6. Expenditure not linked to any spend to save initiative.</p> <p>Q7. This was considered one off expenditure.</p>			

<b>Solace Enterprises</b>	<b>Review of Operation and Support of Community Planning (Part of Review of Scheme of Establishment for Community Planning)</b>	March 2014 (8 Days Consultancy Plus Expenses)	£6,250
<p><i>See 2014/15 also</i></p> <p>Q1. We wanted to bring in an independent, un-impeachable individual to review the operation of community councils and the support that the council provided.</p> <p>Q2. The point of this exercise was for an experienced, external individual to make an objective assessment and make recommendations (i.e. a critical friend).</p> <p>Q3. The work was not done in-house previously.</p> <p>Q4. It is not considered likely that the expenditure on this will increase in future. This was for a specific piece of work.</p> <p>Q5. Not done by someone who had previously left the council's employment.</p> <p>Q6. Expenditure not linked to any spend to save initiative.</p> <p>Q7. This was considered one off expenditure.</p>			
<b>Axiom</b>	<b>Phase 1 of Updating Contact Information for Community Groups (Required as Part of Legislative Duties for Community Learning and Development)</b>	18 – 31 March 2014	£2,007
<p>The feedback was that this was not consultancy work. It was a contracted piece of work designed by council to meet legislative requirements.</p>			

<b>Gorilla Enterprises</b>	<b>Safety Net (£1,000)</b>	2013-14	£1,000
<p><i>This was wrongly coded to Legal Services (under Brodies) previously. Further information has now been provided by Corporate and Community Services.</i></p> <p>Q1. This was a one off short piece of work with a tight deadline.  Q2: The work could not be done in-house because there were no available resources  Q3. This was not done in-house previously. It was a piece of work to help identify inefficiency in processes.  Q4: It is not considered likely that expenditure will increase in future.  Q5. Not done by someone who had previously left the council's employment.  Q6. Expenditure was linked to improving the efficiency of processes.  Q7. This was one off expenditure</p>			
		<b>REVISED TOTAL</b>	<b>£34,290</b>

## EDUCATION DEPARTMENT 2013/14

Name & Designation of Individual Advisor or Consultant; <u>or</u> Name of Company or Organisation	Nature of Service Provided	Period of Time the Consultant, Advisor, Company or Organisation was Employed	Total Cost of Service Provided (Excl VAT)
<b>Coyle Education</b>	<b>Specialist Advice and Support for School Timetabling and Curricular Structures</b>	January 2014 – March 2014	£20,111
<p>Q1. The service provides unique expertise our secondary head teachers to compile their individual school timetables based on each school's curricular pathways for meeting their pupils' needs. The development work is seasonal and required over the same intensive timeframe in all schools each year. It demands high level of expertise and knowledge of education in East Renfrewshire.</p> <p>Q2. An officer from the department works closely with this supplier and the schools to build in-house skills and knowledge. However due to the high level of experience and in-depth understanding required and capacity constraints there continues to be key aspects where this external support is required. This service is highly valued by head teachers who recognise its importance in significantly contributing to the outstanding performance levels of schools.</p> <p>Q3. A number of years ago the individual worked in the authority before retiring. His expertise was developed over his many years in this educational field, which latterly was in the council and is recognised nationally.</p> <p>Q4. This is considered a cost effective and efficient method of providing such a quality service for schools.</p> <p>Q5. See Q4 above.</p> <p>Q6. Although not specifically linked to spend to save, this is such and is best value.</p> <p>Q7. This service is required annually for schools and the department has improved in-house experience by working closely and developing tools based on the methodology used. The department will continue to explore options to further improve in-house expertise within the context of remaining available resources.</p>			
<b>Birnam Wood &amp; Dunsinane</b>	<b>Supporting Head Teachers with Self Evaluation and Triangulation</b>	December 2013 (2 ½ days)	£875
<p>Q1. This was one off continuing professional development (CPD) support for head teachers.</p> <p>Q2. It could not be delivered in-house due to a lack of capacity.</p> <p>Q4. It is unlikely that consultant expenditure on this issue will be incurred in future.</p> <p>Q5. This work was undertaken by a recently retired head teacher who, as well as having a good understanding of education in East Renfrewshire, was respected amongst former colleagues to deliver CPD in this area.</p> <p>Q7. This was considered one off expenditure.</p>			

<b>William Clark</b>	<b>Continuous Professional Development for Teachers</b>	20 October 2013	£230
<p>Q1&amp;2. The engagement of this consultant was necessary due to a lack of in-house capacity at that time.  Q5. Not done by someone who had previously left the council's employment.</p>			
<b>Ellen McBride</b>	<b>Training for Newly Qualified Teachers</b>	7 and 9 January 2014	£1,229
<p>Q1&amp;2. The engagement of this consultant was necessary due to a lack of in-house capacity at that time.  Q5. Not done by someone who had previously left the council's employment.</p>			
<b>Hay Management Group</b>	<b>Support for Teachers on Flexible Route to Headship Course</b>	June and August 2013	£1,429
<p>Q1&amp;2. The engagement of this consultant was necessary due to a lack of in-house capacity and expertise at that time.  Q4. A new national model is being developed to support those aspiring to be Head Teachers  Q5. Not done by someone who had previously left the council's employment.</p>			
<b>Hilda De Felice</b>	<b>Training for Newly Qualified Teachers</b>	4 and 6 June 2013; 19 and 21 November 2013; & 25 and 27 February 2014	£2,780
<p>Q1&amp;2. The consultant was necessary due to a lack of in-house capacity and expertise at that time.  Q5. A number of years ago the individual worked in the authority before retiring from post.</p>			

Turner Townsend (via Hub West Scotland)	<b>Eastwood Leisure Centre:-</b> <b>(1) Detailed Property Condition Survey; and</b> <b>(2) Development Proposals</b>	February - March 2014	£29,040
<p>Q1&amp;2. Both pieces of work were procured externally, based on advice from colleagues in Property and Technical Services, due to the specific technical expertise required.</p> <p>Q5. Not done by someone who had previously left the council's employment.</p>			
		<b>TOTAL</b>	<b>£55,694</b>

**COMMUNITY HEALTH AND CARE PARTNERSHIP 2013/14**

Name & Designation of Individual Advisor or Consultant; <u>or</u> Name of Company or Organisation	Nature of Service Provided	Period of Time the Consultant, Advisor, Company or Organisation was Employed	Total Cost of Service Provided (Excl VAT)
The Validium Group Ltd	Employee Counselling Sessions with Children's Services	18 and 28 March 2013; 22 April 2013; 5 and 20 May 2013; & 24 June 2013	£570
<p>The feedback was that this expenditure predated the appointment of the current Head of Children's Services and Criminal Justice and she is therefore unable to provide additional comment.</p>			
Gillian McIntyre	Personalised Service Plan Work for Learning Disability Pilot.	May to July 2013	£4,388
<p><u>Additional Comments Requested by Committee</u></p> <p>The feedback was that this expenditure predated the appointment of the current Head of Children's Services and Criminal Justice and she is therefore unable to provide additional comment.</p>			
		<b>TOTAL</b>	<b>£4,958</b>



## ENVIRONMENT DEPARTMENT 2013/14

Name & Designation of Individual Advisor or Consultant; <u>or</u> Name of Company or Organisation	Nature of Service Provided	Period of Time the Consultant, Advisor, Company or Organisation was Employed	Total Cost of Service Provided (Excl VAT)
<b>Renfrewshire Council</b>	<b>Contribution From ERC Cost Landscape Capacity</b>	24 April 2013	£4,000
<p>Q1. This relates to the Strategic Development Plan Landscape Capacity Assessment for Renewable Energy developments. All 8 Clydeplan authorities paid £4K each rather than doing their own as it was more cost effective. Our own Supplementary Planning Guidance (SPG) on Renewable Energy was based on this work as well.</p> <p>Q2. This could not be done in-house as we don't have any landscape architects to do this work.</p> <p>Q3. The work was not done in-house previously.</p> <p>Q4. It is not considered likely that the expenditure will increase in future because the SPG is based on this work and has been completed.</p> <p>Q5. Not done by someone who had previously left the council's employment.</p> <p>Q6. Expenditure not linked to any spend to save initiative.</p> <p>Q7. This was one off expenditure.</p>			
<b>Envirocentre Ltd</b>	<b>Hydrology Study Maidenhill / Malletsheugh</b>	5 September 2013	£5,920
<p>Q1. Objections were received to the Local Development Plan (LDP) regarding the proposal to release Maidenhill, Newton Mearns as a housing site. Objections were based on flooding/drainage and transport issues. This study looked at the drainage/flooding issues on the site and was required to respond to the objections and establish that the site could be used for development.</p> <p>Q2. This could not be done in-house as we don't have any hydrologists within the council.</p> <p>Q3. The work was not done in-house previously.</p> <p>Q4. It is not considered likely that the expenditure will increase in future.</p> <p>Q5. Not done by someone who had previously left the council's employment.</p> <p>Q6. Expenditure not linked to any spend to save initiative.</p> <p>Q7. This was one off expenditure.</p>			

<b>Transport Planning Ltd</b>	<b>Provision of Transport Consultancy Services</b>	March 2014	£5,000
<p>Q1. Objections were received to the LDP regarding the proposal to release Maidenhill, Newton Mearns as a housing site. Objections were based on flooding/drainage and transport Issues. This was a Strategic Transport Assessment to assess the impacts of development on the road infrastructure at Maidenhill, Newton Mearns.</p> <p>Q2. This could have been done internally, but there were capacity issues in the Roads Service. The assessment was required to inform the LDP and respond to objections and could not wait.</p> <p>Q3. The work was not done in-house previously.</p> <p>Q4. It is not considered likely that the expenditure will increase in future.</p> <p>Q5. Not done by someone who had previously left the council's employment.</p> <p>Q6. Expenditure not linked to any spend to save initiative.</p> <p>Q7. This was one off expenditure.</p>			
<b>Tom Sneddon Architect</b>	<b>Master Plan – Neilston Infill Strategy</b>	Financial Year 2013/14	£5,000
<p><i>In the previous feedback this was recorded as £31,000. Clarification was received that £5,000 was paid by the council with the balance paid by Architecture Design Scotland (ADS). The accounts were adjusted when the £26,000 was received from ADS. The council paid Tom Sneddon Architect when all the money had been received from ADS.</i></p> <p>Q1. The £5K was a council contribution to a £31K Charrettes held for the Neilston Infill Development SPG prepared for the LDP. The contribution meant the council secured £26K from Architecture Design Scotland for the Neilston Charrettes work.</p> <p>Q2. It is possible to do this work in-house, but the funding was to secure external resources to carry out this work with the Neilston community.</p> <p>Q3. The work was not done in-house previously.</p> <p>Q4. It is not considered likely that the expenditure will increase in future.</p> <p>Q5. Not done by someone who had previously left the council's employment.</p> <p>Q6. Expenditure not linked to any spend to save initiative.</p> <p>Q7. This was one off expenditure.</p>			

<b>Turner and Townsend Management Solutions</b>	<b>Economic Development Initiatives</b>	Financial Year 2013/14	£14,700
<p>Q1-3. The work was associated with the development of the council's participation within the City Deal. Work required an element of specialist economic expertise which did not exist in-house. In addition, as City Deal was a new initiative, existing staff were fully engaged in other core work activity. It was not possible therefore for this work to be undertaken in-house.</p> <p>Q4. As an ongoing initiative, further City Deal consultancy might be required in future, in particular around the development of full business cases (which are required before grant can be drawn down).</p> <p>Q5. Not done by someone who had previously left the council's employment.</p> <p>Q6. This was not linked to spend to save, but the work (and any future work) was instrumental in securing £44m investment in the area.</p> <p>Q7. Further work might be required in this area, particularly within the context of City Deal.</p>			
<b>Capita Symonds Ltd</b>	<b>Construction Design and Management (CDM) Co-ordinator Role – Whitelees MTB Project</b>	April to July 2014	£5,305
<p>Q1. This was linked to the building of the Mountain Bike Facility at Whitelee Windfarm. The CDM co-ordinator was required as there was no experience of constructing such a facility in-house (work continued into 2014/15).</p> <p>Q2. Regarding work being done in-house, it would not have been appropriate to have an officer on site as a CDM co-ordinator for a 12 week build period. That would have required someone to back fill that officer's post which would have been more costly than the 5K charged.</p> <p>Q3. The work was not done in-house previously.</p> <p>Q4. It is not considered likely that the expenditure will increase in future.</p> <p>Q5. Not done by someone who had previously left the council's employment.</p> <p>Q6. Expenditure not linked to any spend to save initiative.</p> <p>Q7. This was one off expenditure (project now complete).</p>			

<b>Peel Land Surveys</b>	<b>Design ' You Are Here' Panels</b>	December 2013	£450
<p>Q1. The work was to carry out a survey to establish the best locations for Whitelee sign panels and the site conditions.</p> <p>Q2. This was specialist work which could not be undertaken in-house.</p> <p>Q3. The work was not done in-house previously.</p> <p>Q4. It is not considered likely that the expenditure will increase in future.</p> <p>Q5. Not done by someone who had previously left the council's employment.</p> <p>Q6. Expenditure not linked to any spend to save initiative.</p> <p>Q7. This was one off expenditure.</p>			
<b>Architrail Ltd</b>	<b>Whitelee Mountain Bike Trail Site Supervision</b>	April to November 2014	£5,732
<p>Q1. This was the building of the Mountain Bike Facility at Whitelee Windfarm. Project Supervision was required as there was no experience of constructing such a facility in-house.</p> <p>Q2. Specialist experience was required so this work could not be done in-house.</p> <p>Q3. The work was not done in-house previously.</p> <p>Q4. It is not considered likely that the expenditure will increase in future.</p> <p>Q5. Not done by someone who had previously left the council's employment.</p> <p>Q6. Expenditure not linked to any spend to save initiative.</p> <p>Q7. This was one off expenditure (project now complete).</p>			

<b>Atkins</b>	<b>Sustainable Travel Consultancy Barrhead</b>	2013/14	£5,521
<p>Q1. It was anticipated that the regeneration of Barrhead Town Centre, including simultaneous construction of the new ASDA and the Foundry, would impact on traffic movements in the town at peak times and significantly reduce parking availability. A significant contributory factor to the congestion was council staff movements and parking habits. We engaged transport management experts at relatively short notice to deliver a focused, but time consuming, short-life project.</p> <p>Q2. Regarding in-house work, there was a lack of resource (staff time). There was limited in-house experience delivering innovative and creative methods of reducing single occupancy car travel to/from work that would result in a significant (short-term) reduction on parking demand for a fixed period before returning to normal post construction.</p> <p>Q3. The work was not done in-house previously.</p> <p>Q4. It is not considered likely that the expenditure will increase in future.</p> <p>Q5. Not done by someone who had previously left the council's employment.</p> <p>Q6. Regarding spend to save, this was a short-life project to address a specific issue</p> <p>Q7. This was one off expenditure</p>			
		<b>REVISED TOTAL</b>	<b>£52,628</b>

BLANK PAGE

**AUDIT AND SCRUTINY COMMITTEE**

**FEEDBACK PROVIDED ON CONSULTANCY EXPENDITURE FOR 2014/15**

Feedback was initially requested on:-

*Any paid consultancy or advice commissioned directly by the council from an external individual, company or organisation for a fixed period of time to assist the council progress an issue, including in respect of the provision of legal services.*

The Audit and Scrutiny Committee is now seeking the following information on each of items of feedback provided before:-

1. *Why were the consultants considered necessary and therefore engaged?*
2. *Was there any prospect of the work being done in-house and, if not, why?*
3. *Was the work in question done in-house previously?*
4. *Is it considered likely or not that the consultant expenditure on the issue in question will increase in future and, if so, why?*
5. *Was the work undertaken by someone who had previously left the council's employment and, if so, why?*
6. *To what extent, if at all, was the expenditure linked to any spend to save initiative?*
7. *Was the expenditure in question considered to have been one-off or, alternatively, was it recurring expenditure for more on-going/repeat work to some degree?*

The feedback provided is listed below by question.

## CHIEF EXECUTIVE'S OFFICE 2014/15

### Accountancy Service

Name & Designation of Individual Advisor or Consultant; <u>or</u> Name of Company or Organisation	Nature of Service Provided	Period of Time the Consultant, Advisor, Company or Organisation was Employed	Total Cost of Service Provided (Excl VAT)
<b>Sector/Capita Treasury Solutions</b>	<b>Treasury Service</b>	Annual Contract for 2014-15	£11,000
<p>Q1. This is a high risk, specialist area which we do not have the in-house expertise to provide.</p> <p>Q2. This could not be done in-house because it is a specialised area. Only large authorities would provide this service in-house.</p> <p>Q3. Not done in-house previously (to officers' knowledge, outside consultants used for this for at least the past 30 years).</p> <p>Q4. On basis of previous trends, costs only likely to increase by inflation.</p> <p>Q5. Not done by someone who had previously left the council's employment.</p> <p>Q6. Expenditure not linked to any spend to save initiative.</p> <p>Q7. This is recurring expenditure.</p>			
<b>Sector</b>	<b>Investment Benchmarking</b>	Annual Contract for 2014-15	£485
<p>Q1. This allows benchmarking with other authorities (it is debatable whether this should be classified as a consultancy cost rather than a benchmarking club).</p> <p>Q2. This is a time consuming exercise and current workloads prohibit it being done in-house.</p> <p>Q3. Not done in-house previously (the service is a member of several benchmarking clubs).</p> <p>Q4. On the basis of previous trends, costs only likely to increase by inflation.</p> <p>Q5. Not done by someone who had previously left the council's employment.</p> <p>Q6. Expenditure not linked to any spend to save initiative, but the output shows where other authorities are investing surplus funds which could lead to financial benefits for the council.</p> <p>Q7. This is recurring expenditure.</p>			



<b>KPMG LLP</b>	<b>Fee re VAT Reclaim HMRC (Trade Waste)</b>	Not Applicable	£1,724
<p>Q1. This is a specialist area in which the council does not have in-house expertise.  Q2. This could not be done in-house as we do not have the expertise.  Q3. Not done in-house previously.  Q4. The expenditure will not rise. This was a one off project.  Q5. Not done by someone who had previously left the council's employment.  Q6. Expenditure not linked to any spend to save initiative, but the council has benefited financially from the outcome of the work completed.  Q7. This was one off expenditure for this particular project.</p>			
<b>KPMG LLP</b>	<b>Fee Relating to Non-Business Sport Litigation (VAT case)</b>	Not Applicable	£1,500
<p>Q1. This is a specialist area in which the council does not have in-house expertise.  Q2. This could not be done in-house as we do not have the expertise.  Q3. Not done in-house previously.  Q4. The expenditure will not rise. This was a one off project.  Q5. Not done by someone who had previously left the council's employment.  Q6. It was not linked to spend to save work, but it is hopeful that the council will benefit financially from the outcome of the court case that KPMG are managing for us.  Q7. This was one off expenditure for this particular project..</p>			
<b>KPMG LLP</b>	<b>Annual Fee for VAT Line Help Services</b>	Not Applicable	£1,000
<p>Q1. This is a specialist area in which the council does not have in-house expertise.  Q2. This could not be done in-house as we do not have the expertise.  Q3. This was done in-house previously, but the employee left the council under ill health retiral and has not been replaced.  Q4. On the basis of previous trends, costs only likely to increase by inflation.  Q5. Not done by someone who had previously left the council's employment.  Q6. It is not linked to spend to save, but by buying into this service the council are mitigating the chance of incurring penalties from HMRC.  Q7. This is recurring expenditure.</p>			

<b>KPMG LLP</b>	<b>Fee Relating to Education VAT</b>	Not Applicable	£3,000
<p>Q1. This is a specialist area in which the council does not have in-house expertise.  Q2. This could not be done in-house as we do not have the expertise.  Q3. Not done in-house previously.  Q4. This was a one off project.  Q5. Not done by someone who had previously left the council's employment.  Q6. It is not linked to spend to save, but by buying into this service the council are mitigating the chance of incurring penalties from HMRC.  Q7. This was one off expenditure for this particular project.</p>			
		<b>TOTAL</b>	<b>£18,709</b>

**Internal Audit**

**Nil Return**

**Miscellaneous Services**

<b>Name &amp; Designation of Individual Advisor or Consultant; <u>or</u> Name of Company or Organisation</b>	<b>Nature of Service Provided</b>	<b>Period of Time the Consultant, Advisor, Company or Organisation was Employed</b>	<b>Total Cost of Service Provided (Excl VAT)</b>
<b>West Lothian Council</b>	<b>On Behalf of Improvement Service, to Support Delivery of Benchmarking Programme</b>	Programme Runs for 3 Years From March 2014 – March 2016,  (Total Cost Over 3 Years £4,838.40)	£2,419
The feedback was that this is not consultancy; it is a service to collate and promote use of national benchmarking data.			

<b>Castlerigg Consulting</b>	<b>ICT Shared Service Project with Renfrewshire and Inverclyde Councils</b> <i>(Following Restructuring, IT Services part of Corporate and Community Services)</i>	June 13 – December 2014  <i>(Costs Shown for 2014-15 are net of Contribution from Renfrewshire. (Castlerigg Cost £150,187.50 less £114,725 = £35,462.50))</i>	£35,463
<p>Q1. In response to a business need to ensure that ICT can deliver to the digital aspirations of the council, consultants were engaged to undertake work on behalf of the 3 councils to identify improvements to the operation of ICT in all 3 and identify opportunities where joint working would be beneficial.</p> <p>Q2. The work had to be independent of the 3 councils, identify the opportunities for improvements and could not be done within existing resources.</p> <p>Q3. Not done in-house previously.</p> <p>Q4. The work continued from 2013/14 into 2014/15.</p> <p>Q5. Not done by someone who had previously left the council's employment.</p> <p>Q6. Regarding spend to save, the expenditure was linked to a potential saving equivalent to the cost of the consultancy plus improvements in operations.</p> <p>Q7. The work was one off and was expected to build up the skills of the existing ICT teams across the 3 councils. The consultants focused on areas where they could add most value with the existing ICT teams carrying out the implementation.</p>			
<b>Ernst &amp; Young</b>	<b>Leisure Trust Feasibility</b>	Programme Costs Incurred 2014-15	£114,830
<p>Q1. This is a specialist area in which the council does not have in-house expertise.</p> <p>Q2. This could not be done in-house as we do not have the expertise or capacity.</p> <p>Q3. Not done in-house previously.</p> <p>Q4. This was a one off project.</p> <p>Q5. Not done by someone who had previously left the council's employment.</p> <p>Q6. It was not officially linked to a spend to save initiative, however one of the main reasons for setting up the trust was to achieve the NDR savings</p> <p>Q7. This was one off expenditure for this particular project.</p>			
		<b>TOTAL</b>	<b>£152,712</b>

## Legal Services

The expenditure does not relate solely to the Chief Executive's Office. Expenditure on legal consultancy work (put out to private firms via a framework tender) is taken from client departments' revenue or capital budgets. The information below therefore incorporates legal costs invoiced in 2014/15 for capital and revenue expenditure. On that basis, Legal Services had minimal consultancy expenditure themselves. The department to which the expenditure relates is part of the information specified in Column 2 below. Depending on the nature of tasks, the firms specified were engaged to complete specific tasks rather than for a fixed period. Work relating to the Court of Session requires staff with rights of audience, Counsel or legal firms with Advocates. For Questions 5 and 6 see comments in covering report.

Name & Designation of Individual Advisor or Consultant; or Name of Company or Organisation	Nature of Service Provided <i>(Department to Which Attributable)</i>	Period of Time the Consultant, Advisor, Company or Organisation was Employed	Total Cost of Service Provided <i>(Excl VAT)</i>
Anderson Strathern Solicitors	Property Lease Related <i>(Environment)</i>	Costs Invoiced for 2014-15	£546
<p>Q1. This one off piece of work was outsourced due to pressure of work on internal legal service at particular time.            Q2. Pressure on in-house team was reason work was out-sourced.            Q3. Work of this nature is generally handled in-house.            Q4&amp;7. Further costs of this sort may arise due to ongoing pressure of work, time demands and internal resource limitations.</p>			
Brodies LLP	(1) <b>Community Councils (£6,393)</b> <i>(Corporate and Community Services)</i> (2) <b>Leisure Trust (£42,583)</b> <i>(Education)</i> (3) <b>Shanks Park Development Strategy (£8,000)</b> <i>(Environment)</i> (4) <b>Planning Advice (£1,300)</b> <i>(Environment)</i>	Costs Invoiced for 2014-15	£58,276

**(1) Community Council**

- Q1. Outsourced due to scale of work, resource implications and because it was considered prudent to have an external view of issue given external views on council's proposal to revisit scheme.
- Q2. The resource implications and wish for an external view was why this was not done in-house.
- Q4&7. One off project, not expected to be repeated.

**(2) Leisure Trust**

- Q1. This one off piece of work was outsourced due to scale of work and resource implications.
- Q2. Resource implications were a reason this work was out-sourced.
- Q4&7. One off project. Not expected to be repeated.

**(3) Shanks Park Strategy**

- Q1. Initial consultation undertaken internally, but further work carried out externally taking account of scale of work and internal resource/ pressure of work at the time (carried over from 2013/14).
- Q2&3. Internal resource / pressure of work at the time was one reason this was done externally.
- Q4&7. The work and expenditure carried over from 2013/14.

**(4) Planning Advice**

- Q1. Advice sought regarding Environmental Impact Assessment issues/cumulative effect for Maidenhill Strategic Development Opportunity site and also the development contribution strategy for both Maidenhill and Barrhead South Strategic Development Opportunity sites.
- Q2&3. Work of this type is generally handled in-house but was outsourced due to pressure of work on the in-house team at particular time.
- Q4&7. Further costs of this sort (i.e. various advice) may arise in the future due to ongoing pressure of work, time demands and internal resource limitations.

<b>Maclay, Murray &amp; Spens</b>	<b>Employment Equal Pay/Tribunal Advice (Corporate and Community Services)</b>	Costs Invoiced for 2014-15	£7,759
<p><i>Comments as for 2013/14</i></p> <p>Q1. The scale of equal pay settlements and likely duration of the settlement process prompted use of external advisers. They have been involved, on behalf of the council, since 2008 in this capacity.</p> <p>Q2. There is technical capability to do this in-house, but the work is resource intensive to the point of impacting detrimentally on Legal Service's ability to fulfil other requirements of the council regarding legal advice/representation.</p> <p>Q3. Work regarding the equal pay settlement has always been outsourced and has not been handled directly by Legal Services, although the Chief Officer (Legal and Procurement) retains oversight of the firm's work in this regard.</p> <p>Q4. The work is designed to settle/defend the council's position regarding equal pay claims (raised by individuals historically affected by inequalities of pay based on gender), with a view to minimising council's ultimate liability, and is therefore reactive to claims being made. Expenditure will continue until all these claims are resolved, but will be likely to reduce due to diminishing numbers of current claims.</p> <p>Q7. Regarding recurring expenditure, see Q1 and Q4.</p>			
Shepherd & Wedderburn	<p>(1) <b>Eastwood Health Centre (£13,109)</b> <i>(Community Health and Care Partnership)</i></p> <p>(2) <b>Barrhead High School (£41,699)</b> <i>(Education/Environment)</i></p> <p>(3) <b>Newton Mearns Flood Prevention Group Judicial Review (£669)</b> <i>(Environment)</i></p> <p>(4) <b>Caveats (£240)</b> <i>(Chief Executive's Office)</i></p> <p>(5) <b>Bell Rock Parent Company Guarantee Transfer (£883)</b> <i>(Education/Environment)</i></p> <p>(6) <b>Various Planning (£3,938)</b> <i>(Environment)</i></p>	Costs Invoiced for 2014-15	£60,538

**(1) Eastwood Health Centre Comments as for 2013/14**

- Q1. This one off piece of work was outsourced due to pressure of work on internal legal service at particular time.  
Q2. Pressure on in-house team was reason work was out-sourced.  
Q3. Work of this nature is generally handled in-house.  
Q4&7. Further costs of this sort may arise due to ongoing pressure of work, time demands and internal resource limitations.

**(2) Barrhead High School Comments as for 2013/14**

- Q1. The matter involved Court of Session litigation and engagement of Counsel so the work required to be outsourced as internal service has no rights of audience in Court of Session.  
Q2&3. Could not be done in-house.  
Q4&7. Litigation now concluded so no further costs.

**(3) Newton Mearns Flood Prevention Group Judicial Review Comments as for 2013/14**

- Q1. The matter involved Court of Session litigation and engagement of Counsel so the work required to be outsourced as internal service has no rights of audience in Court of Session.  
Q2&3. Could not be done in-house.  
Q4&7. Litigation now concluded so no further costs.

**(4) Caveats Comments as for 2013/14**

- Q1. This is the lodging of Court of Session caveats by Edinburgh agents.  
Q4&7. This is an annual process.

**(5) Bell Rock Parent Company**

- Q1-3. This related to St Ninians contractual issues (see 2013/14). The work was outsourced to the firm involved in the original preparation of PFI documentation for the school extension who retained intimate knowledge of contract provisions relevant to efficient handling of remediation issues. This was a more efficient use of resources than dealing with matter in-house.  
Q4&7. Ongoing expenditure dependent on further issues arising connected to PFI documentation and internal capacity at that time.

**(6) Various Planning Advice**

- Q1. This centred on interpretation of the Development Contributions SPG regarding the general principle of taking contributions and thereafter on the implications/legitimacy etc of education contributions. Outsourced due to pressure of work on internal service at particular time.
- Q2. Pressure on in-house team was reason work was out-sourced.
- Q3. Work of this nature is generally handled in-house.
- Q4&7. Further costs of this sort (i.e. various advice) may arise in future due to ongoing pressure of work, time demands and internal resource limitations

		<b>TOTAL</b>	<b>£127,119</b>
--	--	--------------	-----------------



## CORPORATE AND COMMUNITY SERVICES DEPARTMENT 2014/15

Name & Designation of Individual Advisor or Consultant; <u>or</u> Name of Company or Organisation	Nature of Service Provided	Period of Time the Consultant, Advisor, Company or Organisation was Employed	Total Cost of Service Provided (Excl VAT)
<b>ODS Services Ltd</b>	<b>Training and Support on Using Improvement Science /Model for Improvement to Deliver SOA Workstreams</b>	April 2014 – March 2015	£22,591
<p>Q1. The council identified that it needed additional capacity to roll-out the Model for Improvement across the CPP. ODS met the requirements of the tender.</p> <p>Q2. The work could not be done in-house. This exercise was a skills transfer as we seek to increase the number of staff who understand and can use the model.</p> <p>Q3. The work was done in-house previously, however the skills are highly sought after and the previously trained staff had moved on.</p> <p>Q4. There may be spend on this issue over the next two financial years. This is dependent on department requirements for support and the skill-base and turnover of staff.</p> <p>Q5. Not done by someone who had previously left the council's employment.</p> <p>Q6. Expenditure not linked to any spend to save initiative.</p> <p>Q7. This is on-going work to embed the Model for Improvement into the CPP and council.</p>			
<b>Solace Enterprises</b>	<b>Review of Operation and Support of Community Planning (Part of Review of Scheme of Establishment for Community Planning)</b>	April 2014 – October 2014	£9,588
<p><i>See 2013/14 also</i></p> <p>Q1. We wanted to bring in an independent, un-impeachable individual to review the operation of community councils and the support that the council provided.</p> <p>Q2. The point of this exercise was for an experienced, external individual to make an objective assessment and make recommendations (i.e. a critical friend).</p> <p>Q3. The work was not done in-house previously.</p> <p>Q4. It is not considered likely that the expenditure on this will increase in future. This was for a specific piece of work.</p> <p>Q5. Not done by someone who had previously left the council's employment.</p> <p>Q6. Expenditure not linked to any spend to save initiative.</p> <p>Q7. This was considered one off expenditure</p>			

<b>Axiom Market Research &amp; Consultancy</b>	<b>Telephone and Research Services for Mapping of Community Groups (Required for Community Learning and Development Strategy)</b>	April 2014 – September 2014	£4,683
The feedback was that this was not consultancy work. It was a contracted piece of work designed by council to meet legislative requirements.			
<b>ODS Services Ltd</b>	<b>Research: Community Assets and Equality in Relation to Securing 2 Equalities Groups in East Renfrewshire as Part of Council’s Equality Duties (Diversity ER and ERDA)</b>	April 2014 – March 2015	£5,000
<p>Q1. Consultants were necessary for this project to pilot the application of the relatively new concept of “Appreciating Assets” to community development for equality groups. This required, among others, drawing on practice elsewhere, an independent mediator and facilitator between equality groups and the council; and expertise in CLD. This was linked to a 3 year fixed cost work started in 2013-14.</p> <p>Q2. Aspects of the work being done in-house have included identifying relevant officers, elected members and community representatives for interviewing and consultation sessions facilitated by the Consultants; ongoing support to equality community groups to explain new concepts; and undertaking follow-up actions, such as completing unfinished tasks.</p> <p>Q3. Appreciating Assets is a relatively new concept which required external expertise.</p> <p>Q4. The expenditure was fixed and is not likely to increase in the future.</p> <p>Q5. Not done by someone who had previously left the council’s employment.</p> <p>Q6. Expenditure not linked to any spend to save initiative.</p> <p>Q7. This was one off expenditure linked to a 3 year fixed cost programme.</p>			

<b>Castlerigg Consulting Ltd</b>	<b>Consultancy Support for Development of Future Council Change Programme</b>	April 2014 – September 2014	£29,000
<p>Q1. This was considered necessary to engage with CMT and each Director independently to agree a mandate for future transformation and change with clearly defined outcomes and benefits. The engagement of consultants was mainly to obtain an <u>independent</u> assessment of the critical strengths and weaknesses with the council's current and past approaches to change and transformation, including the delivery of financial benefits and to challenge and inspire the council on the 'art of the possible' with regard to future opportunities for transformation and change.</p> <p>Q2. The consultants engaged significantly with the (then) Head of Customer &amp; Business Change Services and Programme Management Office who were integral to the conclusions, however the element of independent, objective challenge was sought and could only be obtained by using external people. The consultants also brought much needed capacity to undertaking the level of engagement that was required right across the council.</p> <p>Q3. Not applicable.</p> <p>Q4. A corporate resources contract is currently out to tender to allow the council the flexibility to draw down additional support for the change programme. This covers the areas of ICT, HR and change. This will help the council to deliver on the pace and scale of change required to modernise the council and meet budget challenges and will augment existing capacity and skills where required.</p> <p>Q5. Not done by someone who had previously left the council's employment.</p> <p>Q6. This work was not directly linked to a single spend to save initiative, but was critical to delivery of the council's future change programme which contributes essential financial savings.</p> <p>Q7. This was a one off expenditure.</p>			
		<b>TOTAL</b>	<b>£70,862</b>

## EDUCATION DEPARTMENT 2014/15

Name & Designation of Individual Advisor or Consultant; or Name of Company or Organisation	Nature of Service Provided	Period of Time the Consultant, Advisor, Company or Organisation was Employed	Total Cost of Service Provided (Excl VAT)
Coyle Education	(1) Investigating Practicalities of Operating 3 Double Periods for S6 Pupils	December 2014	£5,277
	(2) School Timetabling	January 2015	£6,330
	(3) Completion of Secondary School Timetabling	March 2015	£3,528
<p>Q1. For 3 issues above are all inter-related to school structures and associated timetabling. It concerned the department responding to feedback from teachers to provide more upper school classes with larger continuous blocks of learning and teaching time which necessitated a feasibility study of each schools' timetable. As for the 2013/14 response, the above consultant was approached which provides unique expertise to head teachers of our secondary schools to compile their individual school timetables based on each school's curricular pathways for meeting their pupils' needs. The development works is seasonal and required over the same intensive timeframe in all schools each year. It demands a high level of expertise and knowledge of education in East Renfrewshire.</p> <p>Q2. An officer from the department works closely with this supplier and the schools to build in-house skills and knowledge. However due to the high level of experience and in-depth understanding required and capacity constraints there continues to be key aspects where this external support is required. This service is highly valued by head teachers who recognise its importance in significantly contributing to the outstanding performance levels of schools.</p> <p>Q3. A number of years ago the individual worked in the authority before retiring from post. His expertise was developed over his many years in this educational field which latterly was in the council and is recognised nationally.</p> <p>Q4. This is considered a cost effective and efficient method of providing such a quality service for schools.</p> <p>Q5. A number of years ago the individual worked in the authority before retiring.</p> <p>Q6. Although not specifically linked to spend to save, this is such and is best value.</p> <p>Q7. This service is required annually for schools and the department has improved in-house experience by working closely and developing tools based on the methodology used. The department will continue to explore options to further improve in-house expertise within the context of remaining available resources.</p>			

<b>William Clark</b>	<b>Work Associated with Joint Schools Faith Campus Consultation</b>	November 2014	£2,403
<p>Q1. This related to the pupil consultation element of the statutory education consultation for the new Faith Schools Joint Campus. Such consultation is considered a specialist piece of work requiring both an understanding of the legislation and the workings of the local authority and the ability to engage effectively with pupils across the primary and secondary sector.</p> <p>Q2&amp;3. Guidance strongly advocates use of independent, experienced parties to carry out this exercise. This supplier has the necessary skills, abilities and experience, particularly in the secondary sector, to assist in this task, having previously worked with school managers and pupils.</p> <p>Q4&amp;7. It may be necessary to engage this consultant when undertaking future statutory education consultations to evidence this task is being carried out independently.</p> <p>Q5. Not done by someone who had previously left the council's employment.</p>			
<b>Ellen McBride</b>	<b>(1) Work Associated with Joint Schools Faith Campus Consultation</b>	November 2014	£2,132
	<b>(2) NQT Training – Interview Skills</b>	6 & 8 January 2015	£1,250
<p>(1) <b><u>Work Associated with Joint Schools Faith Campus Consultation</u></b></p> <p>Q1. This work related to the pupil consultation element of the statutory education consultation for the new Faith Schools Joint Campus. Such consultation is considered a specialist piece of work requiring both an understanding of the legislation and the workings of the local authority and the ability to engage effectively with pupils across the primary and secondary sector.</p> <p>Q2. Guidance strongly advocates use of independent, experienced parties to carry out this exercise. This supplier has the necessary skills, abilities and experience, particularly in the primary sector, to assist in this task, having previously worked with school managers and pupils.</p> <p>Q4&amp;7. It may be necessary to engage this consultant when undertaking future statutory education consultations to evidence this task is being carried out independently.</p> <p>Q5. Not done by someone who had previously left the council's employment.</p>			

<b>(2) <u>NQT Training – Interview Skills</u></b>			
<p>Q1-3. The engagement of this consultant was necessary due to a lack of in-house capacity and expertise at that time.. Lack of in-house capacity was one reason provided for this work being done.</p> <p>Q4&amp;6 Going forward, a new model of in-house delivery is being developed.</p> <p>&amp;7.</p> <p>Q5. Not done by someone who had previously left the council’s employment.</p>			
<b>Hilda De Felice</b>	<b>NQT Training – Motivating Yourself</b>	3 & 5 June 2014	£1,200
<p>Q1-3. The engagement of this consultant was necessary due to a lack of in-house capacity at that time. Lack of in-house capacity at that time was reason provided for this work being done..</p> <p>Q5. A number of years ago the individual worked in the authority before retiring from post.</p>			
<b>Stuart Allison</b>	<b>Science Review Questionnaires</b>	January 2015 (3 Days)	£750
<p>Q1. The development of these questionnaires was part of early preparatory work in advance of a wider review of the learning and teaching of science across East Renfrewshire’s schools. This work requires a detailed knowledge and understanding of East Renfrewshire’s recent science improvement programme, the local schools and catchment areas as well as teaching staff. Knowledge of the national perspective and future direction of science in relation to the continuing implementation of Curriculum for Excellence is also essential. The above consultant had the necessary skills, abilities &amp; experience to assist in this task and was available to meet the timescale required.</p> <p>Q2-4. Whilst there was insufficient expertise and capacity in-house to undertake this task at that time, the department is seeking to improve</p> <p>&amp;7 in-house knowledge/expertise in this area.</p> <p>Q5. This individual worked for the authority before retiring from post.</p>			

<b>Bob Tennent</b>	<b>Bespoke Services Related to Teaching Staff Analysis of East Renfrewshire Primary and Secondary Schools. Consultancy on Curriculum Structures to Support Developing the Young Workforce Recommendations.</b>	Various dates - November 2014 - March 2015	£14,080
<p>Q1. There was a need to examine teacher staff usage within primary and secondary schools. This looked at the entitlement of the current model and actual operations within establishments, considered efficiencies and will be used to inform future wider redesign. To undertake this work required detailed knowledge and understanding of East Renfrewshire's management, curriculum and pupil support structures and staffing arrangements, in addition to high analytical skills. At the same time it was necessary to consider the implications of the national Developing the Young Workforce recommendations in terms of the existing curricular structures within our schools.</p> <p>Q2&amp;3. This one-off work required to be completed within a relatively short timeframe and there was no in-house capacity to do so. The above consultant has the necessary skills, abilities &amp; experience to assist in this task and was available to meet the timescale required.</p> <p>Q4&amp;7. Consultant support is unlikely to be incurred in future years for this one off task; however the use of the skills set of the supplier may be used in future should best value be demonstrated to meet the needs of schools.</p> <p>Q5. This individual worked for the authority before retiring from post.</p>			
<b>Daniel McGinty</b>	<b>Flexible Routes to Headship Training</b>	1 day – September 2014	£350
<p>Q1-3. The engagement of this consultant was necessary due to a lack of in-house capacity and expertise at that time.</p> <p>Q4&amp;6. A new national model is being developed to support those aspiring to be Head Teachers.</p> <p>Q5. Not done by someone who had previously left the council's employment.</p> <p>Q7. It is unlikely that consultant expenditure on this issue will be incurred in the future.</p>			

<b>Clearwater Brooks</b>	<b>NQT Training – Facilitating Feedback</b>	29 April and 1 May 2014	£1,300
<p>Q1-3. The engagement of this consultant was necessary due to a lack of in-house capacity and expertise at that time.  Q4,6 It is unlikely that further consultant expenditure on this issue will be incurred going forward as an in-house model of delivery is being  &amp;7 developed.  Q5. Not done by someone who had previously left the council's employment.</p>			
<b>Hub West Scotland (Turner &amp; Townsend)</b>	<b>Structural Survey – Eastwood Leisure Centre</b>	May and June 2014	£1,150
<p><i>Comments as for 2013/14. This relates to further costs incurred early in the 2014/15 financial year but related to the original work commissioned in February/March 2014</i></p> <p>Q1-3. This work was procured externally, based on advice from colleagues in Property and Technical Services, due to the specific technical expertise required.  Q5. Not done by someone who had previously left the council's employment.</p>			
		<b>TOTAL</b>	<b>£39,750</b>



## COMMUNITY HEALTH AND CARE PARTNERSHIP 2014/15

Name & Designation of Individual Advisor or Consultant; <u>or</u> Name of Company or Organisation	Nature of Service Provided	Period of Time the Consultant, Advisor, Company or Organisation was Employed	Total Cost of Service Provided (Excl VAT)
<b>KPMG LLP</b>	<b>Business Case Review for Bonnyton House Care Home</b>	5-13 February 2015	£4,860
<p>Q1. There was considerable family and staff opposition to the proposal to sell Bonnyton House and related publicity in the local press, questioning the council's decision. We felt it was important that we could show the council's financial analysis about Bonnyton had been reviewed by an independent body.</p> <p>Q2-3. It was important to show that an independent body had reviewed the council's analysis. All the initial financial analysis was carried out by council and HSCP staff.</p> <p>Q4. It is considered likely that expenditure will rise because further detailed analysis will be required.</p> <p>Q5. Not done by someone who had previously left the council's employment.</p> <p>Q6. Expenditure is not linked to any spend to save initiative.</p> <p>Q7. Work is limited to the analysis of Bonnyton and that required to achieve council savings. Expenditure will not be recurring, but the costs will increase on a one-off basis.</p>			
<b>Louise Close Ltd</b>	<b>Consultancy Service for Self-Directed Support Care Home Pilot</b>	January /February 2015	£907
<p>Q1. It was proposed to Government that a 'critical friend' relationship with a known party would support the development of the learning as set out in the approved submission to Government.</p> <p>Q2. The work could not be done in-house. Using the skills and approach of this known party was deemed the most appropriate approach to providing the learning and development input to the programme. It was felt essential to have a person with considerable experience of working on change programmes within the sphere of social care.</p> <p>Q3. Not applicable.</p> <p>Q4. The role of the consultant has been scoped and agreed and is not likely to change from the approved budget plan.</p> <p>Q5. Not done by someone who had previously left the council's employment.</p> <p>Q6. Expenditure is not linked to any spend to save initiative.</p> <p>Q7. The expenditure is recurring over the term of the funding with Scottish Government Ministers.</p>			
<b>TOTAL</b>			<b>£5,767</b>

## ENVIRONMENT DEPARTMENT 2014/15

Name & Designation of Individual Advisor or Consultant; <u>or</u> Name of Company or Organisation	Nature of Service Provided	Period of Time the Consultant, Advisor, Company or Organisation was Employed	Total Cost of Service Provided (Excl VAT)
<b>Architrail Ltd</b>	<b>Project Supervision Whitelee Mountain Bike Trails Project</b>	April to May 2014	£9,825
<p>Q1. This was the building of the Mountain Bike Facility at Whitelee Windfarm. Project supervision was required as there was no experience of constructing such a facility in-house. This is the continuation of the 2013/14 project.</p> <p>Q2. Specialist experience was required so this work could not be done in-house.</p> <p>Q3. The work was not done in-house previously.</p> <p>Q4. It is not considered likely that the expenditure will increase in future.</p> <p>Q5. Not done by someone who had previously left the council's employment.</p> <p>Q6. Expenditure not linked to any spend to save initiative.</p> <p>Q7. This was one off expenditure (project now complete).</p>			
<b>Capita Symonds Ltd.</b>	<b>CDM Co-ordination Role Whitelee Mountain Bike Trails Project</b>	April to May 2014	£1,591
<p>Q1. This was linked to the building of the Mountain Bike Facility at Whitelee Windfarm. The CDM co-ordinator was required as there was no experience of constructing such a facility in-house. This was the continuation of the project from 2013/14.</p> <p>Q2. Regarding the prospect of this work being done in-house, it would not have been appropriate to have an officer on site as a CDM co-ordinator for a 12 week build period. That would have required someone to back fill that officer's post which would have been more costly than that charged. The officer was also acting as the client.</p> <p>Q3. The work was not done in-house previously.</p> <p>Q4. It is not considered likely that the expenditure will increase in future.</p> <p>Q5. Not done by someone who had previously left the council's employment.</p> <p>Q6. Expenditure not linked to any spend to save initiative.</p> <p>Q7. This was one off expenditure (project now complete).</p>			

<b>Dougall Baillie Associates</b>	<b>Transport Appraisal &amp; Access Solutions</b>	April to October 2014 * (Education Department Contribution £4,350)	£10,000 *
<p>Q1. This relates to the Waterfoot Road Faith Campus project required for the Maidenhill Development to be effective and promoted through the Local Development Plan (LDP). The Transport Appraisal looked at the impact of the proposal and the access options.</p> <p>Q2. This could have been done internally, but there were capacity issues at that time in the Roads Service. The Roads Service assisted with the brief.</p> <p>Q3. The work was not done in-house previously.</p> <p>Q4. It is not considered likely that the expenditure will increase in future.</p> <p>Q5. Not done by someone who had previously left the council's employment.</p> <p>Q6. Expenditure not linked to any spend to save initiative.</p> <p>Q7. This was one off expenditure.</p>			
<b>City of Play</b>	<b>Play Provision for Barrhead</b>	October 2014	£950
<p>Q1. This was a small piece of work looking at the potential for designs and feasibility for Natural Play proposals for Barrhead South.</p> <p>Q2. This was specialist work that could not be done in-house.</p> <p>Q3. The work was not done in-house previously.</p> <p>Q4. It is not considered likely that the expenditure will increase in future.</p> <p>Q5. Not done by someone who had previously left the council's employment.</p> <p>Q6. Expenditure not linked to any spend to save initiative.</p> <p>Q7. This was one off expenditure.</p>			

<b>Biggar Economics Ltd.</b>	<b>Economic Development Consultation</b>	May to August 2014	£2,000
<p>Q1. Biggar Consultants are economic appraisal specialists and have been appointed on several occasions to assist with, in particular, the business cases for City Deal projects.</p> <p>Q2. There was no in-house expertise for economic impact appraisals.</p> <p>Q3. The work was not done in-house previously.</p> <p>Q4. The company may bid again for work when new business plans are being developed or revised, as and when required. There is no likely increase in expenditure though.</p> <p>Q5. Not done by someone who had previously left the council's employment.</p> <p>Q6. Expenditure not linked to any spend to save initiative.</p> <p>Q7. There may be future expenditure at the same level as explained above (a maximum of once or twice per year).</p>			
<b>Biggar Economics Ltd.</b>	<b>Consultancy on Social Economics Impact</b>	September to November 2014	£2,400
<p>Q1. Biggar Consultants are economic appraisal specialists, and have been appointed on several occasions to assist with, in particular, the business cases for City Deal projects</p> <p>Q2. There was no in-house expertise for this.</p> <p>Q3. The work was not done in-house previously.</p> <p>Q4. The company may bid again for work when new business plans are being developed or revised, as and when required. There is no likely increase in expenditure though.</p> <p>Q5. Not done by someone who had previously left the council's employment.</p> <p>Q6. Expenditure not linked to any spend to save initiative.</p> <p>Q7. There may be future expenditure at the same level as explained above (a maximum of once or twice per year).</p>			

<b>WSP UK Ltd.</b>	<b>Transport Appraisal / Assessment – Newford Grove</b>	June 2014 to February 2015	£7,827
<p>Q1. The impact on local traffic numbers, behaviour, management, etc. was required as relevant input into the necessary road safety, parking and other measures required by the design of the proposed new build Family Centre and Nursery at this location.</p> <p>Q2. The relevant expertise was not available using in-house resources and the need to access professional advice with no bias was also considered important.</p> <p>Q3. To the best of knowledge, the work was not done in-house previously.</p> <p>Q4. A refresh of the report to consider the merits of an alternative access to the site was undertaken (it is understood that this was in addition to the above amount but, without ledger information, that cannot be said for certain). No further expenditure is expected at this point but the project has still to receive planning permission.</p> <p>Q5. Not done by someone who had previously left the council's employment.</p> <p>Q6. Expenditure not linked to any spend to save initiative. The assessment was carried out in connection with a series of other data-collection activities to inform planned capital expenditure.</p> <p>Q7. This was originally considered one-off expenditure but planning refusal led to the need for more detailed consideration of alternative access which, in turn, led to the refreshing of report. As planning permission has yet to be gained, it is impossible to say at this stage whether further expenditure will be incurred.</p>			
<b>Active Maps Ltd.</b>	<b>East Renfrewshire Cycle Maps</b>	March 2015	£2,725
<p>Q1 This was to produce detailed cycle maps for the council area in relation to active travel.</p> <p>Q2. The level of mapping work required and constraints placed on the council by external funding partners meant that doing this in-house was not feasible.</p> <p>Q3. This has not been done in-house before; it was a bespoke project.</p> <p>Q4. A similar project may be carried out in future, but at this time there are no firm plans to do so and any plans would require external funding.</p> <p>Q5. Not done by someone who had previously left the council's employment.</p> <p>Q6. Expenditure not linked to any spend to save initiative.</p> <p>Q7. This was one off expenditure, but we would consider using the same supplier if we had a similar project.</p>			

<b>PMR Leisure</b>	<b>Consultancy Services for Balgray Watersports</b>	May to September 2014	£5,108
<p>Q1. This was in relation to a feasibility study to determine if a wakepark was feasible at Balgray Reservoir. PMR Leisure are experts in the wakepark field and advised on governance/operational arrangements on the basis of a social enterprise model.</p> <p>Q2. This was specialist work that could not be done in-house.</p> <p>Q3. This has not been done in-house before.</p> <p>Q4. It is likely that expenditure will increase in future. The wakepark at Balgray Reservoir is an ongoing project and further specialist work will be required.</p> <p>Q5. Not done by someone who had previously left the council's employment.</p> <p>Q6. Expenditure not linked to any spend to save initiative.</p> <p>Q7. This was initial feasibility. More work will be required.</p>			
<b>Anderson Bell Christie</b>	<b>Master Plan Maidenhill / Malletsheugh</b>	May to October 2014	£26,000
<p>Q1. Anderson Bell Christie were employed to facilitate the Maidenhill Masterplan and discuss and co-ordinate the infrastructure requirements of the different parties and developers.</p> <p>Q2. It was possible for this work to be carried out by internal staff, but there were capacity issues within the Planning Service at that time due to the ongoing LDP process. Anderson Bell Christie also brought external expertise as an architecture practice which was beneficial.</p> <p>Q3. Not done in-house previously.</p> <p>Q4. Is it not considered likely that the expenditure will increase in future.</p> <p>Q5. Not done by someone who had previously left the council's employment.</p> <p>Q6. Expenditure not linked to any spend to save initiative.</p> <p>Q7. This was one off expenditure.</p>			

<b>WSP UK Ltd.</b>	<b>Traffic Impact Analysis – Barrhead North</b>	September 2014 to February 2015	£5,950
<p>Q1. This relates to the Barrhead North Masterplan for development at Glasgow Road and Shanks promoted through the LDP process. The work was to consider the improvements required to facilitate development and minimise impact on existing network.</p> <p>Q2. It was possible for the work to be carried out by internal staff, but there were capacity issues in Roads at that time. Roads Service assisted with the brief.</p> <p>Q3. Work not done in-house previously.</p> <p>Q4. Not considered likely that the expenditure will increase in future.</p> <p>Q5. Not done by someone who had previously left the council’s employment.</p> <p>Q6. Expenditure not linked to any spend to save initiative.</p> <p>Q7. This was one off expenditure.</p>			
<b>Roderick MacLean Associates Ltd.</b>	<b>Barrhead Retail Capacity Assessment</b>	July to November 2014	£2,470
<p>Q1. This piece of work was carried out to consider the retail capacity within Barrhead and to consider if the Glasgow Road site could accommodate small scale retail development without adversely impacting on Barrhead Town Centre. This informed the Masterplan for Barrhead North promoted through the LDP.</p> <p>Q2. This was specialist work that could not be done in-house.</p> <p>Q3. Work not done in-house previously.</p> <p>Q4. It is not considered likely that the expenditure will increase in future.</p> <p>Q5. Not done by someone who had previously left the council’s employment.</p> <p>Q6. Expenditure not linked to any spend to save initiative.</p> <p>Q7. This was one off expenditure.</p>			

<b>Anderson Bell Christie</b>	<b>D2D Watersport Centre Design &amp; Cost Feasibility</b>	May 2014 to March 2015	£5,350
<p>Q1. This was a study into the physical and infrastructure requirements in terms of the feasibility of creating a Wakepark Facility at Balgray Reservoir and what the potential costs would be to help design and plan for the development.</p> <p>Q2. This was specialist work that could not be done in-house.</p> <p>Q3. The work was not done in-house previously.</p> <p>Q4. Expenditure could rise in future. The project is still in a development phase.</p> <p>Q5. Not done by someone who had previously left the council's employment.</p> <p>Q6. Expenditure not linked to any spend to save initiative.</p> <p>Q7. There is a possibility of additional expenditure in 2015/16.</p>			
		<b>TOTAL</b>	<b>£82,196</b>