MoU Evaluation Criteria Summary

# Business Case Confidence
## Trowbridge Town Hall

## Wiltshire Council

26th August 2022

LEMON GAZELLE

# 1 Introduction

The criteria for this stage of assessment is one of Wiltshire Council feeling confident in the Trust being able fulfil its side of the Memorandum of Understanding.  It is also an opportunity for the Trust's Board of Trustees to look at its own resource and capacity in deciding whether it should take on such a significant commitment.  The Trustees have a responsibility under their Charitable Objectives to consider such risk and commitment.

The Memorandum of Understanding states the responsibilities on the Trust's side as being:

- *"All TTHT inputs to design briefing process – presenting 'one voice' to the design and construction team:*
- *Procuring/allocating resource to provide the team/expertise required for TTHT input into delivery of the Project:*
- *Managing all base-build project interfaces (from TTHT's perspective):*
- *The design and delivery of loose-fit FF&E including, inter alia, strategy, planning, procurement, design, and design interfaces with base-build install:*
- *Producing, reviewing and submitting a robust business case (including the Market hall option);*
- *All fund-raising efforts;*
- *Establishing a Facilities Management resource to maintain/operate the building upon completion of the Community Asset Transfer."*

The following summarises the tests for each of these elements where questions have elicited responses and evidence around the Trust's ability to deliver their side of the MoU.  The following assessment draws from the Director's responses to questions as well as other interviews and written evidence.  It sets out an expectation on each element as to whether it can be identified that a level has been achieved which might provide sufficient confidence might be reached to allow the next stage to be entered.  As it is an ever changing situation, notes have been added as to levels being reached in the near future.

The levels of assessment are shown as orange or green.

- Orange (1) – the basic level of requirement in the Trust's ability to achieve the requirement has not been achieved
- Green (2) – A basic level of requirement has been achieved in responding to the element of responsibility
- Green (3) – A higher level of requirement has been achieved in responding to the element of responsibility
- Green (4) – The highest level of requirement has been achieved in responding to the element of responsibility required for this assessment

Each element will have its own requirement in relation to the MoU.  These are set under each heading in Section 2.

# 2 Confidence Criteria – Levels and Requirement

## 2.1 Inputs into Design Briefing Process

"All TTHT inputs to design briefing process – presenting 'one voice' to the design and construction team"

| 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 |
|---|---|---|---|

### 2.1.1 Vision

| 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 |
|---|---|---|---|
| There is no single vision for design | There is a single "vision" for the design. | The vision is short, simple and specific to the project. The vision demonstrates the FHSF application objective need to "viably deliver the charitable objective(s) of the trust" | The vision is ambitious. |
| **Requirement to meet MoU criteria:** Requirement met (Level 3) – Evidence: Vision and viability set through Business Plan | | | |

### 2.1.2 Point of contact

| 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 |
|---|---|---|---|
| There is no specific person / persons to present the inputs to the design and construction team | There is a TTHT person / persons assigned to present the inputs to the design and construction team. | Members of the design and construction team are aware of who this person is. | Members of the Trust are aware of who this person is. |
| **Requirement to meet MoU criteria:** Requirement met (Level 2) – Evidence: Through Alignment meetings (Chair, Trustees and Director attending) | | | |

### 2.1.3 Decision-making Process

| 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 |
|---|---|---|---|
| There is no decision-making process | There is a decision-making process | The decision-making process is set down. | The decision-making process is clear and accountable. |
| **Requirement to meet MoU criteria:** Requirement met (Level 3) – Evidence: Initial Alignment meetings.  Imminent following stages seen though Base Build Delivery Team Board.  Equivalent FF&E set up by the Trust or similar has been suggested (ref Base Build Delivery Team ToR).  Note involvement of as many as possible on Trust side.  Suggest Oct 2022 | | | |

| 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 |
|---|---|---|---|

### 2.1.4 Communication

| There is no set way(s) of communicating to the Design and Construction team. | There is a set way(s) of communicating to the Design and Construction team. | The communications methods are set down. | This method(s) has been made aware of to stakeholders. |
|---|---|---|---|

**Requirement to meet MoU criteria:** Requirement met (Level 2) – Evidence: Need to formalise will become necessary as initiative proceeds. The Base build Delivery Team Board is set up (ToR received 5 August 2022) – equivalent needed for FF&E Delivery and where Base Build interfaces are dealt with would complete the circles to include FF&E also.  Suggest Oct 2022

### 2.1.5 Delegation

| There is no method of delegating different thresholds / levels of decision-making. | There are methods of delegating different thresholds / levels of decision-making. | The methods of delegation are set down and clear | The thresholds of decision-making have been shared with the design and construction team and other stakeholders. |
|---|---|---|---|

**Requirement to meet MoU criteria:** Requirement met (Level 2) – Evidence: Base build Delivery Team Board set up – clarification made on these through that.  Will need FF&E Delivery Board or similar to be set up to formalise delegation – Suggest Level 4 by October 2022.

## 2.2 Business Case

*"Producing, reviewing and submitting a robust business case"*

| 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 |
|---|---|---|---|

### 2.2.1 Case

| 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 |
|---|---|---|---|
| There is no business case. | There is a business case. | It is clearly set out. | It has been signed off by Trustees |

**Requirement to meet MoU criteria:** Requirement met (Level 4) – Evidence: Business Plan and confirmation of sign off through Director email 22nd July 2022

### 2.2.2 Content

| 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 |
|---|---|---|---|
| The business case does not contain the content that should be included in a business case. | The content contains, at least, the areas of opportunity / need, shortlisted options, options evaluation (including budgets), implementation strategy, recommendations. | The content includes, at least, the decision, objectives, need, context / background, options workings, budgets and finances, benefits (financial and non-financial), sustainability issues, broad risk analysis. | The content includes the decision, objectives, the need, context / background, alignment to other organisational strategies and plans, options workings, budgets and finances, benefits (financial and non-financial), sustainability issues, rigorous risk analysis (scenario planning, sensitivity analysis and the impact on mitigation), uncertainty. |

**Requirement to meet MoU criteria:** Requirement met (Level 4) – Evidence:  Business Plan -There is a discussion around sustainability issues as far as development of a self-contained financial model - if anything, a usefully slightly pessimistic approach is taken. A balanced risk analysis is undertaken.  The risk narrative is furthered by sensitivity analysis based on inflation - this is a logical issue to look at in the present climate.  Risk analysis is broad but given the time until activities begin, detailed analysis should be undertaken at that point.

| 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 |
|---|---|---|---|

### 2.2.3 Robustness

| No testing of robustness of the business case has been undertaken. | Methodologies, at least basic, have been applied to test the viability of alternative scenarios / situations in, at least, optimistic vs pessimistic terms for the recommended proposition. | Appropriate stress testing or similar methodology has been, at least, broadly applied in line with the proposals (eg through sensitivity analysis / scenario planning). | Thorough and appropriate methodologies been undertaken in terms of stress testing or similar in terms of alternative scenarios / situations which may occur in both financial and non-financial terms. |
|---|---|---|---|

**Requirement to meet MoU criteria:** Requirement met (Level 3) – Evidence: Business Plan - The logic of a quite complicated picture has been talked through the narrative rather than singular comparisons. The assessment of impact of inflation is discussed and the impact on the business via narrative. Level 4 requirements make more sense to be undertaken closer to opening when more information known about the socio economic external environment which will (could) impact on the initiative at that time.

### 2.2.4 Responsibility

| No specific person / persons responsible for the Business Case. | There is a named person / persons responsible for the production, review and submission of the business case. | The details of this responsibility are formally set down. | Stakeholders are aware of the responsibilities and boundaries of this responsibility. |
|---|---|---|---|

**Requirement to meet MoU criteria:** Requirement met (Level 2) – Evidence: Director has immediate responsibility (multiple sources) - authored by RIO but overseen, reviewed and submitted to Trustees by Director

| 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 |
|---|---|---|---|

### 2.2.5 Communication

| There is no set way of communicating the Business Case to stakeholders | The business case has been communicated to appropriate stakeholders? | There are various versions of the Business Case that could be made available for those people who may require differing versions (eg hard copy, digital, large print, for use with digital reader etc)<br><br>There is a communications log for all those requiring updates and versions of the plan setting out, for example, the version type and who and how individuals might want to receive the plan? | There is a clear point of communication to someone who could answer questions or make points of clarification on the business case. |
|---|---|---|---|

**Requirement to meet MoU criteria:** Requirement met (Level 2) – Evidence: Sight of Plan up to Cabinet decision limits number of stakeholders to this point (noted discussions about joint communications) (Director correspondence) – widening scope (and, therefore, versions) will only take place after Cabinet meeting and joint communications take place.

## 2.3 Fundraising

*"All fund-raising efforts"*

| 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 |
|---|---|---|---|

### 2.3.1 Funding Strategy / Plan

| There is no fundraising plan / strategy | There is a fundraising plan / strategy.  The fundraising plan is written down. | Stakeholders are aware of the existence of the fundraising strategy.  The fundraising strategy is used by stakeholders. | The fundraising strategy is directly linked to the overall vision and operations required by the project? |
|---|---|---|---|

**Requirement to meet MoU criteria:** Requirement met (level 2) – Evidence: This is a necessarily evolving picture.  The Business Plan describes the income for the operational side when the Town Hall is operational.  An approach to revenue budgets between now and opening are set out as a broad approach in the Funding Strategy as is the approach to FF&E.  These will tie up as the funding bids and approaches following the Cabinet agreement (it will incentivise a number of funders to know of the Cabinet agreement).  A more concrete Plan, therefore, will be expected soon after that which can be used and evolve.  Would look to developing to Level 4 by end of October 2022.

### 2.3.2 Monitoring / Review / Updating

| The fundraising plan / strategy is not monitored, reviewed or updated. | Is the fundraising plan/ Strategy monitored, reviewed and updated? | The process and regularity of the monitoring, reviewing and updating the fundraising Plan / Strategy is set down? | There is a person(s) responsible for the monitoring, reviewing and updating set down? |
|---|---|---|---|

**Requirement to meet MoU criteria:** Requirement met (level 2) – Evidence: The intent of review and monitoring of funds is stated (Director correspondence)

| 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 |
|---|---|---|---|

### 2.3.3 Responsibility

| | | | |
|---|---|---|---|
| There is not a person(s) responsible for fundraising. | There is a named person / persons responsible for fundraising. | The responsibilities regarding fundraising are clearly set out. | Stakeholders are aware of who the person / persons is who is responsible for fundraising. |

**Requirement to meet MoU criteria:** Requirement met (level 3) – Evidence: Director responsibilities linking to Trustees through Funding Committee demonstrated.

### 2.3.4 Robustness

| | | | |
|---|---|---|---|
| The funding strategy / plan is not robust | The Funding Plan covers a basic breadth of sources, demonstrate a basic track record, basic criteria and is broadly in line with the project and the business case. | The plan covers details of pathways between restricted / unrestricted capital / revenue to specific funding streams (eg investors, corporates, supporters, funders etc), detailed track record set out, clearly articulated criteria. | The Fundraising Plan covers a logical breadth of funding streams (linking reasons for type), track record of organisation and individuals, Individuals responsible for plan, realistic, challenging but achievable goals, clearly articulated, links with the business case. |

**Requirement to meet MoU criteria:** Requirement met (level 2) Evidence: This is a necessarily evolving picture. The Business Plan describes the income for the operational side when the Town Hall is operational. An approach to revenue budgets between now and opening are set out as a broad approach in the Funding Strategy as is the approach to FF&E. These will tie up as the funding bids and approaches following the Cabinet agreement (it will incentivise a number of funders to know of the Cabinet agreement decision) and the Fundraising campaign can start in earnest alongside Wiltshire Council's own communications. A more concrete Plan, therefore, should be expected soon after that. Would look to developing to Level 3 by end of October 2022 and Level 4 by December 2022 (as FF&E funding requirements are more imminent and can be articulated clearly)

## 2.4 Resource

*"Procuring/allocating resource to provide the team/expertise required for TTHT input into delivery of the Project"*

| 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 |
|---|---|---|---|

### 2.4.1 Process

| | | | |
|---|---|---|---|
| There is no process for procuring / allocating resource to provide the team / expertise required for the trust input. | There is a process for procuring / allocating resource to provide the team / expertise required for the Trust input. | This process is set down. | This process is understood by stakeholders. |

**Requirement to meet MoU criteria:** Requirement met (level 2) – Evidence: Director correspondence, PLANN been taken on to take project forward – process set out in PLANN tender response.

### 2.4.2 Procurement / allocation

| | | | |
|---|---|---|---|
| No resource procured / allocated to the project has been identified | The resource required been procured / allocated for the project. | The procurement / allocation for the resource to the project has been clearly set out. | The procurement / allocation understood by stakeholders. |

**Requirement to meet MoU criteria:** Requirement met (level 2) – Evidence: Resource for PLANN identified through revenue budget and how shortfall will be covered explained in correspondence.

### 2.4.3 Management

| | | | |
|---|---|---|---|
| There is no process to manage the resource | The process is set out. | The process is being managed. | The resource management process is understood by stakeholders. |

**Requirement to meet MoU criteria:** Requirement met (Level 2) – Evidence: For when operational, Business Plan sets out, for fit out, this process is Project Managed by PLANN, under the direction of the Director.  Approach to work set out in Tender response.

| 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 |
|---|---|---|---|

### 2.4.4 Leadership

| There is no person(s) responsible for procurement / allocation to provide the team / expertise for the trust input to the delivery of the project. | There is a named(s) responsible for procurement / allocation to provide the team / expertise for the Trust input to the delivery of the project. | This person(s) has the requisite experience / qualifications regarding the project to undertake this role. | It is clear to stakeholders who this person(s) is. |
|---|---|---|---|

**Requirement to meet MoU criteria:** Requirement met (level 2):  Evidence: Director correspondence – Director is responsible subject to Board ratification.  There are weekly Chair / Director meetings)

## 2.5 Fixtures, Fittings and Equipment

*"The design and delivery of loose-fit FF&E including, inter alia, strategy, planning, procurement, design, and design interfaces with base-build install"*

| 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 |
|---|---|---|---|
| **2.5.1 Process** | | | |
| There is no overall design and delivery strategy in place for FF&E. | There is an overall design strategy in place for FF&E. There is a delivery strategy in place for FF&E. | The strategy includes the design interfaces with the base build installation? | The stakeholders are familiar with and agree with the design and delivery strategy. |
| **Requirement to meet MoU criteria: Requirement met (L**evel 2) – Evidence: PLANN Tender submission | | | |
| **2.5.2 Procurement** | | | |
| There is no procurement plan in place. | There is a procurement plan in place for FF&E | The procurement plan aligns with procurement rules (internal and external) that may apply for the purchase of appropriate FF&E. | Stakeholders are familiar with the procurement plan. |
| **Requirement to meet MoU criteria:** Not making this a requirement at this stage as FF&E roll out is not imminent | | | |
| **2.5.3 Personnel** | | | |
| No-one has overall responsibility for the design and delivery for FF&E. | One person has overall responsibility for the design and delivery for FF&E. | The person responsible for overall responsibility of FF&E has the requisite experience and qualifications to undertake this role. | Stakeholders are familiar with who has the overall responsibility for FF&E. |
| **Requirement to meet MoU criteria:** Requirement met (level 2) – Evidence: PLANN have set out responsibilities under the Director, but overall responsibilities lay with the Board (one board member has pertinent expertise) | | | |

## 2.6 Base Build Interfaces (from the Trust perspective)

*"Managing all base-build project interfaces (from TTHT's perspective)"*

| 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 |
|---|---|---|---|

### 2.6.1 Process

| 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 |
|---|---|---|---|
| There is not a process (plan / strategy) for how all base-build interfaces will be dealt with. | There is a process (plan / strategy) for how all base-build interfaces will be dealt with. | This process is set down. | The process is clear / understood to all stakeholders who are likely to be involved in these areas. |

**Requirement to meet MoU criteria:** Requirement met (level 2) – Evidence: To be enhanced as project develops and FF&E planning in place – approach at the moment is set within PLANN Tender submission

### 2.6.2 Responsibility

| 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 |
|---|---|---|---|
| There is not a person(s) with overall responsibility to manage the base build interfaces from the Trust side. | There is a person(s) with overall responsibility to manage the base build interfaces from the Trust side. | The responsibilities and thresholds of responsibility are clearly set down. | The person(s) are known to all stakeholders who are likely to be involved in the base build thresholds. |

**Requirement to meet MoU criteria:** Requirement met (level 2) – Evidence: Director correspondence (Director, but with support from Chair and the Trustee with the relevant experience). To be enhanced as next phase develops. Will need FF&E Delivery Board or similar to be set up to formalise delegation – Suggest Level 4 by October 2022.

### 2.6.3 Skills / Expertise

| 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 |
|---|---|---|---|
| The person / persons who is responsible for the base build thresholds does not have the requisite skills to be able to deal with such matters. | The person / persons who is responsible for the base build thresholds have the requisite skills to be able to deal with such matters. | The required skills are set down. | There are a set of delegated thresholds / responsibilities set down whereby this person can make decisions. |

**Requirement to meet MoU criteria:** Requirement met (level 2) – Evidence: Director correspondence - Ultimately this is the Director (with oversight over PLANN) but stated that key elements are discussed with Chair and the Trustee with requisite experience.

## 2.7 Facilities management

*"Establishing a Facilities Management resource to maintain/operate the building upon completion of the Community Asset Transfer."*

| 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 |
|---|---|---|---|

### 2.7.1 Resource

| The Facilities Management resource has not been established / identified | The Facilities Management resource has been established / identified. | The resource been confirmed by the Trustees / Board. | The Facilities Management resource is in place. |
|---|---|---|---|

**Requirement to meet MoU criteria:** Requirement met (level 2) – Evidence: Director correspondence.  This is scored for present situation but will be enhanced when requirement known.

### 2.7.2 Process

| The process to establish and maintain this resource has not been set down. | The process to establish and maintain this resource has been set down. | The process to establish and maintain this resource is clearly understood. | The process to establish and maintain this resource is clearly agreed by stakeholders. |
|---|---|---|---|

**Requirement to meet MoU criteria:** Requirement met (level 2) – Evidence: Director correspondence.

### 2.7.3 Personnel

| There is no (nor evidence that there will be a) person / persons with overall responsibility for Facilities Management. | There is (will be) a person(s) with overall responsibility for Facilities Management. | There is a team in place to undertake the functions of Facilities Management. | The roles and responsibilities for Facilities Management are clearly set down and agreed. |
|---|---|---|---|

**Requirement to meet MoU criteria:** Requirement met (level 2) – Evidence:  From Director correspondence - there is a present function which will be reviewed to align to the Business Plan when the building becomes operational.

| 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 |
|---|---|---|---|

### 2.7.4 Skills / Expertise

| The person / persons responsible for Facilities Management does not have the requisite skills to oversee them (or can access them). | The person / persons responsible for Facilities Management has the requisite skills to oversee them (or can access them)? | Is the list of skills that the person / persons responsible for Facilities Management possesses accessible. | There a person(s) available with the requisite skills for Facilities Management should the person responsible become unavailable. |

**Requirement to meet MoU criteria:** Requirement met (level 2) – Evidence: From Director correspondence - Using present staff they have the proven skill to oversee operations as they are now.  Director has made assurance about mentoring these individuals, but increased capability will need to be proven within the roles going forward.