



Service Improvement Review for the Guarding of MPS Buildings

Project Initiation Document

February 2005

NOT PROTECTIVELY MARKED

Suitable for publication - no FOIA exemptions



Working for a safer London

Protective Marking	NOT PROTECTIVELY MARKED
Publication Scheme Y/N	Y
Title	Service Improvement Review for the Guarding of MPS Buildings
Version	1
Summary	Project Initiation Document (PID)
Author(s)	Ruth Child C086568 ICG - DCC2(3)
Creating Branch / Command Unit	Internal Consultancy Group
Owning Branch / Command Unit	
Date created	11 January 2005
Review date	11 January 2006

1. BACKGROUND AND BUSINESS NEED

1.1 Background to Service Improvement Reviews

The Metropolitan Police Authority (MPA) took on the duties of a best value authority under the terms of the Local Government Act 1999 when it was established in July 2000. The purpose of best value reviews is to increase effectiveness, efficiency and economy in a specific area of work.

The MPA Planning, Performance and Review Committee (PPRC) took the opportunity to adopt a new approach to best value using Service Improvement Reviews (SIRs) to bring about innovation and excellence in policing London by:

- Thinking afresh about the need for a service and how it is carried out
- Asking service providers and others how improvements could be made
- Assessing performance and learning from others who are doing better
- Considering if other ways of providing the service might be helpful.

1.2 Background to this SIR

This service improvement review topic emerged during MPS budget meetings towards the end of 2003. It was nominated as a subject for review as concerns were expressed over the service being provided compared to its cost. Furthermore, Internal Audit performed an audit in 2000 that highlighted several concerns around guarding services and physical security as a whole. In their follow up work, conducted in early 2003 it was found that the majority of these concerns had yet to be addressed.

The topic was selected by Management Board and approved by the MPA's Planning Performance and Review Committee for review during 2004/05.

The MPS currently has a contracted guarding service provided by Interserve, who subcontracts staff from several security firms to provide personnel at 30 sites across the MPS estate. Key sites with high-level security guarding requirements, currently New Scotland Yard and Wellington House, have guards provided by SO16.

1.3 Business Needs

The MPS needs to ensure that the estate and all assets within are protected from threats, and the risk introduced by any vulnerabilities at sites are minimised through application of suitable and adequate physical security measures. The provision of a guarding service is a vital part of maintaining physical security at specific sites in the estate.

It is necessary for the MPS to review the current guarding service requirement, delivery and supervision to ensure that the current estate's

needs are met and maintained. The guarding service needs to be sufficiently flexible to enable it to adapt to the continually changing needs of the MPS in the short, medium and longer terms.

A total facilities management (TFM) contract and 'intelligent customer' interface has been identified and approved by the MPA as the method through which the MPS will manage its contracted services in the future. Currently, the TFM will include guarding services. The TFM contract, which will come into effect from January 2007, will be flexible enough to permit changes during the life of the contract to meet the MPS' evolving needs. The tendering and bid assessment processes will benefit from knowledge of the up to date guarding service requirement and operational and management structures and processes that support it. This information will support work currently underway in the MPS to examine the impact and operational implications of the TFM.

The impact on the MPS guarding service of the proposed licensing of all private security guards as part of the professionalisation of the security guarding profession will need to be considered.

2. OBJECTIVES AND SCOPE

2.1 Objectives

To complete a Service Improvement Review on the provision of a guarding service for MPS buildings by June 2005, and produce recommendations related to its future provision and management within the MPS.

Specifically, the SIR will examine the MPS' need for the provision of a contracted building guarding service for nominated sites. It will:

- Define the appropriate levels of building security guarding required by the MPS estate
- Determine if appropriate mechanisms exist to monitor and maintain the required levels of security across the estate
- Identify feasible solution options and define suitable evaluation criteria, to include best value / cost benefit analysis, in order to evaluate these options and select a preferred solution
- Review how the guarding services are managed and integrated within the MPS' physical security portfolio.

2.2 Scope

A scoping study has been performed prior to the review, which highlighted the need for the SIR to consider the following factors:

Identification of Guarding Service requirements

- The identification of business/operational requirements for guarding services, taking into account current and anticipated future needs.
- The identification of solution options for current and future guarding requirements.

Evaluation criteria and selection of a preferred option

- The evaluation of the identified solution options for the provision of required guarding services, in accordance with agreed criteria.
- The provision of a cost benefit analysis of the various options for the provision of a guarding services and identification of any preferred solution based on the agreed evaluation criteria.

Monitoring of Guarding Service

- To ensure that the guarding services provide the level of protection required and is monitored and supervised suitably to maintain quality of service provision.

Management and integration of guarding services within the Physical Security Portfolio

- Review to confirm that the current organisational structure, policies and processes are sufficient to link all the elements of physical security coherently and efficiently, and in order to avoid duplication of work.
- Identification of any key areas and requirements where standard procedures need to be developed in order to ensure that facilities management services are fully cognisant of physical security requirements, for example for specifying requirements for new buildings and when identifying suitable leased sites.
- Identify where communications may be required between customers (sites on the estate) and facilities management regarding repair requests, security upgrades, new guarding or temporary guarding requirements and feedback on guarding service provision.
- Assess the need for contingency planning for when guarding services may need to be supplemented at short notice.

Strategic view

- To consider the impact of current programmes of work and professionalisation of guarding services on the provision and cost of future guarding services.
- To ensure that those responsible for development of the new Total Facilities Management contract (including those responsible for the impact planning around the contract) are consulted during the SIR and informed of any relevant findings.

The scope will not include how bids for the Total Facilities Management Contract should be assessed, the content of Form 2110 or other aspects of security not directly relating to guarding services in a physical security context. Also, the marketing and awareness of security issues is considered to fall beyond the scope of the SIR.

3. ORGANISATION

3.1 Project Board

David Hill	Chair, Director of Resilience, Compliance and Operational Support
Ch. Supt. Jamie Stephen	Deputy Chair, Head of SO16
Murad Qureshi	MPA Link member (Brent)
Siobhan Coldwell	Head of Scrutiny & Review MPA
Roy Upton	Assistant Director, Resilience, Compliance and Operational Support
Julie Norgrove	Deputy Director, Internal Audit
Bob Farley	Head of Information Compliance DCC10(2-6), Business Development, Liaison & Strategy Group
Nick Chown	Director of Corporate Risk Management Group
Ch. Supt. David Morgan	CW (HQSEN) Westminster Borough (Senior Management), Partnership portfolio and representative for the Superintendents' Association.
Ch. Supt. Sultan Taylor	Operations Manager, DoR - TS1 (Transport Service Directors Office)

Det. Supt. Andy Campbell	DCC8(4) Professional Standards Directorate Support
Assistant Commissioner Ron Dobson	London Fire Brigade; Chair, Independent Challenge Panel
Mo Bunce	MPS Strategic Disability Team, representing the Diversity Directorate
Details to be confirmed	Police Federation JEC representative
Damian Okonkwo	MET-TUS representative

3.2 Review Team

Role	Name and Contact	Activities
Sponsor / Chair of SIR Project Board	David Hill (782301)	As chair of the SIR Project Board, to agree the PID, provide direction to the Review Team and sign off the Review products.
Sponsor Liaison / Deputy Chair of SIR Project Board	Jamie Stephen (40565)	Ch Supt, Head of SO16
ICG Review Team Leader	Mike Boyles (65751)	Responsibilities in line with the ICG Project Processes Manual
ICG Team Member	Ruth Child (65782)	Responsibilities in line with the ICG Project Processes Manual
ICG Team Member	Lucien Kong (65111)	Responsibilities in line with the ICG Project Processes Manual
ICG Team Member	Elaine Bullock (65380)	SIR administrative support and research activities in line with the ICG Project Processes Manual.

At the conclusion of the project, feedback will be sought from the sponsor or nominated representative via a quality of service questionnaire.

3.3 Independent Challenge Panel

- Ron Dobson. Assistant Commissioner, London Fire Brigade, ICP Chair.
- Rachel Whittaker. MPA Member.
- Martin Low. Head of Transport Services, Westminster City Council.
- Chris Taxis. Head of Corporate Security, Bank of America (International Services).
- Trevor Gannon. Regional Head of Corporate Security, Credit Suisse First Boston (Europe) Ltd.

4. APPRAOCH

The SIR will follow the 4Cs framework through:

- **Comparison** with other forces and organisations' security processes;
- **Consultation** with key stakeholders across the organisation and outside, in particular customers of the guarding service;
- **Challenge** the current status quo by identifying and asking pertinent and relevant questions; and
- **Competition** - Identifying whether there are appropriate, alternative ways of providing the service.

The Review will follow a phased approach with four main stages:

Stage 1: Background research and scope (40 days)

A scoping study has been completed, which performed background research to develop the scope presented in Section 2.2. The scoping study involved consultation with senior MPS stakeholders in addition to the gathering of relevant information and identification of other current MPS initiatives (or imminent pieces of work) that impact on building security, facilities management and provision of a guarding service.

Products from this stage will include the final version of this PID and the final version of the scoping study in addition to an outline consultation plan for the Review.

Stage 2: Identification and definition of issues (50 days)

This will include continued consultation with a range of stakeholders, and may also require benchmarking against other police forces or suitable organisations. Further work will be undertaken to identify the issues arising from current MPS work programs and developments in the 'professionalisation' of the guarding industry that may limit or inform the SIR process. It will enable the Project Board to select the specific issues to be addressed in Stage 3.

Stage 3: Solution generation (40 days)

This will involve the identification of feasible solution options for the provision of guarding services and explore the implications of each of these solutions on their management, supervision and integration within the physical security work stream in the MPS.

The main product from this stage will be an Options Paper, which will allow the Project Board to consider which options to explore in detail in Stage 4.

Stage 4: Solution evaluation and recommendations (40 days)

This involves assessing the feasible solution options to determine which will be the most effective in addressing the issues, including determining in more detail how the proposed solutions would work in practice and their associated costs and benefits. A high-level implementation plan will also be devised. These findings will be tested with key stakeholders through further consultation. Finally, Project Board will be asked to approve the solutions recommended in the final report.

It is estimated that the review will take up to 170 days, of which 40 days effort has already been used to carry out the scoping phase for this SIR.

Throughout stages 2 to 4 the Independent Challenge Panel will inform the Review Team's work by scrutinising its scope, emerging findings and recommendations. 'Quick wins' identified at any stage of the Review will be presented to the next available ICP and Project Board meetings.

5. PROJECT PLAN

Work Strands & Activities	Responsibility	Timescale
Stage 1: Background research and scope		
Background research	Team	Completed
Scoping Study	Team	Draft Completed
Agree membership of and establish the Project Board	Sponsor & Team	Completed
Agree membership of and establish the Independent Challenge Panel	Sponsor, Team & Project Board	Early February
Present PID to Project Board	Team	14th February
Present PID to MPA Planning Performance Review Committee	Team	17 th March
Approve Scope of SIR	Sponsor, Team & Project Board	14th February
Stage 2: Identification and definition of issues		
Consultation with stakeholder groups.	Team	Ongoing
Monitor developments in ongoing pieces of work in the MPS on physical security and guarding.	Team	Ongoing
Background research into TFMs – how they work in practice– including comparison of proposal for the MPS' contract to TFMs in other suitable organisations.	Team	mid February
Monitor the progress of the national review into the guarding services profession - the idea of licensing and exemptions (e.g. for in house security) etc.	Team	Ongoing
Comparisons with other organisations – working practices of other organisations e.g. other police forces, government departments.	Team	Late February
Competition – exploring alternative forms of delivering a guarding service	Team	Early March
Issues paper to Project Board and Independent Challenge Panel.	Team	Early March

Stage 3: Solution generation		
Develop solution options (based on understanding of the service requirements) and evaluation criteria.	Team	April
Presentation of options paper on potential improvements to the service provision and integration into the physical security work stream to the ICP	Team	April
Presentation of options paper on potential improvements to the provision of a guarding service for buildings and its integration into the physical security work stream to the Project Board	Team	April
Stage 4: Solution evaluation and recommendations		
Detailed assessment of preferred solution options to determine which will be the most effective in addressing the issues, including determining in more detail how the proposed solutions would work in practise and their associated costs and benefits.	Team	May
Preparation of a high-level implementation plan. These findings will be tested with key stakeholders through further consultation.	Team	May
Presentation of proposed solutions, recommendations to the ICP.	Team	May
Presentation of proposed solutions, recommendations and final report to the Project Board.	Team	May
Presentation of final report to MPS Management Board and MPA Planning and Performance Committee.	Team	May / June; PPRC 14 th July

6. PRODUCTS

The principal product from this Review will be a final report, to be completed by 31 May 2005. This report will highlight the findings of the review and offer recommendations for improvement of the current process. A high level Improvement Plan will be produced to support these recommendations.

7. RESOURCES, COSTS AND BENEFITS

7.1 Resources

The Review's consultation will require input from a range of MPS officers and police staff, notably individuals from Resources, Compliance and Operational Support (DoR), SO16 (including Physical Security Unit), Corporate Risk Management Group, and Information Compliance (DoI).

Senior Designated Officers, Quality Assurance Officers and Building Security Officers will be consulted as appropriate, though this will not be more than half a day for any individual.

7.2 Costs

This work will take up to 170 days, which will be deducted from Service Improvement Reviews' allocation of Internal Consultancy days. ICG does not charge for its work: for information, the total cost of these days would be £76,500.

7.3 Benefits

The potential benefits of this service review will be:

- Understanding of best value in relation to the provision of a guarding service in the MPS
- Identification of a solution options for the provision of a guarding service
- Recommendation of a preferred solution based on the application of cost benefit analysis and other assessment criteria as appropriate
- Recommendations which will ensure that the organisation is fully cognisant of the effectiveness of the guarding service
- Recommendations that will ensure efficient management and supervision of a guarding service as a fully integrated part of the physical security work stream.
- Ensuring the MPS continues to provide a satisfactory and adequate guarding security service – at the sites that it is required - that will not compromise the security of key buildings in the MPS estate.
- Improved guarding services for the customer - both the MPS and staff.

8. CONSTRAINTS, ASSUMPTIONS AND RISKS

8.1 Constraints

The review must be completed and report its recommendations to the MPA PPRC by 14th July 2005.

The timing of the review, in particular the consultation and challenge stages are constrained by the availability of key stakeholders, ICP panel members and ICG staff.

The timing of key MPS and MPA meetings will determine when specific products will be signed off.

8.2 Assumptions

MPS officers and staff will be able to participate in the initial consultation in Stage 2 and members of the Independent Challenge Panel will be available to assist during the proposed timescales.

8.3 Risks

From an initial assessment of this Review, the main areas of risk are:

- Due to the commercial aspects and sensitivity around this subject, confidentially agreements may need to be agreed between the MPS and members of the Independent Challenge Panel, who may also need to be security cleared to a suitable level. This may impact on proposed SIR timescales.
- Insufficient ICG resources being available during the course of the project in the stipulated timescale, delaying the formulation of recommendations for the Review
- Changes to the scope in the review may impact on the ICG effort required to meet the project deadlines
- Key stakeholders and MPS staff may not be available during the consultation period.
- The limited availability of quantitative data and performance information, to support any qualitative information collected, may make it difficult to assess the efficiency and quality of the current service.

A separate risk register will be produced to enable the Project Board to review and monitor risks at its meetings.