



In House Provision Soft FM Services

Summary Business Case

Confidentiality Statement: St Georges University of London in Confidence

DOCUMENT CONTROL

General documentation information			
Document title:	Business Case for In House Provision Soft FM Services		
Business case type:	Summary Business Case		
Author:	Emma Brookes – Assistant Director of Facilities		
Date:	Nov 2015		
Version control			
Date	Version	Editor	Description/Reason for change
2015.09.07	1.0	E Brookes	Final Document
Distribution/Approval list			
Formal reviewers	Role and review responsibility	Signature	
Eric Munro	Joint Director of Estates and Facilities		
Sign-off reviewer	Role and review responsibility	Signature	
St George's University Senior Management Council			
Related products/information			
Title			
Name of Document St George's University of London – In House Provision – Soft FM Services			
Document Ownership			
This document is owned by the Facilities Department at St George's University of London.			

TABLE OF CONTENTS

Document Control	2
1. Introduction	1
1.1. Business case details	1
1.2. Summary	1
2. Strategic fit	2
2.1. Business need	2
2.2. Objectives and outcomes	3
2.3. Scope	4
2.4. Key benefits and measures	4
3. Delivery options	5
3.1. Option analysis and associated benefits	5
3.2. Rationale for selection of proposed option	8
4. Costs and benefit assessment	9
4.1. IM&T requirements	9
4.2. Capital costs	9
4.3. Payback period	10
4.4. Financial summary	10
4.5. Funding provision	10
5. Outline programme definition	11
5.1. Key milestones	12
5.2. Dependencies, assumptions and key interfaces	14
6.3. Project roles and responsibilities	18

1. INTRODUCTION

1.1. BUSINESS CASE DETAILS

Business Case Details	
Title:	In House Provision Soft FM Services
Workstream:	<i>Improving efficiency of central services</i>
Sponsor:	<i>Eric Munro</i>
Project/Programme Manager:	<i>Emma Brookes</i>
Approval sought from:	<i>St George's University of London Operations Board</i>

1.2. SUMMARY

Approval is sought for the move to an in house provision for the University's Soft FM Services. It is anticipated that, following one off capital costs for equipment and uniform, the University will be able to reduce the costs of its Soft FM services by approximately £200K per annum from November 2016.

The Facilities Team currently provides the following services:

- Cleaning – Out sourced
- Site Services (Post, Portering and R&D) – In House
- Site Security & Car Parking – Out Sourced
- Grounds & Gardens – Out sourced
- Waste - Outsourced
- Pest Control - Outsourced
- Window Cleaning - Outsourced
- Reception Services – In house
- Helpdesk - Outsourced

The total in-house service would have an estimated value of circa £1.27m per annum compared to the current level of £1.55m.

The department is confident that following the development of this business case there is sufficient knowledge and expertise within the current team to mobilise an in house service.

2. STRATEGIC FIT

2.1. BUSINESS NEED

2.1.1. What is St George's University of London's need (strategic drivers) for this programme?

- **What are the current organisational problems that need to be addressed?**

The current services are provided by Ocean and CIS for Domestic and Security services. At the beginning of 2015 it was agreed that we would uplift the cost of the contract with Ocean to reflect the London Living Wage (LLW). This has increased the contract value significantly. There has subsequently in the last month been communications with the unions and a petition raised to increase this to total parity of terms and conditions including sickness and annual leave entitlements, both of which would have a significant impact on the contract price. SGUL currently uses a rate of 29% to calculate it's on costs but this does not include sickness or annual leave cover, however as there would already be some on costs included in the contract it would be reasonable to think that any contract uplift would be in the region of 25%.

The current specification is not being met by the providers in relation to the domestic contract which presents a risk to the organisation and the current standards are being closely monitored by the current management team.

Although the service we are provided through CIS for security is now of a good standard, this comes with a high cost for the service provision due to management fees and inclusion in the LLW and now needs to be looked at under the Financial Improvements Programme.

- **What is the impact of these problems on patients/staff/services etc?**

The impact of the current issues presents a reputational risk to the organisation as complaints from students, staff and patients can have a detrimental impact on how our services are seen. There is also a financial risk that the department will carry a cost pressure due to increased costs for the contracts and therefore be unlikely to meet any cost improvement programs set out for the future.

- **Is there any quantitative evidence to demonstrate this?**

Under the governance of the SLA's put into the helpdesk when the Ocean contract was put into place, Ocean fails to meet the required timing schedules in response to calls logged; many calls are outstanding and need to be chased daily for an update on completion. We have also encountered complaints from customers where calls have

been closed down directly by Ocean stating they have been completed, when they have not been started.

In the last 12 months we have received 57 complaints in all areas of the contract with regards to cleaning and waste removal.

For November 2015 we have 91 calls that remain overdue, with no advice from Ocean as to why jobs have not been completed.

Audits, 2 spot check audits have been carried out since July 2015 to present to look at the quality of cleaning against the cleaning specification and the national standards of cleanliness. The scores of these audits ranged from 16-47%.

2.1.2. Why are we doing this?

It has been assumed that an in-house service will be based on a similar level of specification to the level of service currently received by the University, although it is recognised that service changes will be made to mirror the University's strategic service direction wherever possible. It is the desire of the Facilities Department to increase the governance of the service by introducing an adapted version of the National Standards of Cleanliness 2007 and PAS:5748 as well as including tried and tested auditing methods to include, but not limited to: Computerised handheld monitoring system, ATP testing and UV light technology. Based on the University's current service provision and expenditure, it is anticipated that savings of approximately £200K can be anticipated, based on the use of improved cleaning equipment and technologies that are available to us. The exact level of savings that can be achieved will be mainly dictated by the specification.

It is anticipated that at the start of the contract the savings will be in the region of £160K but following a period of service redesign the saving will rise to £200k. There will be further savings in the region of £50k per annum following the inclusion of the security services to the in-house team from December 2016.

It is further anticipated that the service would be more flexible to the needs of the service and will have the ability to flex and change throughout the year as the demographic of service users change dependant on the time of year.

2.2. OBJECTIVES AND OUTCOMES

The three main programme objectives are

- **Service-user focus:** To provide the opportunity to re-evaluate the service model to one more suited to meeting the needs of the service-user.

- **Future proofing:** To deliver flexibility for future requirements, providing a greater degree of control.
- **Financial control:** To achieve savings from April 2016 onwards, and to establish the context in which savings could be made in subsequent years.

The overall outcome sought is to provide a best value security and domestic service to SGUL's users. Prior to the scheme being mobilised there will be publicity campaigns throughout SGUL, promoting the change. In April 2016, when the in-house provision would be scheduled to commence, service users will experience the change, and will be able to provide direct feedback as to the efficacy of the programme. Through regular meetings with users of SGUL, the outcome can be assessed.

2.3. SCOPE

All Soft FM Services for the University;

- Cleaning
- Site Services (Post, Portering and R&D)
- Site Security & Car Parking
- Grounds & Gardens
- Waste
- Reception Services
- Helpdesk

2.4. KEY BENEFITS AND MEASURES

Benefit	How will this be measured?
Improved Cleanliness Scores	Electronic Auditing
Improved Service Provision	Reduction in Complaints
Improved Joint working with SGHFT	Site wide services for some areas
Reduction in costs	Financial Accounts
A more responsive / flexible service	Help desk reports
Ability to monitor service more effectively through direct management	PDR's, training records, help desk reports and audits.
Improved HR benefits for New Staff	Reduced instances of TU involvement
Improved External Perception	Reduced instances of TU involvement, or negative media coverage

3. DELIVERY OPTIONS

3.1. OPTION ANALYSIS AND ASSOCIATED BENEFITS

Option 1 – Do Nothing	
Description	<ul style="list-style-type: none">• Extend the current contracts which have been in place since CIS, 5 December 2011 and Ocean, 2
Benefits	<ul style="list-style-type: none">• None
Advantages	<ul style="list-style-type: none">• There is little or no work involved in this option.
Disadvantages	<ul style="list-style-type: none">• There is a potential for the Organisation to be challenged on the basis that we have not allowed other companies to bid for the work.• Cost for the service will increase with no benefits to the service.
Assumptions	<ul style="list-style-type: none">• The additional costs for the service will be approximately 25% in addition to the current £808,000.00 for Ocean and £446,216.50 for the CIS Contract (excluding the library service, under separate contract direct to Library).
Risks	<ul style="list-style-type: none">• The Organisation will be open to challenge from extending the contract.• There will be a cost pressure to the organisation from the increase in costs.• Loss of reputation for the organisation due to poor standards of cleanliness.

Option 2 – Do Minimum	
Description	<ul style="list-style-type: none">• Go out to tender for new contracts based on the parity of terms and conditions and using a similar specification to the current one.
Benefits	<ul style="list-style-type: none">• None
Advantages	<ul style="list-style-type: none">• The services and staff remain the responsibility of the contractor

Option 2 – Do Minimum	
Disadvantages	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Costs for the contract will significantly increase with minimum benefit to the service. • There is a significant workload involved in preparing the ITT ready for companies and it would be unlikely to be possible to have a new contract in place for 1 • More work is required to ensure that we look at all options with regards to security services and how these might be better tied in with SGHT services to realise potential savings for both organisations.
Assumptions	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • The contract would be procured through and framework.
Risks	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Delay in the provision of a new contract. • Management hours required to pull together ITT may impact day to day operations. • Staff may be required to TUPE to a new provider causing stress and concern. • Mobilisation period may be difficult to manage.

Option 3 – Do Maximum	
Description	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Go out to tender for a new contract with parity on terms and conditions and including a revised specification to provide cleaning services under the National Standards of Cleanliness (2007) (NSoC) and PAS:5748.
Benefits	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • A better standard of cleaning to the organisation.
Advantages	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • The services and staff will remain the responsibility of the contractor. • Improved KPI's as part of the new contract.
Disadvantages	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Costs for the contract will increase significantly with minimum benefit to the service. • There is a significant workload involved in preparing the ITT ready for companies and it would be unlikely to be possible to have a new contract in place for 1 • More work is required to ensure that we look at all options with regards to security services and how these might be better tied in with SGHT services to realise potential savings for both organisations.
Assumptions	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • The contract would be procured through a framework.

Option 3 – Do Maximum	
Risks	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Delay in the provision of a new contract. • Management hours required to pull together ITT may impact day to day operations. • Staff may be required to TUPE to a new provider causing stress and concern. • Mobilisation period may be difficult to manage.

Option 4 – In House Provision Soft FM	
Description	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • To TUPE all staff back in-house for the domestic services and extend the security contract for a period of 1 year until December 2016 with a view to an in-house provision from this time and to allow further work with the Trust to join up services and realise potential savings.
Benefits	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Full control of services which will allow for more flexibility to meet the needs of the Organisation. • Reduction in costs • No VAT to pay on the contracts.
Advantages	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • The specification can be a living document with the ability to flex the services as required. • The ability to support the Trust if required without the need for additional costs to the University. • Improved and sustainable cleaning techniques. • Improved Governance across the service via the use of auditing technology.
Disadvantages	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Staff will be the responsibility of SGUL and will need to be paid and managed via SGUL. • Increased Management and HR required in supporting the service.
Assumptions	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • 28.5 WTE's will TUPE to SGUL on 1 • 18.78 WTE's will TUPE to SGUL on 1
Risks	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Increase in sickness levels • Right to work and recruitment issues could impact services.

3.2. RATIONALE FOR SELECTION OF PROPOSED OPTION

The rationale for the proposed option is based on having full control and governance of the staff and services of the Facilities department. This proposal will allow the organisation to make a financial saving based on 20% VAT less 1% claimed back by the organisation which under the current contract price is likely to be a saving in the region of £205k per annum. Under the terms of a new contract with full parity of terms and conditions this is likely to be more in the region of £410k per annum as any new contract procured on the basis of parity would invariably be significantly more costly to the organisation than the current contracts. The financial savings from bringing the service in house are directly in line with the organisations cost improvement programs. These figures are based on 6% sickness rate and 32 days annual leave with all staff taking up the university pension scheme; however it is assumed that not all staff will take up the pension option and not all sickness and annual leave will be covered so there is a potential that savings may well exceed this level.

The University will be sending a clear message to its staff that they are valued and that the market testing exercise is not primarily an attempt to gain financial savings.

Bringing services back in-house not only provides local jobs for local people due to the nature of the soft services provided, but also is known to deliver greater flexibility at a local level.

The preferred Option is Option 4.

4. COSTS AND BENEFIT ASSESSMENT

4.1. IM&T REQUIREMENTS

Item	No	Comments
Data outlets	0	
Application	0	
Phone	1	Required for additional B7 £260 +VAT
PC	1	Required for additional B7 £781.86 + VAT
Printers	0	

4.2. CAPITAL COSTS

Item	As-is Cost (£) 000	To-be Cost (£) 000
Clock card system	0	10
IT & Telecoms hardware	0	5
C4C Auditing system	0	10
Equipment	0	73
Uniforms	0	15
Contingency	0	10
Total (Exc VAT)	0	123
Chargeable VAT	0	25
Budget Cost - TOTAL	0	148
Depreciation/Capital charges (to be completed/advised by Capital Management Accountant)		

4.2.1. Recurring costs

Item	As-is Cost (£) 000	To-be Cost (£) 000
Staffing	0	791
Domestic Services (Inc. pest control and window cleaning)	808	39
Waste Disposal	45	30
Site Security (Main Campus / Horton Halls, ex. Library)	446	395
Annual Saving in recurring costs	0	44
Other (Please Specify)	0	0
Chargeable VAT	246	13
TOTAL	1545	1268

4.3. PAYBACK PERIOD

Based on year 1 savings of £183k the payback period would be 10 months

It is anticipated that financial benefits of circa £160k per annum will be realised from April 2016 onwards, £200K from November 2016 and £250k from December 2016 onwards.

Over a period of 7 years realising financial benefits of circa £1.5m.

4.4. FINANCIAL SUMMARY

Project/Item Cost in £000s per year	2016/17	2017/18	2018/19	2019/20	2020/21	2021/22	2022/23	Cumulative Total
Financial benefits (assuming a 7 year contract)	183	250	250	250	250	250	250	1.68m
Capital Start-up Costs	123	0	0	0	0	0	0	123k
Revenue Start-up Costs	25	0	0	0	0	0	0	25k
Total cost per annum	148	0	0	0	0	0	0	148k

4.5. FUNDING PROVISION

This program will be funded from existing budgets.

5. OUTLINE PROGRAMME DEFINITION

- **Can this programme be achieved within SGUL's current capability and capacity?**

There is now sufficient expertise within the department to allow an in-house service to be successful and deliver the intended outcomes. There will however be the requirement for an additional band 7 in the management structure to allow for the additional staff management responsibilities and the job descriptions of the existing management team will be re-written to reflect changes in roles.

There will be an additional HR resource required to reflect the increase in staff numbers to the organisation and it is assumed that this would be on a part time basis of approximately 15/20 hours per week at a band 6 advisor level. Costs for this would be approximately £22k plus on costs per annum.

The revenue costs for this program will be reduced from the current budgets which is in line with the organisations cost improvement program.

DRAFT

5.1. KEY MILESTONES

Detailed below is the draft project plan for this exercise. Progress will be monitored during the weekly project meetings

Task	Timetable
Approval of Business Case by SMC	December 2015
Commence mobilisation of contract	December 2015
Inform Ocean of the intention to bring the service in-house	7 th December 2015
Communication	
Develop a schedule of weekly project meetings; a variety of stakeholders will be involved	7 th December 2015
Produce a weekly mobilisation report	14 th
Develop an audit process for each site, using the C4C auditing tool	7 th March 2016
Develop a monthly report format (?)	7 th March 2016
Develop a communication plan to inform all SGUL users of the change of service provision (newsletters, posters etc.)	7 th March 2016
TUPE	
Request staffing information and terms and conditions from Ocean, and review	7 th December 2015
Agree a communication plan with Ocean	14 th
Refer to statutory requirement for service user consultation	16 th
Inform the relevant Unions of the decision to bring the service in-house; allow them to be involved in all necessary consultations	16 th
Announce to staff the intention to bring the service in-house	11 th
Review all job descriptions, consulting with HR on the process	11 th
Consider if additional recruitment may be required	18 th
Conduct first staff presentations with TUPE packs	7 th March 2016
Clarification of individual terms and conditions	7 th March 2016

Confirm TUPE transfer in writing	7 th March 2016
Conduct one to one meetings with staff	10 th
Conduct staff security vetting (if not already completed)	10 th
Issue staff contracts	14 th
Issue induction packs including PPE, uniform and related paperwork.	14 th
Orders - Equipment/Uniform	
Establish what existing equipment can be utilised	7 th December 2016
Decide what new equipment requires purchasing (steam cleaners, biometric clocking systems, auditing tablets)	11 th
Obtain quotations for the purchase of the new equipment	18 th
Select the best product from the quotations obtained, and place the order for delivery in February (allowing teams to train in March)	8 th February 2016
Obtain measurements from all staff for new uniform, and place order	8 th February 2016
Take delivery of the uniform, and hold in storage at Main Campus and Halls (book a room for storage of the uniform at Main Campus)	14 th
Cleaning Specific	
Develop rotas for all roles	18 th
Confirm agreement with any existing suppliers (pest control, window cleaning, grounds or waste management)	18 th
Engage with new suppliers (pest control, window cleaning, grounds or waste management)	1 st February 2016
Develop site specific training manual	8 th February 2016
Develop site manuals encompassing all areas of service	8 th February 2016
Order materials, as necessary	8 th February 2016
Agree KPIs and SLAs and communicate these to all stakeholders	15 th
Induct existing staff into SGUL procedures and methods	1 st March 2016
Complete training needs analysis for all staff	1 st March 2016
Conduct risk assessments	7 th March 2016
Start Date	
In-House Service Commencement	1 st April 2016

5.2. DEPENDENCIES, ASSUMPTIONS AND KEY INTERFACES

a) The provision of an in-house soft services team at a time of significant change across the University and requires the specification and service level agreements to be sufficiently flexible to allow the soft services provision to change to meet future service needs at no financial detriment to the University.

b) This section sets out some of the key risks associated with the proposed in-house provision strategy.

i) Staffing

TUPE exercises of any sort raise uncertainty and insecurity amongst staff, whether they are employed by the University or by contractors.

Communicating consistently across different staff groups will require a degree of consistency and there is a risk that disenchanted staff may opt to leave in search of alternative, more secure employment. In turn, this may pose risks to service delivery and/or increase costs through the increased use of temporary staffing.

With the proposed in-house service there will be a requirement for contracted staff to transfer across to the organisation. On the basis that the University adopts the preferred option, outlined above, it is estimated that 28.5 wte's Contracted staff will transfer across to the University in April 2016 with a further 18.78 wte's in December 2016.

As part of the next phase of the process, precise TUPE costs for these staff will need to be established.

<u>RAG Rating</u>	
<u>Impact</u>	Uncertainty leads to staff leaving the University, may have impact on service delivery resulting in deterioration in service as perceived by service users.

<u>Mitigation of Risk</u>	<p>Proactive communication with staff through individual/small staff group (translation meetings where required)/departmental groups. Delivered through face to face meetings and via written briefings.</p> <p>Through regular and transparent communications with the recognised partnership Trade Unions.</p> <p>Fall back – use of agency staff to support full time staff</p> <p>Continual engagement with service users via Service User Forums/ Senior management attendance at SMTs/Cleanliness monitoring</p> <p>Requires more stringent contract monitoring to ensure KPIs are adhered to by existing contractors during tendering phase</p>
---------------------------	--

ii) Services

The key period of risk in relation to the provision of services will be in the six months following start of in-house service (or possibly earlier, if an existing contractor is not monitored carefully). With no commercial incentive, there is a risk that the current service providers may not be motivated to provide the highest levels of service. Whilst the authors of this report in no way wish to impugn the professionalism of any of the current service providers, there is the risk that an contractors may divert resources to other more commercially viable contracts.

Similarly, during the service mobilisation/handover period and during the first few months of the new arrangement, there is a risk that some services may be disjointed or disrupted as the department gets to grips with the service requirements and the resources that it has inherited.

An in-house service is very likely to instigate a number of Service changes, as dictated by the service specification. Changes to the way in which services are provided always bring a risk of service disruption and the potential for alienating service users. However, all of the proposed in-house management team are very skilled in the implementation of change and therefore this risk should be considered relatively minor.

<u>RAG Rating</u>	
<u>Impact</u>	Impact on service delivery resulting in deterioration in service as perceived by service users.

<u>Mitigation of Risk</u>	<p>Requires more stringent contract monitoring to ensure KPIs are adhered to by existing contractors during the transition period.</p> <p>Robust project planning between the department and outgoing contractors and University ensuring communication with all affected staff. Risk Register established as part of Programme Management of process and reviewed monthly by Programme Board</p> <p>Effective communication with University staff where any changes in service delivery is planned as part of the new specification.</p> <p>Identified leads from University E & F/Procurement Project management /Outgoing contractor and SU.</p> <p>As part of risk management of project – current contract monitoring will be reported via Programme Board in addition to current meeting structures</p>
---------------------------	---

iii) Organisational Capacity

Undertaking the development of an in-house service requires the deployment of significant resources to manage the process, develop service specifications, develop job descriptions and ensure that the service is underwritten with robust policies and procedures etc. The University’s FM team will need to ensure that they have sufficient time available to adequately resource this type of exercise. As services still need to be provided and corporate governance arrangements still need to be maintained throughout the developmental period, there is a risk that the timescales for the exercise may become extended/delayed or existing services fail to receive sufficient management attention.

<u>RAG Rating</u>	
<u>Impact</u>	Impact on service delivery resulting in deterioration in service as perceived by service users.

<u>Mitigation of Risk</u>	<p>Requires more stringent contract monitoring to ensure KPIs are adhered to by existing contractors during developmental phase.</p> <p>Robust project planning between in-house team and outgoing contractor ensuring communication with all affected staff</p> <p>Risk Register established as part of Programme Management of process and reviewed monthly by Programme Board</p> <p>Effective communication with University staff where any changes in service delivery is planned as part of the new specification.</p> <p>Identified leads from University E & F/Procurement Project management /Outgoing contractor and SU.</p> <p>As part of risk management of project – current contract monitoring will be reported via Programme Board in addition to current meeting structures</p>
---------------------------	--

iv) Investment

There will be a requirement for investment in equipment and uniforms etc., which will need to be factored into the set-up cost structure. The most likely solution to fund the majority of this is to bid for capital funds which would be recouped over the 1st year's savings of the new service. However, this in turn may restrain the University's other capital projects.

<u>RAG Rating</u>	
<u>Impact</u>	<p>Possible impact on service delivery resulting in deterioration in service as perceived by service users if investment not made.</p> <p>Possible_increase in revenue costs as equipment and services may need to be leased.</p> <p>Possible loss of reputation to the department and organisation.</p>
<u>Mitigation of Risk</u>	<p>Identified as a risk within Risk Register established as part of Programme Management of process and reviewed monthly by Programme Board.</p> <p>Potential for University to seek invest to save funding or capital resources to support any investment as alternative to increasing revenue costs.</p>

v) Service Specification

The organisation needs to be mindful that standardisation against the lowest cost risks diminishing services and potentially effecting key services, whilst standardising against the highest performance standards risks increasing costs. In order to mitigate these risks, it is important that representatives from student and staff services are involved in the development of the service specification and that there is sign-up across the University to what is being asked of its In-house service.

<u>RAG Rating</u>	
<u>Impact</u>	<p>Raising service expectation of service users.</p> <p>Level of revenue savings not realised due to increased expectations.</p> <p>Effective service user and staff engagement ensures that key areas of concern are reflected in service specification and joint working between service users and E & F will ensure that wherever possible support is given as a two way benefit.</p>
<u>Mitigation of Risk</u>	<p>Early workshops to set the framework those staff and service users can expect from the tendering process.</p> <p>Confirmation from University Senior Management Council as to the key objectives/outputs expected from this process which will assist in managing expectation and measuring successful completion of exercise.</p>

6.3 PROJECT ROLES AND RESPONSIBILITIES

Role	Name
Authorising Body	St George's University Senior Management Council
Executive Sponsor	Eric Munro

Role	Name
Programme / Project Manager	Emma Brookes
Programme / Project Board Members	Emma Brookes – Assistant Director of Facilities Liz Gilby – Customer Manager Matt Bull – Sports and Halls Manager Communication department rep – as required <i>programme, resolving risks and issues and reviewing progress of the programme</i>
Key Stakeholders	E&F Staff/Students/ Visitors
Other	Senior Management Council members/TPF/Current External Contractors relating to outsourced services/ Director of E & F SGHT/SU

DRAFT