
**Children, Education & Communities Policy &
Scrutiny Committee**

5 July 2017

Report of the Tour de France Scrutiny Review Task Group

Tour de France Scrutiny Review – Final Report**Summary**

1. This final report presents the findings of the Scrutiny Review into the planning of major events.
2. The Task Group accepted that delivering the Tour de France in York was an outstanding achievement for the City Council but recognised not every aspect worked well and there were lessons that should be learned for any similar events in the future. The Task Group is therefore asked to endorse the proposed review recommendations ahead of the report's presentation to the Learning & Culture Policy & Scrutiny Committee.

Background to Review

3. In November 2014, the Committee considered a scrutiny topic submitted by Councillor Cuthbertson, proposing a scrutiny review of the planning, promotion and delivery of the Council's programme of activities which accompanied the Tour de France (TdF). At the same time, the Committee received detailed background information on the TdF and was informed by the Director of Communities & Neighbourhoods that work was already underway to assess the overall TdF project including outputs, budgets, reviews etc, with the intention of providing a report to Cabinet in January 2015.
4. It was suggested that the Cabinet report may answer the questions raised in Councillor Cuthbertson's scrutiny topic submission, so it was agreed the Committee would wait to consider that report before deciding whether a scrutiny review was necessary.
5. In January 2015, the Cabinet report detailing the outcomes achieved against the objectives set for TdF by Cabinet in 2013 was considered. The report included a number of background papers providing information on TdF's economic and social impact and feedback on

reviews carried out on individual elements of the delivery programme, including management of the event, its financial implications, and the lessons learned for the future.

6. Having considered all of the information provided, the Committee agreed they would like to proceed with a review based on the following review remit:

'To consider the appropriate planning, promotion, and delivery of future major events to ensure all associated risks are managed effectively, including Health & Safety and reputational risk. The review will examine the Grand Departy, and the provision of the entertainment Hubs and camping sites.'

7. Having taken account of their outstanding review work, the Committee agreed it would not be possible to conduct their review in the available time prior to the purdah period for the 2015 elections. They therefore agreed the topic should be revisited at the start of the new 2015-16 municipal year to enable the newly appointed Learning & Culture Policy & Scrutiny Committee to re-confirm their decision to proceed with the review.
8. In June 2015 the new Committee agreed to form a Task Group made up of the following members to carry out the review on their behalf:
- Cllr Dave Taylor (up to May 2016)
 Cllr Keith Myers
 Cllr Margaret Wells
 Cllr Ian Cuthbertson (Co-optee)
 Cllr Denise Craghill (from May 2016)
9. Work on the review did not start immediately as the Task Group were made aware of an ongoing Veritau review. The resulting Veritau report was made available to the Task Group in Nov 2015 enabling work on the scrutiny review to commence.

Consultation

10. As part of their review the Task Group met with a number of CYC officers, Councillors and external parties:
- 2 x Operational Leads (Crown Management Solutions)
 - Commercial Innovator - responsible for camp sites and merchandise (seconded from Visit York)
 - Spectator Hubs & Grand Departy Lead Officer (CYC)
 - Chair of Safety Advisory Group (CYC)
 - Strategic Lead & Chair of TDF Operations Board (CYC)

- Ward Cllr for Heworth Without Ward
 - Executive Member for Culture, Leisure & Tourism at the time of the TdF
11. The Task Group took account of the different perspectives of the consultees and the different levels of their involvement. They also noted that the degree of detail obtained about each area examined, varied considerably because of the passage of time since the events concerned took place, as evidenced by the different levels of information provided by the various consultees.
 12. They also sought to consult with the Chief Executive and Council Leader from the time of the TdF, but were unsuccessful.

Information Gathered

13. Throughout the review the Task Group considered evidence relating to TdF. This provided information on the timeline of the project i.e. the work undertaken in support of the various elements, the meetings held and the decisions made. This was helpful in supporting and adding clarity to the evidence provided by the consultees.

Provision of Camping Sites

14. Because there was limited hotel accommodation and the cost looked set to rise, it was proposed to include camping as alternative accommodation at an affordable rate, and it was hoped this would generate income.
15. Initially, provision of camping facilities went broadly to plan, with sites planned for Millennium Bridge/Rowntree Park, the Designer Outlet and Monk Stray. The three sites were marketed with different approaches aimed at three different groups of customers - Millennium Bridge being for families, the Designer Outlet for 'glamping' while Monk Stray would be a 'Glastonbury' style offer.
16. However, the use of Monk Stray for public events had previously been the subject of local residents' concern and the Task Group found no evidence to suggest that this was taken into account when considering possible camping sites.
17. The advertisement of the Monk Stray campsite appeared on the website in January 2014, before a licensing application was submitted or other public consultation took place. The licensing application for the Heworth end of the Stray was submitted in early February 2014, for a premises

licence for events up to 14 days per year. This resulted in immediate protests from local residents because it brought to mind their past concerns about a previous licensing application made in 2010¹.

18. There were also errors in marketing; the campsite's postcode was incorrectly given as that for the Heworth end of the Stray (over which controversy had arisen in 2010) instead of the Hopgrove end of the Stray, which was what it should have been. A similar mistake was made on the website with the Millennium Bridge campsite postcode being shown as Millennium Bridge Terrace.
19. Two public meetings were held; the Member for the Heworth Without Ward held a public meeting in February 2014 at the local cricket club (near the Heworth part of Monk Stray). Plans for the event were displayed and factual information about the licensing application was given out.
20. CYC subsequently held a public 'engagement' meeting in March 2014 at Bell Farm Social Hall, some 650m from the Heworth part of Monk Stray and less accessible. At the time there were questions raised about the adequacy of the publicity and notice given for that meeting, and no record of that meeting appears to have been retained, nor any details of the large numbers of e-mails sent by members of the public to CYC both direct and via the Member for the ward.
21. The Monk Stray licensing application was determined in late March 2014. The hearing considered 286 representations by residents, while Cllrs Boyce and Ayre and Julian Sturdy MP all attended to raise concerns. There was no public support for an unlimited licence which would allow events of up to 14 days per year after the TdF weekend and in the end, a licence was granted for the day of the TdF only with alcohol sales up to 20:00 and other activities finishing by 23:00.
22. In parallel, in February 2014, the ward Member advised the Strategic Lead that the proposed campsite location on Monk Stray nearer Hop Grove was directly opposite another campsite for which planning permission had recently been refused because of traffic access from Malton Road. For CYC to make an application for the proposed location would have meant embarrassment if the Planning Committee were to refuse it or, if allowed; it would provide grounds for an appeal against the earlier refusal.

¹In September 2011 at a Cabinet Member Decision Session on the Council's events protocol, it had been stated that any future licensing application for that part of Monk Stray would be subject to consultation. It seems this was widely understood as a promise to hold a public consultation before any future licence application was made.

23. In late May 2014, the involvement of the Caravan Club in providing camping facilities on Monk Stray near the Hopgrove gained prominence. It was alleged that the use of the Caravan Club to run the campsite under its exemption certificate was a way of avoiding making a planning application in respect of that site. Unfortunately, this generated negative publicity for the plans in the local press. Because of this, the Caravan Club withdrew its support, giving the reason as its wish not to suffer reputational damage arising from the local political problems.
24. At this point, a decision was taken not to proceed with the Monk Stray campsite plans (although the spectator hub at the Heworth end of Monk Stray would operate for the one permitted day) and the plans for the Designer Outlet campsite were also abandoned on commercial grounds. This left Millennium Bridge as the only campsite still on offer. Bookings already taken for the other sites had to be offered the choice of an alternative pitch at Millennium Bridge or a refund. This caused additional work and a number of refunds had to be made.
25. Additional support was needed in preparing and operating the Millennium Bridge campsite. This caused additional work and expense in employing East Riding of Yorkshire staff to perform this function. The camping at Millennium Bridge was otherwise successful, operated efficiently and received very positive feedback from campers, residents and Members.

Provision of Entertainment Hubs

26. Large numbers of visitors to the city were expected for the TdF event. The aim was that they would stay for the weekend and generate money for the city. Because of the numbers of visitors expected, it was planned to provide spectator hubs which would allow audiences to view the race on large screens, allow them to get food and drink, and for there to be some entertainment throughout the day.
27. Four hubs (at the Knavesmire, Designer Outlet, Rowntree Park and the Heworth end of Monk Stray) were planned initially. However, late in the day, over the weekend of 6th-9th June 2014, plans to use the Heworth end of Monk Stray as a spectator hub were abandoned and arrangements for a new spectator hub at Huntington Stadium to replace it were announced. Local councillors were not consulted about the additional use of the Stadium for this purpose. It is not clear why a change of venue for this hub was seen to be necessary and there is no record of this decision being made. It appears that, following the

withdrawal of the Caravan Club from organising the camping (see paragraph 21 above), the Strategic Lead asked the Events Officer to find cost reductions. The Strategic Lead advised that using the Stadium as a venue for both the Grand Depart (GD) concert and an entertainment hub would reduce costs, but the Task Group found no evidence to support this.

28. Arrangements for the provision of large screens proved unreliable. The screen that had been intended for the Rowntree Park hub was positioned in Parliament Street by mistake, but could not then be moved to Rowntree Park because of crowds and traffic on the day. This was a source of complaints on the day. The consultees confirmed there were also difficulties with over-loaded mobile networks on the day which led to communications difficulties within the team.

Grand Depart Concert

29. The Task Group found evidence to suggest the Grand Depart Concert (GD concert) was first mooted in July 2013 as a way of generating up to £250k to offset the costs of the TdF.
30. The Commercial Innovator and the external management consultants confirmed that while the TdF Opportunities Register of late November 2013 recorded 'Organising a Concert' as a possibility, there was no further development of this idea until late March/April 2014.
31. The Strategic Lead confirmed that in late December 2013, the GD Lead Officer was asked to think about what a GD concert event might look like; it seems that it was initially intended to be a folk festival. The Strategic Lead also confirmed that the concert was not seen as a money generating exercise but would offer campers at Monk Stray (and residents) some entertainment.
32. From its onset, TdF staff were told not to get involved in the GD concert because this was one person's responsibility i.e. the GD Lead Officer. This focused a dependency on an individual officer, increasing the potential risks associated with the GD concert.
33. The Task Group found no record of any clear objective, no commercial analysis of feasibility, programme planning, detailed cost estimates, the likely timetable, projected ticket sales, income and potential profit, or the risks involved.
34. Furthermore, the Task Group found no evidence to suggest the positioning and marketing of the GD concert within the overall TdF

events programme had been established before planning commenced. It was seen as an extra item and secondary to the main TdF programme, yet there was insufficient definition of what the event would be and understanding of what support and co-operation would come from the regional TdF delivery team. In fact, it subsequently emerged that the GD concert could not be marketed within the wider TdF promotion and publicity because it was seen as a non-TdF event, which would potentially direct custom and revenue away from the TdF concert arranged by Welcome to Yorkshire for 3 July in Leeds. There was no record of that risk being assessed.

35. The Task Group also found little or no record of local arrangements, pre-contract meetings, exchanges of e-mails with promoters etc. The GD Lead Officer commented that “A lot of ... GD concert meetings went either un-minuted or no notes of the meeting were produced”.
36. Unsubstantiated figures of £250k for income and £100k costs for a GD concert first appeared in a ‘Commercial Opportunities Budget’ spreadsheet in February 2014 but the Task Group found no evidence of any breakdown of those figures or of work to ascertain what amounts were involved. The income figure seemed to be based on sales of 10,000 tickets at £25 each, yet there is no evidence of any check on venue capacity being made or of any commercial assessment as to ticket pricing or number of tickets that could be sold.
37. Although entries relating to the Grand Departy can be seen in ‘Project Highlights reports’ from March 2014 these refer to ‘*community activities over the weekend of the Grand Depart*’ and not to a GD concert per se.
38. The external management consultants confirmed that, at their handover in early April 2014, there were no defined plans for the GD concert and it was necessary to put together a complete list of what would be needed. Their view was that this was far too late for an event date of 4 July and was not within the TdF delivery plan timescale. Despite the late start on the concert planning work, the external management consultants noted that the Events Officer had ‘strong political support from the Cabinet Member and that it was generally felt that all would turn out OK in the end’
39. No details of the GD concert otherwise emerge until April 2014, when ward councillors were notified in two separate e-mails from the Strategic Lead and the GD Lead Officer. The e-mail from the Strategic Lead to Huntington & New Earswick ward councillors on 4 April confirmed that CYC was ‘looking to do a family concert on the Friday 4 July in the stadium’ and said that ‘we are in the early stages of planning’. Shortly

after this, an e-mail from the GD Lead Officer to H&NE ward councillors on 20 April confirmed that the Strategic Lead had taken a decision on 17 April to go ahead with the concert - with just over 11 weeks to go.

40. The Task group found no record of the Strategic Lead's decision to proceed with the GD concert in April, nor of any formal decision at Executive Member level which would endorse such action. However they noted that when asked at the Council meeting held on 17 July 2014 'who had added the concert to the TdF calendar and when', the Executive Member for Culture, Leisure and Tourism stated "the Huntington Stadium concert was added to the calendar of events under the delegated authority of the Director of Communities and Neighbourhoods".
41. It is not until May 2014 that the Project Highlights report (which recorded progress during April and is the last such report available,) included any mention of a concert at Huntington Stadium. Significantly, the event was given a 'red' status in the RAG rating section of the report as soon as it appears because of problems with resources and lack of budget details. Despite this, there appeared to have been no ongoing evaluation of risk as the GD concert project developed over the two months still to go.
42. Although minimal risk status details appeared in the Project Highlights report for May 2014, the Task Group found no other formal risk assessment for the GD concert as a project from the outset. By contrast, the TdF event had a full risk assessment for all aspects of the Grand Depart, although the Task Group found no evidence to suggest the risk register was kept updated. Yet, despite the GD concert's late start, the team's lack of experience of such events and the high reputational and financial risks, the concert was not included in any risk register.
43. The GD Lead Officer confirmed that she did not believe it was feasible to do the work in-house to promote the GD concert, and after an unsuccessful search, was recommended to contact Cuffe & Taylor by one of the possible tenderers. After the details for a family event were discussed with them at a meeting and site visit, a contract was effectively in existence. This approach to engaging a provider was highly informal; there was no clear evidence of a tendering process and the arrangement breached CYC procurement rules. Nevertheless, the GD Lead Officer advised that Cuffe and Taylor were the only company interested in doing the GD concert. The contract was signed on 15 May 2014, with just over 7 weeks to go.

44. The appointment of Cuffe and Taylor as promoters was done without the involvement of the CYC Procurement team, who were unaware of the whole process until after it had been completed. While the Procurement team did offer support and advice on other aspects of TdF procurement (e.g. catering, camping and security), they confirmed they were not aware of what was being done in respect of concert promotion until after the contract was signed.
45. It is understood that the Cuffe and Taylor contract was provided by the firm as an example of their standard contract. When shown the document, the finance team put a list of questions to the GD Lead Officer but these were not answered. Because placement of the contract did not conform to procurement rules, a waiver was needed, so written justification was requested from the GD Lead Officer to enable Cuffe and Taylor to be set up as a supplier in the finance system. The response received was not adequate and this was reported to the appropriate Assistant Director, who refused to approve the waiver. The Strategic Lead was advised to seek Executive Member approval before proceeding but the Task Group found no record of any such decision having been formally taken.
46. Although no waiver was granted, there was a legal requirement for CYC to pay Cuffe and Taylor because a contract existed, so they were set up as a supplier in the finance system.
47. There were delays in sorting out the line-up of acts for the GD concert. The acts offered kept changing and there was some dallying over decisions at the CYC end. The GD Lead Officer then encountered problems with the licensing arrangements – receiving the wrong information from stadium management led to a 3-4 week delay in decision-making. All this led to knock-on delays, not only in marketing and publicity, but in the event management and safety planning (e.g. impact on policing, safety and broader risk analysis).
48. The Strategic Lead confirmed that a decision point came when the Caravan Club withdrew from managing the camping in late May 2014, at which time there had been poor ticket sales for the GD concert. The Task Group found no evidence of any analysis of where the concert audience might come from following the loss of the Monk Stray campers. Without that analysis, but concerned about preserving ‘our reputation as a city’, the Strategic Lead decided to continue with the concert after discussing this with the Chief Executive and others. At this point, the emphasis changed from one of balancing the books to getting people to come. From 10 June 2014, tickets were being sold at half price, and in

the last few days; free tickets were offered to staff, partners and local armed forces personnel.

49. The Task Group found that negative reports about the concert appeared in local print and broadcast media, besides being promoted by an ex-councillor on social media. Parallel news reports of the controversy over the cancellation of the camping at Monk Stray also fuelled perceptions of negative publicity.
50. According to the GD Lead Officer, publicity material for the concert was 'delayed' and she had to put up banners herself. The GD Lead Officer - a key member of the team - took two weeks' leave in early-mid June before the TdF weekend. At this point, only a few tens of tickets had been sold since they went on sale in mid-May; an emergency meeting with the promoters was held to seek improved sales and ticket pricing was changed to allow heavy discounts for future sales.
51. The GD Lead Officer confirmed that on her return from leave, banners and publicity material were still on her desk and she found boxes of leaflets for the concert in the basement; which should have been distributed by then. The GD Lead Officer was 'horrified by the lack of sales, leaflet distribution failure and changes in pricing policy'. Extra marketing support was subsequently provided by Cuffe & Taylor, and by the CYC marketing team.
52. The Safety Advisory Group (SAG) confirmed that an event manual for the concert promised for early June, was supplied far too late (only 48 hours before the event), contravening agreed timescales.
53. Close to the GD concert, it was realised that no stewards had been arranged for the event. The external management consultants were able to engage the TdF stewards on a separate contract from the regional TdF operation, which incurred further work and overheads. There were also difficulties in acquiring equipment for the TdF weekend, such as mobile phones, via the Council's usual procurement channels.
54. In the end, the weather on the day of the GD concert was bad. This and poor ticket sales meant that attendance was very poor – press reports estimated this at around 1500, far below what had been hoped for. Officers later conceded in hindsight that the concert line-up was wrong and a mix that was intended to appeal to everyone in the end appealed to very few. There were concerns about safety at the event, which were exacerbated by publication of the minutes of the SAG's post-concert review meeting.

55. It took some time for the Task Group to clarify the political accountability for the Grand Departure - it emerged that the GD concert was considered to be part of the commercial stream of the TdF activity and was therefore under the control of the Leader of the Council, who during the period covering the TdF preparations was the Cabinet Leader with responsibility for Economic Development. The Task Group found no record of any decision by the Cabinet Leader approving the inclusion of the GD concert or its continuation following the loss of the campsite at Monk Stray.

Analysis

Camping Sites

56. Some of the negative public feedback could have been averted if the website advertisement for the various campsites had been properly checked and the incorrect postcodes identified.
57. The potential for a public outcry and resident's objections should have been foreseen for both the unlimited events licensing application and the planning application for an additional access in Stockton Lane to the Heworth end of Monk Stray, particularly bearing in mind the previous difficulties over a licence application for the Heworth end of Monk Stray.
58. The apparent poor handling of the CYC engagement meeting with residents in March 2014 added to the public disquiet over the plans for the Heworth end of Monk Stray.
59. There was a significant risk of major embarrassment associated with the management of the campsites by the Caravan Club, had they used their exemption certificate to avoid a need to apply for planning permission for camping at the Hop Grove end of Monk Stray. This risk should have been foreseen and mitigated. The risk of knock-on effects on the whole camping programme and the sale of tickets for the Grand Departure coming from a failure to deliver a campsite at the Hop Grove end of Monk Stray should also have been foreseen and mitigated.
60. Given that East Riding of Yorkshire staff were needed to manage the single campsite at Millennium Bridge, it is likely that further external resources would have been needed to manage campsites at the Designer Outlet and Monk Stray had they been operational. The additional costs and overheads should have been assessed and included in the project budget.

Spectator Hubs

61. Planning and delivery of the spectator hubs seems to have been successful, although no explanation was given for the decision to replace the Monk Stray (Heworth end) hub with a new hub at Huntington Stadium. Instead of saving money, this most probably cost additional effort and resources, making for additional strain on an already stretched team and putting the successful delivery of the project at risk. The possibility of over-loaded mobile networks should also have been foreseen, together with the possibility of the miss-placement of the large screens, both of which illustrate a lack of staff resource and clear co-ordination.

Grand Departy Concert

62. The cultural, commercial, logistic rationale and timetable for the concert were not defined from the outset. There was also no detailed assessment of the viability of the proposed concert, based on estimated ticket sales and concert costs, or that the target selling price for seats sold in the Stadium would at least cover the costs.
63. The proposed concert was not included in the collective planning vision until too late in the day - rather than being part of the regional TdF event marketing, the concert was ultimately seen as conflicting with it and was not properly supported.
64. There was a failure to maintain and retain a significant proportion of ongoing project documentation for the GD concert. The general TDF documentation was also incomplete – some Operational Board minutes were missing and Project Highlight reports were also missing, as were budget statements and ongoing financial records.
65. Delays arose within CYC when deciding which acts to have in the line-up.
66. Difficulties with the Huntington Stadium licensing application for the GD arose because of a delay in contacting the Stadium management.
67. It is not appropriate for key officers to be allowed annual leave at a critical point in an event planning process. In this case, this led to a crucial delay in the distribution of publicity material, contributing to the poor ticket sales.
68. The decision to continue with the concert despite the Caravan Club's withdrawal and poor ticket sales, all in the hope of not damaging the

city's reputation, led to the sale of tickets at heavy discounts in the hope of breaking even, compounding the problems.

69. The need for stewards at the concert was realised too late in the day and additional disruption was caused by the need to arrange these at short notice. There were also difficulties in terms of arranging for supply of mobile phones.
70. Concerns about safety of the event arose on the day of the concert, putting SAG officers under unnecessary pressure, which could have been avoided if the event manual had been supplied in ample time.
71. It was not clear where the political responsibility for the concert lay until some time after the event.

Review Conclusions

72. Whilst recognising the Council's outstanding achievement of delivering the Tour de France in York, the Task Group having considered all of their findings pertaining to the commercial activities undertaken, agreed that:
 - Due to the limited time available between the decision to proceed with the Grand Depart and the concert taking place there was insufficient time to plan and apply a number of the Council's processes e.g. proper/appropriate procurement, project and risk management procedures.
 - Time was also a factor affecting the council's other commercial activities undertaken as part of the programme accompanying the Tour de France, which resulted in the Council not fully applying its own project management principles to those activities.

Review Recommendations

73. As a consequence of their review, the Task Group identified a number of draft recommendations aimed at ensuring appropriate project management of future major events. However, it was subsequently confirmed that a number of those draft recommendations had already been implemented as a result of lessons learnt from the TdF project - officers confirmed that a detailed officer review was undertaken of project management, which resulted in the following improvements:

Task Group's Proposed Recommendation	Feedback From Officers regarding progress improvements
a. The cultural, commercial,	The Council's Project Management

<p>logistic rationale and timetable for an event must be defined from the outset and it must include all related activities.</p>	<p>framework now sets out a process for the development of a business case and associated plans and this includes scoping, cost/benefit analysis and risk management. A project like TdF would likely be classified as a large project and therefore be reported to CMT on a regular basis and be included in the Large Project Highlight Report which is routinely presented to the Audit and Governance Committee for scrutiny in terms of process.</p>
<p>b. All project documentation for both principal and subsidiary events must be produced in a timely manner, maintained during planning and retained post implementation. This includes financial, cultural and commercial appraisals, minutes or notes of meetings, project logs, action lists/ progress reports, records of decisions made formally and under delegated authority, risk registers, estimates, budgets and financial statements, , all purchase and sales contracts, orders, invoices and payment records.</p>	<p>The Project Management framework now dictates that these documents are in place, particularly for large projects, so this would be captured for elements that are in scope of the project. Links and dependencies would also be identified.</p>
<p>c. A detailed assessment of financial viability must be carried out for any event, particularly where an admission charge is to be made (including ticket prices, total number and value of expected ticket sales, concert costs and venue costs), in order to inform the decision on whether to proceed. This should include the costs and other overheads associated with using external</p>	<p>This would now be included in the business case development process.</p>

agencies/bodies etc.	
d. As part of assessing whether or not to proceed with a project, consideration should be given to how best to deliver it i.e. in-house or by an external provider	
e. Both the administrative and political lead must be identified to the staff team, external contractors/providers and to Members of Council as soon as possible after project initiation and before approval to proceed is given.	As part of the Project Management Framework, roles and governance are now identified during the pre-project phase to ensure robust arrangements and that it is clear who has been identified to perform a particular role in relation to the project.
f. Performance and availability of necessary resources must be monitored against project plans so that remedial action can be taken where needed, and if a decision is taken to change the direction of a project mid-process, this must be recorded with written justification.	Operating within the project management framework, these decisions are now recorded (including justification). As part of the corporate project governance arrangements, a project the size of TdF would be regularly reviewed by CMT and Audit and Governance as routine, as part of the Large Project Highlight Report to supplement individual reports that would go to CMT and Executive.
<p>g. Each element of a project must be included in the overall project risk register and monitored within the project management process. This should include the possible risks associated with:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ Any necessary planning or licensing applications (to include examining and factoring in the previous history of local event planning or licensing applications associated with a site/venue). ▪ Using external agencies to manage/provide event related activities - this must include 	The corporate project framework now in place guides project staff to develop and manage risk registers from an early stage of a project (pre-project right through to closure, with risk workshops). All elements that have been identified as “in the scope” of the project should be assessed for risk and controls and actions be put in place in order to mitigate the risk. A key part of the process, in order to cover the issues presented below, is to ensure that it is clear what is “in scope” and what is “out of scope” (exclusions). This will be clearly written into the Project Initiation Document. If an item is not in the initial scope of a project, there will

<p>an assessment of CYC's relationship with those external agencies</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ The knock-on effects of cancelling or significantly changing one element of an event on other elements ▪ Not being ready to deliver an event by the agreed date, particularly where time is limited between project initiation and event date' ▪ The supply of equipment for an event - where a pre-event trial cannot be carried out, suppliers must be vetted thoroughly and references obtained before any contract is placed. ▪ Equipment failure - back-ups for vital equipment which is used only for the duration of the target event (e.g. walkie-talkie radios to cover mobile phone failure) must be arranged and user-tested in good time, before the event. 	<p>need to be a change control process, through the project board, that formally places the item "in scope" explaining the adjustments to the business case, plan and risks or articulates the arrangements that will be in place if it is "out of scope", but there is a clear link between the project and the new item. This will be reflected in board minutes and decisions.</p>
--	---

74. The Task Group were pleased to note the improvements made to date, and therefore agreed their proposed recommendations listed in the table above had already been implemented. However, they did agree further recommendations were required to ensure the appropriate project management of major events in the future as listed below:

- i. The engagement of any external promoters, providers or contractors must be carried out in accordance with CYC's procurement rules, and the Procurement Team must be consulted as part of the procurement process before any written contract document is drafted or any implied contract is created.

- ii. In regard to the involvement of Councillors by organising bodies e.g. CYC, Make it York etc, in any future significant events or any possibly controversial smaller activity:
 - A thorough assessment of the current local political situation should be made and reviewed as part of the consideration / planning stage.
 - Ward Member(s) in which an event(s) is to be held must be consulted as plans for the event are being drawn up and before they are made public.
 - All Councillors should be kept updated to seek cross-party consensus.
 - iii. Project work must be allocated to staff at the appropriate level so that managers and team leaders are not unnecessarily diverted on to lower level work.
 - iv. Staff leave during the critical period before delivery of any event must be carefully managed and restricted where necessary to ensure that event planning and delivery continues in accordance with the overall timetable.
75. In order to ensure the appropriate promotion of future major events:
- v. Arrangements for publicity must be planned before the event, and advertising and publicity for events must be checked for accuracy before implementation.
 - vi. Plans for public engagement meetings must take account of any anticipated objections from Ward Members, existing community groups or groups of residents. Such engagement meetings must take place in or near to the relevant area and proper notice of such events must be given.
76. To ensure the risks associated with future major events are assessed and mitigated effectively:
- vii. The event manual for each planned event must be prepared and supplied to the SAG and event management staff by the required pre-event deadline.
 - viii. For those events where ticket sales are required, in order to mitigate any associated financial risk, arrangements for monitoring ticket sales must be made before tickets go on sale and an effective method for the continuous assessment of sales against targets put

in place. Any proposed price changes or special offers to boost sales must be assessed and agreed before implementation.

- ix. Where an additional event is proposed to be run alongside an existing externally-originated programme, it must be agreed from the outset that this can be done and that no element of competition is anticipated.

Associated Implications

77. There are no Financial, Legal, HR, Crime & Disorder, IT or Equalities implications associated with the draft recommendations arising from this review

Risk Management

78. The corporate project framework guides project staff to develop and manage risk registers from an early stage of the project (Pre-project right through to closure, with risk workshops). All elements that have been identified as “in the scope” of the project should be assessed for risk, and controls and actions put in place to mitigate the risk.
79. In regard to recommendations vii – ix, a key part of the corporate project framework process, is to ensure that it is clear what is “in scope” and what is “out of scope” (exclusions). This will be clearly written into the Project Initiation Document. If an item is not in the initial scope of a project, there will need be a change control process, through the project board, that either formally places the item “in scope” explaining the adjustments to the business case, plan and risks, or articulates the arrangements that will be in place if it is “out of scope”, because there is a clear link between the project and the new item. This will be reflected in board minutes and decisions.

Council Plan

80. The TdF provided the council with an opportunity to impress visitors, businesses and residents with the quality of the city, and its legacy continues to increase visitor numbers and opportunities for income generation, thereby supporting the ‘Prosperous City for All’ priority of the 2015-19 Council Plan.

Contact Details

Author:

Chief Officer Responsible for Report:

Melanie Carr
Scrutiny Officer
Scrutiny Services

Andrew Docherty
Assistant Director, Legal & Governance

Tel No. 01904 552054

Report Approved

Date

26/06/2017

Specialist Implications Officer(s)

Wards Affected: List wards or tick box to indicate all

All

For further information please contact the author of the report

Background Papers: None

Annexes: None

Abbreviations:

CYC – City of York Council
CMT – Council's Management Team
GD – Grand Depart
H&NE – Huntington & New Earswick
SAG - Safety Advisory Group
TdF – Tour de France